



# **RESTORATION READINGS**

BY

**ORAM JACKSON SWINNEY**

**COPYRIGHT 1949**

**By**

**ORAN J. SWINNEY**

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

(Note: I have tried to maintain the spelling of words as they appeared in the text of the book. The unusual spelling was common in the day in which the articles first appeared. – B.J.)

*Being a compilation of works from able pens of the last century, and revived for you who neither possess the works from which they are taken nor have access thereto. This is not by any means to be considered exhaustive or complete. It is but a calling up, for profit in study, some things that should never perish from the earth, because they are based on eternal principles and therefore, of interest to every Bible student as well as the casual reader.*

—O.J.S.

## *PREFACE*

Anyone interested in the work of the Lord can not but appreciate the following pages taken from various works referring directly to the Nineteenth Century Reformation, and written for the sole benefit of restoring the Gospel in its truth and simplicity to that period. If, then, these works accomplished their purpose one hundred years ago, it seems plausible that a repetition of some of them might turn many today to the Lamb.

There is a notable and vivifying spirit of love and fellowship, as well as piety and deep reverence for God breathing throughout these works that will impress the reader, as well as instill into his being the consciousness, perhaps, of his own lack; and inspire him to aspire to the heights attained by these heroes of God, of the last century.

The natural force of these writings, their choice of words, the simplicity, depth and harmony, all combine to impress upon one the fact that the "weak and beggarly elements" of this life are insufficient for the soul of man; and that the saving power of God, his Word, is truly a "savor of life unto life."

My one regret is that I had not the ability to choose from the wealth of material at my disposal, the articles and items that might possibly be best suited to a work of this nature. But this goes forth with a fervent prayer that it may be read with the intent for which it was originally written; and for which I am passing it on to our Christian fellows of today: That God through Jesus Christ, our blessed Redeemer and Saviour, may receive all the praise, glory, love, and acclaim so justly due him from all the intelligence of this world.

ORAN J. SWINNEY.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania, March 9, 1945.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



	PAGE
Some Thoughts Through The Years A. Campbell .....	5
A New Year's Gift for 1835 (A discussion of The Gospel Restored) ...	8
A Welsh Anecdote .....	15
The Death of Mrs. Thomas Campbell by Thos. Campbell .....	16
The Death of Thomas Campbell – Dr. R. Richardson .....	23
Thomas Campbell's Farewell Address .....	26
Answers To Questions on Infant Baptism, The Covenants, The Clergy, etc. – Thomas Campbell .....	41
Questions and Answers on Baptism – A. Campbell .....	90
Questions and Answers on Discipline, Prayer, Baptism, Strong Drink, etc. – Walter Scott .....	105
Practical Thoughts and Reflections on Peter's Sermon – A. Campbell	158
Practical Thoughts and Reflections on Acts, vs. 37-47 – A. Campbell	160
Letters and Articles – Various	163
Death of Alexander Campbell – Moses E. Lard .....	173
Elder Walter Scott's Demise — A. Campbell .....	196
Letters, Etc., From Walter Scott's Works .....	198
Reformation .....	203
The Laver of Regeneration .....	205
The Inheritance .....	208
Articles .....	210
Union of the Disciples and Christians .....	211
Figures .....	219
Exhortation .....	220
Confession .....	221
Reasons for Embracing the Ancient Gospel .....	224
Correspondence .....	238
Marriage .....	252
Responsibility .....	258
Gospel Restored .....	269

DEDICATED TO MY LOVING WIFE

BETTY

WHO HAS BEEN MY CONSTANT  
COMPANION AND INSPIRATION  
THROUGH BOTH THE JOY AND  
SORROW THAT WALK HAND IN  
HAND IN THIS LIFE.

- OJS.

## **Some Thoughts Through The Years**

### FROM THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGERS

EVERY day's experience develops more fully the profound depths of the philosophy of the Divine Author of the Christian faith. Wisdom, knowledge, and goodness infinite appear in all his aphorisms. Errors of some sort may be found, have been found, and will be found in some of the maxims and sayings of the wisest of the wise men of all times, either ancient or modern; but no man's age, wisdom, knowledge, or experience has yet found one flaw in the reasonings, one error in the conclusions, one mistake in the recorded sayings of Jesus the Nazarene. Moreover, it is, to me at least, most clearly evident, that if human life were extended for the term of seven thousand years; and if man's experience were so enlarged as to engross within it the experience of all the men that have lived or shall live in that long period, he would at the close of his life have as much reason as when he first began to think for himself, to exclaim, the depths both of the wisdom and knowledge of Jesus Christ! how infinite! how unsearchable!

This fact constitutes no weak argument in proof of his celestial and divine descent. We might stake our hope of eternal life upon the inability of man, philosopher or sage, to detect an error or a falsehood in all that is recorded of him. But it was not for this purpose that we have made this remark; we have been led to it when about to quote a maxim from Jesus as pertinent to the commencement of a new volume. That maxim is, "Sufficient for every day is its own trouble." From which I learn, that every day has its own trouble; and in the second place, that its own trouble is sufficient for every day. This I did not know some twenty-five years ago.

In the bright sketches of a vivid imagination I foresaw, in the glowing visions of the future, many clear and cloudless days, without a sorrow or a sigh. But I was as one that dreamed. Every day, with all its pleasures and its joys, has had its troubles, too.

Though by kind nature happily inclined ever to contemplate the bright side of the picture, the disappointments of every day have at length thrown some dark clouds into all my paintings of the remnant of life. There are no more golden days, free from cares and fears within the horizon of my future anticipations. But the philosophy of Jesus happily interposes in my behalf, and admonishes me not to increase the troubles of today with those of tomorrow; but to regard the troubles of the present as sufficient without the addition of the anticipated evils of the future. While, then, the maxim of the Great Teacher assures us that every day "has its own trouble," it kindly admonishes us to regard its own trouble as sufficient.

"When I stepped forth into life, elate and gay in youth," said my old friend Paternus, "I saw nothing before me but pure streams of pleasure flowing from new fountains of delight. I was drinking nectar with the gods, or reclining on Elysian couches, feasting on ambrosial delicacies, or walking through the exquisite vales of Elysium in company with the nymphs of Paradise. In the morning I heard but the responsive echoes of the joys of returning day : in the evening nothing but the songs of nightingales, and the serenades of love; I saw nothing on earth but the bloom of Eden—The roses of Sharon and the lilies of the vales. Night itself was but the azure vault of heaven without a cloud, sparkling in all the splendid brilliancy of the countless lamps in the palace of creation.

"I sought a partner for my joys—for cares and sorrows I had none. I found a kindred soul in this aged matron of four score years, who now reclines her wearied head on my enfeebled arm. Pharaoh's daughter never wore such charms as she. At the age of 20, when we joined our hearts and hands, and fortunes, too, at hymen's sacred altar—were I to set forth her beauty, Eve would be my model. But the rose has withered, and the lily has forever faded from her cheeks.

"We lived for one full year in an enchanted castle; but our fears and cares began to bud when God blessed us with a son. Every little ailment of his infancy touched our hearts, and preached to us a strange sermon—that every rose has its own thorn. When he began to prattle round our knees, and seemed



exuberant in health and spirits, our joys were checked by the thought that even this good health and playfulness of temper might betray him in some ill-fated hour into the fire or water, or that some disaster might snatch him from our arms. God relieved us by giving us another, and another, and another, till in some twenty years we had five living sons and as many daughters too. I could not count the fears, and doubts, and cares, and anxieties which crowded upon us as they advanced in years. First our fears were drawn from their infancy and imbecility; then from their childhood and its dangers; then from their youth and its snares; and now from their manhood and its temptations. Even their children, and their prospects for years to come, occasion uneasy apprehensions. For years the sun scarcely rises or sets once without some pang, or shock, or fear; for now we have not less than forty-five descendants—children, grand-children, and great-grand-children, all looking up to us for counsel, or touching on some delicate point the sympathies of our souls. So that with old Jacob I can say, "Few and full of evil have been the days of the years of the life of my pilgrimage."

But to remember the maxim before us: I would say, that our experience approves the wisdom of implicitly receiving and acting upon the words of the Redeemer. In every case in which we can test his wisdom and goodness by our own experience, he is clearly and fully sustained. Ought we not, then, equally to rely upon him in all things to which our experience cannot reach; and obey him, without hesitation, even when his requisitions seem incompatible with our immediate pleasure and the suggestions of our passions and affections?

But the reader will say, "What has all this to do with the preface to a new volume?" I will tell you, then, gentle reader, that the beginning of a volume is a good deal like the beginning of one's life :—we anticipate much—we promise much—we fear much—we are anxious about much that will never come to pass. And do not know why it is, but so it is, that I anticipate more than usual, and fear more than usual, in reference to the present undertaking; and lest I should be disappointed, I thought it good to preach a short sermon to myself on a good text; and

I thought it might not be injurious to my reader to hear it, and to learn with me two useful lessons from one aphorism, viz.—that every day has its own trouble, and that the troubles of every day are sufficient for itself, without those of tomorrow.

Alexander Campbell, Jan'y. 1835.

#### A NEW YEAR'S GIFT FOR 1835

The restoration of the gospel institution has been our theme for many years. Some contend that it was restored to its original simplicity and intelligibility when the New Testament, fairly translated and disencumbered from the traditions of men, accompanied with the proper rules of interpretation, was presented to the people. "This," say they, "is not only objectively, but virtually to restore the Christian institution to as many as will receive the book." Others may be found who contend that the development of the various elements of the gospel, and the items of that order of things instituted by the Apostles, contrasted with various abuses found in the apostasy exhibited on the pages of our publications, is the restoration of the Christian institution. But some again may be found, who, in their acceptance of the term restored, only regard the Christian institution as restored when preached by the mouth, and when received by some persons. Thus we have the gospel restored objectively, theoretically, and practically, according to the modes of thinking of different individuals. But the gospel institution, if not restored when the Apostles' writings, in their fair construction, were put into the hands of the people—if not restored when the elements were fully developed and contrasted with the corruptions in which they were interred, by the pen, the tongue, and the press—if not restored when simply preached viva voce to the people, and by them acknowledged to be according to the written record; but when practiced, that is, the testimony believed, the promise embraced, and the commandments of the Messiah obeyed—then the Christian institution was not restored, in fact, until one congregation, immersed into the faith of Christ, began to walk in all the commandments and ordinances

of the Lord, according to the word of the Apostles, having the living oracles deposited in their hands.

If the gospel was first fairly and fully declared in Jerusalem, the day of Pentecost; and if the first organized congregation, receiving and practising the Apostles' doctrine in full, was the commencement of the Christian institution in fact—then the restoration of that institution to its primitive character must be dated (not from the first person immersed under that but) from the first congregation immersed into the testimony and organized according to the Apostles' doctrine. But still if such a congregation do exist, or did exist, be it noticed that the gospel institution is only so far restored to the world as it has been received and practiced by that congregation and such as have grown out of it.

It is necessary, for it is now time, that when there is much said about reformation and restoration—about the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things—that we had definite, and perspicuous, and correct ideas of these words and sentences; and that we could ascertain how far the Christian institution is at this moment actually restored.

We neither wish to be deceived nor to deceive any individual on this subject, nor would we hold up to the world as a model of the Christian institution restored, any community which has only been immersed upon the confession of the primitive faith, which is not organized according to the Christian institution, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayers of the Apostles.

It is not to institute the invidious and foolish question, What church has this honor? or, who planted it? or, who waters it? or, Where shall we look for it? but to call the attention and to fasten the minds of the brethren who are zealous for the restoration and the reformation, etc., upon themselves, that they may learn, understand, and feel how far they are restored, reformed, and blessed with the pure unadulterated institution of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps we have all much more credit with the public, and look for more credit than we deserve. Perhaps it would be more

difficult to find the first church, the second church, or the last church which exhibits the Christian institution restored, than some of us imagine. But the question which we desire to institute, and which we desire to have debated by every professed performer and restorer in the land, is, Does the church of which I am a member enjoy the Christian institution restored? If it do not, then how should it be organized? Wherein reformed? or, What is wanting to its perfection according to the primitive model? This question to the individual members of all the churches, respecting the standing of their church, I would most affectionately and most respectfully tender as my New Year's gift for 1835. But it is not the only one: Another is yet to be expressed, which is tendered as a part of the same gift. It is this: how far have you, my brother, reformed from the corrupt practises of the professors in other societies, that profess not to belong to this reformation?

If these two questions (the former respecting the congregation—the latter respecting yourself,) are duly considered, and practically carried out in their details, in the same spirit from which they are dictated, and for the object for which they are proposed, I am assured that my New Year's gift will not be contemned.

Give me leave to add, that our convictions are annually more and more deepened from a still more intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Apostles and the Prophets—that to be a living, active, intelligent, and useful citizen of the kingdom of heaven, is a more bold, arduous, and lofty enterprize, than most of us moderns are willing to admit. The exhortations, cautions, expostulations, and motives to a courageous, bold, and persevering course of action presented by the Apostles, and by the Saviour himself, are such as to inspire us with very high conceptions of Christian character, and of the difficulties which impede or retard our ascent to heaven.

The imagery, comparisons, and striking similitudes used by the Apostles descriptive of Christian life and action, when carefully considered may assure the most dull of apprehension, that the obtaining of an unfading crown in the church triumphant, is one of the boldest and loftiest aspirations, and one of the most

magnificent enterprizes of which humanity is capable. An indolent, idle, lazy, inactive Christian, is an association of words wholly inadmissable in the syntax of Christiania. One might as well conceive of a knavish, cunning, sly, roguish honest man, as of an indolent, slothful, sensual Christian.

I have thought it might be a useful service, and perhaps an acceptable one to the majority of our readers, to set before them, in a connected view, the various allusions to ancient customs found in Paul alone, designed to set forth the arduous efforts necessary to an honorable understanding in Christ's band on earth, and to preferment in the celestial kingdom. This I shall attempt in the present volume, under an appropriate head, for the purpose of arousing the sleeping energies of many who are dreaming in their slumbers on earth of glory eternal at last, while they have scarcely morality enough to make them respectable citizens of Virginia or Ohio, to say nothing of the lack of that strong, manly, and healthy piety which adorns human nature.

The tone and pulse of Christian morals need much to be changed for the better. Unless the disciples greatly excel in their individual characters on comparisons with other professors or non-professors, in vain would the tongue of Demosthenes and the pen of Cicero attempt to sustain their pretensions to primitive Christianity. And unless the congregations exercise a more faithful discipline, and not suffer them who in word or action dishonor their profession to remain among them, who will not or cannot be reformed, the good cause, hitherto plead so successfully, must languish, and be greatly impeded in its march and conflicts with the opposition.

If the disciples will go forth pure as the light of heaven, clear as the sun, and fair as the moon, they will be as terrible as an army with banners. But it is by truth speaking, covenant keeping, and righteous seeking that we conquer and silence the artillery of the adversary. When constables, sheriffs, and the officers of justice are in quest for the disciples of Christ for their broken pledges, false promises, violated covenants, and other transgressions of political law, the church that owns

them may lock her doors and hang her harp upon the willow trees.

There must be a stricter discipline—I say, beloved brethren, there ought to be, there must be, if Christ be regarded, a stricter discipline. There is one commandment you must obey—"From such turn away." "From whom?" do you ask. Those, in one word, who have the form of godliness, but deny its power. But read Paul's 2d Epistle to Timothy, especially chapter III, and learn the character which you are not to endure amongst you. As it is better in the sight of heaven and earth to be a poor honest man, than a rich and wicked man; so it is incomparably better to have a small church of good, zealous, irreproachable Christians, than the full of the largest synagogue in London, of the faithless, truthless, and Christless Christians of the 19th century.—May the Lord sanctify us more and more through the truth! for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

EDITOR

Williamstown, Grant County, Ky., Nov. 8, 1834.

Brother Campbell :

BEING well aware of the numerous burdensome communications forwarded for your publication, it is with diffidence I solicit a page in the Millennial harbinger for this. But presuming it may not only prove interesting to yourself, but also to many of your readers, I transmit it with a hope that you will devote to it that attention to which you, in your better judgment, may think it is entitled.

I have resided in this place for nearly twelve months, during which period I have heard many lectures upon the Scriptures, from Presbyterians, Calvinists, Methodists, Reformers, etc., and to my great astonishment, I have heard but little said concerning "the secret operations of the Holy Spirit", "the Bible a dead letter," etc., etc.; but I have heard language like the following, even from the mouths of Presbyterians themselves : –

"No man," says one, "can be converted to Christianity only

by hearing or reading some important truth contained in the Bible."

"Any man," says a second, "who will sit down and examine the Scriptures with that intensity with which he would examine the record of a landed matter in which he himself is interested, will rise up a Christian before he shall have read the Bible once through."

Brother Campbell, you are a scholar and critic——can you tell me how this language must be interpreted to make it mean what has been so long taught, namely, that, "the Scriptures have in them a mystical, theological, or some other than a literal or a figurative meaning"? But enough of this.

Among the many preachers, whose meetings I have attended, there is Elder John Roberts, of Harrison County, Ky., whom I consider the main pillar in the Reformation in this part of the state. He is a gentleman of but limited literary attainments, but who is well acquainted with the Scriptures, and who reasons so forcibly, and proves so clearly from the Bible the doctrine which he preaches to be apostolic, that I cannot see how any rational being, who will listen attentively and impartially even to one of his discourses, can avoid being convinced of the necessity of yielding immediate obedience to the Son of God. I have often attended his meetings with much interest; but never, under his preaching have I witnessed a more interesting scene than the conversion of old brother Arnold and his almost superannuated companion, both in the 74th year of their age, accompanied by the conversion of (now) old brother Sowards, in the 75th year of his age. Brother Arnold is a man whose youthful ear witnessed the thundering of the revolutionary cannon; who was subsequently engaged twelve years in conflicts with the Indians, in which he received a ball that he carries in his flesh to this day; who has resided in this country for the last thirty years; whose fields have been converted into this town; whose ample possessions and charitable hands have liberally contributed to the wants of his fellow-creatures; who has been "careful to entertain strangers;" whose house (being a large brick) has for many years been open to all denominations of preachers; and whose life has long been remarkable

for temperance and piety, he and his wife having been orderly members of the Methodist for the last fourteen years. But notwithstanding he had listened with due attention to so many arguments in favor of so many doctrines and creeds, and had lived a pious life for so many years, yet, it seems, in drawing near the close of life, he was fearful of "making a leap in the dark," and that something was yet necessary to insure his salvation. Under these impressions, at the close of a discourse delivered by brother John Roberts, upon the evening of the 5th instant, in which he urged emphatically the necessity of meeting God in his own appointed way, and proved most conclusively from an overwhelming cloud of testimonies, drawn from the language of Jesus and his Apostles, that baptism is the act in which true believers in Christ put him on and have their former sins remitted, brother Arnold and his aged consort arose and demanded baptism. This, brother Campbell, was an affecting scene—so much so, that the congregation was in a flood of tears—tears of joy—not those of grief. Next old brother Sowards, who had also traced the toilsome paths of life from the revolutionary war, burdened with the sins of three score years and fifteen, lacking seven days; whose gray hairs and trembling limbs seemed to portray him as tottering over the grave, "leaning on a slender straw," went forward and demanded baptism in the name of Jesus, declaring that he believed him to be the Son of God, the Saviour of sinners, and that he desired to serve him the remainder of his days.

Accordingly they repaired to the water on the evening following, were baptized by brother Roberts, and returned to town, the placid countenance of each seeming strongly expressive of the ever-memorable language of old Simeon—"Lord, now lettest thy servant depart in peace according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

Brother Roberts remained three days with us, during which time nine persons made the good confession, three of whom were members of the Methodist church at this place previous to baptism.

Yours in the hope of immortality,

Lunenburg C. Abernathy.



## WELSH ANECDOTE.

A Welsh clergyman invited to assist in the ordination of a minister in some part of England, was appointed to deliver the address to the church and congregation; and having been informed that their previous minister had suffered much from pecuniary embarrassment, although the church was fully able to support him comfortably—took the following singular method of administering proof.

In his address to the church, he remarked, "You have been praying, no doubt, that God would send you a man after his own heart, to be your pastor. You have done well. God, we hope, has heard your prayer, - and given you such a minister as he approves, who will go in and out before you, and feed your souls with the bread of life. But now you have prayed for a minister, and God has given you one to your mind, you have something more to do—you must take care of him; and in order to his being happy amongst you, I have been thinking you have to pray again. "Pray again[ pray again! what should we pray again for!" Well—I think you have need to pray again. "But for what?" Why I'll tell you. Pray that God would put Jacob's ladder to earth again. "Jacob's ladder! Jacob's ladder! What has Jacob's ladder to do with our minister?" Why I think if God would put Jacob's ladder down, that your minister could go up into heaven on the Sabbath evening, after preaching, and remain all the week; he could then come down every Sabbath morning, so spiritually minded, and so full of heaven, that he would preach to you almost like an angel. "O, yes, that may be all very well; and if it was possible we should like it; but then we need our minister with us during the week, to attend prayer ,meetings, visit the sick, hear experience, give advice, etc., etc., and therefore must have him always with us; we want the whole of his time and attention." That may be, and I will admit the necessity of his daily attentions to your concerns; but then you will remember, that if he remains here, he must have bread and cheese; and I have been told that your former minister was often wanting the common necessaries of life, while many of you can enjoy its luxuries; and therefore, I thought if God would put Jacob's ladder down, your present minister might

preach to you on the Sabbath; and by going up into heaven after the service of the day, save you the painful necessity of supporting him.

Somerset, Pennsylvania, July 10, 1835.

SINCE I wrote you last, ten persons, having made the good confession, were baptized into Christ. This makes the late increase of our numbers here about thirty-seven. Forty have been baptized; but three, I think, were from other parts. Prospects of great accession still ahead. We are filled with joy, and walking in the Spirit, as we trust universally. We have a great desire to see our much esteemed father Campbell.

#### C. FORWARD.

TWO weeks ago I went to the Episcopal church in this place, and there saw the performance of the fourth mode of baptism. The Parson, after dipping his fingers in a bowl of water, and letting them drip till he had repeated the ceremony, "I baptize thee," etc., put his almost dry fingers on the forehead of the child, and finally declared it regenerate. So we now have baptism without immersion, pouring, or sprinkling! Ohio

#### OBITUARY

For the gratification of a numerous family connexion, and of an extensive circle of interested acquaintance, both in this land of our nativity, whom we have not leisure to address particularly—we have consented to publish the following communication relative to the decease of our beloved mother.—

#### EDITOR

Bethany, Friday, May 1st, A. D. 1835.

ALICIA-ANNE CLAPP—

Dearly beloved Daughter—It becomes my painful duty to inform you of the decease of your worthy and beloved mother. She departed this life on Tuesday, the 28th ultimo, about 5 o'clock, P. M. aged 71 years and 8 months. She had been confined to her room, though not to her bed, for nearly two weeks. Last Sunday we had a meeting, as usual, in son M'Keever's; and she still felt able to come down stairs, and

recline on bed in the adjoining apartment, though not to be present with us. She spent a very restless night—had complained much of pain and soreness in her stomach and left side, for some two or three weeks previous; but still was able to dress and undress, to lie down and get up, without much or any assistance; till about ten o'clock the next day (Monday) the prior to her decease; at which time she manifested a slight degree of mental confusion; but by means of a gentle opiate, seemed so far relieved from her pain as to produce a disposition to repose, which she much needed, having slept but little the night preceding. She continued thus to doze and wake, by intervals, without manifesting any disposition to speak, except to ask occasionally for a drink of water. On Tuesday morning, between five and six o'clock, she seemed to wake out of a troublesome sleep, and seeing your brother Archbald and myself standing at the bedside, she asked us with apparent difficulty, what we thought of her case. I said, My dear, you are going to your gracious heavenly Father. She replied, Yes, my keeper—my preserver—I want my keeper—my preserver; meaning as we understood, her desire to be with him; for she spoke with labor and difficulty. I said, You are going to the blessed Saviour. She reiterated with a look and tone of expressive interest and resignation,—My salvation—my salvation—this great salvation! Thrice, at least, she distinctly uttered these soul-cheering, heart-consoling words. Pausing a little, I said, My Love, the Lord Jesus will shortly receive your spirit. These words, with a most expressive look of deep-felt complacency, she attempted to reiterate; but apparently unable to repeat them all distinctly, she dwelt upon the last part of the sentence, which she repeated twice or thrice,—"Receive my spirit—my spirit ;—he will receive my spirit." I said, My dear, you can say them in your heart, and the Lord will hear you. He will shortly give you a voice to praise him/' Perceiving her unable to reply we ceased to add. But—O! the meek, composed serenity!—the unanxious submissive resignation! which she manifested; not only at the trying moment of the communications; but, indeed, all along, from the commencement of her illness, patient, uncomplaining submission, was the constant tenor of her deportment. She had labored, less or more, under the influence of a troublesome

phlegmatic cough, from the beginning of winter, but with frequent intervals of relief. Even four weeks before her decease, she appeared for some time to be getting much better; nor, indeed, did we apprehend anything seriously dangerous in her condition, till part of the last two weeks; nor even at the last, was she unable to assist herself, as far as necessary, but for a part of two days. For the last twenty-four hours she manifested little or no symptoms of pain, but only a laborious breathing, occasioned by a collection of phlegm in the region of the lungs; and, for about fifteen minutes before she expired, she lay as tranquil as if asleep;—her eyes were close shut, without moving hand or foot, without the least struggle, she thus breathed her last.

But, O, my daughter, what a lesson has her decease taught me! I learned more of God, of Christ, and of myself, from the last twenty-four hours of her life, than I think I have done for the last twenty years—yes, in 'some sort, than I had ever learned in all my past life. I would not, for all the worldly enjoyments of twenty years of the most healthful activity, have been deprived of the benefit of having been present with your dying mother, the last week of her precious life. What an inestimable benefit the Lord conferred upon me, in the days of my thoughtless, inexperienced levity, in putting such a jewel into my bosom. She had been trained up in the fear of the Lord from her early infancy—the only and tenderly beloved daughter of a pious and early widowed mother, who brought her up with tender and pious affection, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Sincere, affectionate, unaffected, and benevolent ;—and, I may truly add, beneficent to the utmost of her ability, she took more pleasure in giving than receiving—in serving, than in being served. Hers was truly, and without ostentation, what the ambitious aspiring heathen proudly assumed as a just ground of enrollment among the gods of his country—"Because he had endeavored to imitate them, in having as few wants as possible of his own; and in doing everything in his power to supply the wants of others." Such, indeed, was her truly noble and independent spirit—and her kind and generous disposition. Add to these obvious and predominant features of her character, the depth and sincerity of her con-

jugal and maternal affection there could not be a more faithful, dutiful wife—a more tender and affectionate mother. Next to, and under Jesus Christ, I was the object of her constant and supreme attachment. We lived together nearly half a century; and I can truly say, she never once disappointed my confidence, in not carrying into effect, as far as possible, every injunction I laid upon her: and you well know my daughter, that I very frequently placed her in very trying and difficult circumstances not unfrequently with the sole tuition and management of a large rising family; especially at my coming to this country, when, for two long years and a half, the vast Atlantic was between us—and, that even for the last eight years, she was more than three-fourths of the time deprived of my company. Yet (though with manifest reluctance) to these burdens and privations, for nay sake, for her family's sake, and for the truth's sake, as the case might be, she meekly and resignedly submitted. But her hope and her comfort was her keeper, her preserver. And, as having been long accustomed to this blessed hope, it was the first thought—the first word that occurred, upon the annunciation of her approaching dissolution. I shall never forget the meek, child-like, submissive *look*, with which she uttered these soothing, consoling words—My keeper my preserver.

It appears we can never learn anything but by experience; especially to know God and ourselves. When I said above, that in being present with your pious mother, during the last week of her life, I learned more of God, of Christ, and of myself, than I had ever learned before; I did not mean that I had learned any new *attributes*, divine or human, that I had not learned long ago; but only, that I had learned more affectingly the real *import* of the divine economy in the constitution and assumption of our nature, with its blissful effects and consequences, than I had ever done before.—I mean especially, the blissful and glorious display of the divine goodness and love; and still more especially of the latter. It had long been, with me, a favorite maxim, that as "God is love," so "all his works are love." But at this trying moment with what peculiar force did it appear! The constitution of the human family is a *work* of purest, reigning love. A thing most evident, not only from

our sensitive and intellectual powers of enjoyment, and "the means of gratification with which we were, and still are, surrounded; but more especially, and supremely, from the principle of love—the endearments of conjugal affection, in which the human family was constituted; and out of which it was to grow.—

"Hail, wedded love! mysterious law! true source  
Of human offspring; of sole property in  
Paradise—a Paradise of all things  
Common, else: in thee the tender charities  
Of father, son, and brother, first were known."

In this heaven-born-love-born constitution, and law of our nature, has God laid, not only the strongest natural foundation of love among mankind; but also the strongest bond of grateful love to draw and unite us to himself, for such a gift. This is that anchor of love and gratitude to God for his unspeakable gift to another—better self; for whose sake a man will cheerfully forsake all things, even life itself, as we see from the beginning; for Adam was not deceived, but his wife, being deceived, was the cause of his transgression ;—he rather choosing to lose his life than his wife—to die with her—than to live without her.

The last night I sat with your dear mother, beholding the restless tossings of dissolving nature, and realizing our intimate connexion—the endearing affectionate attachment of her soul to me, what were my feelings towards her, and what were the grateful emotions of my heart towards God, the author of this attachment!—and towards our Lord Jesus Christ; by whose expiring agonies I realized her speedy, and ultimate triumphant deliverance from this last enemy, and our happy and eternal reunion in the divine presence. Here again we are presented with a still more transcendent manifestation of the divine love, the exuberant source of this most blissful consolation ;—"God manifest in the flesh"—"Immanuel—God with us." Thus identifying himself with us, and redeeming us by his blood. Here is the consummation of his love—"God is love." In this, he has not only made himself forthcoming to us for our relief and personal enjoyment; but also to all his holy rational crea-

tures: having thus taken a visible tangible form, and so made himself really accessible—an object of real personal intercourse; thus fulfilling the ultimate desire of the strongest personal attachment, that love and gratitude can effect; such as we have Job. XXIII, 3.—“O that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat!”—and in Canticles VIII. 1. “O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother; when I should find thee without, I would kiss thee, yea, I should not be despised.” Both these ardent aspirations have been long since fully answered. And now he, whose pure abstract essence bears no relation to time nor place, being invested with humanity, is thus made truly accessible to the rapturous adorations and embraces of his saints ... But alas! my dear, when I saw your affectionate mother draw her last breath, I felt as if my bond of attachment to the world was cut off, having now no longer any interest in it. And when I saw her laid in the grave, O how it reconciled me to that dreary mansion as to a peaceful home—a safe retreat from a busy, bustling, weary world. And now, henceforth realizing her intellectual existence in the unknown regions of the blest, who, like her, departed this life in the exercise of the divine faith, I feel a drawing, reconciling interest in, a consequent attachment to, that better country, which I never felt before; something like the sweet endearing thoughts of home. Something, I suppose, like what my beloved felt in relation to this country during her detention in the land of her nativity after my departure hence, and safe arrival here:—a feeling strong enough to subdue her female timidity to such a degree, as to induce her, after having already suffered an appalling shipwreck, to commit herself, and her dear children, a second time, to the fearful hazards of a tremendous ocean. Such, indeed, are my present feelings toward the strange, unseen country, whither my beloved has gone. I now think of it in relation to her, as the only known object of an entire personal attachment there. When I think of her, I think of it; and of it, because she is there. There still remains, however, one spot upon earth, to which also, for her sake, I feel a strong distinguishing attachment— the precious spot where her dear remains are deposited. There she lies in vicinity of our beloved

Margaret, your brother Alexander's first beloved, in the same blissful hope of a glorious resurrection. And now, dear daughter, what remains for me, thus bereft of my endearing attached companion, from whose loving faithful heart, I am persuaded, I was not absent a single day of our fifty years connexion.—Yes, what now remains for me, without any worldly care, or particular object of worldly attachment,—but, with renewed energy—with redoubled diligence, as the Lord may be graciously pleased to enable, to sound abroad the word of life—the praises of him who has called us out of darkness in to his marvelous light, and has thus blessed us. And at last, if it be the will of God, to have my mortal remains alongside your beloved mother's.

O blessed word of life! Who—possessed of human sympathy,—that has tasted of thy sweets, but would wish all to partake of thy blissful consolations; especially in the trying season of unavoidable calamity, seeing "man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upwards." But, alas for infidelity! that blighting, woeful, deadly evil!—which goes to rob us of our benign, heart-cheering solace. O, my daughter, may it be your happy privilege and mine to live it, to enjoy it; and thus to infuse among our acquaintance the balmy influence of its soothing, life-giving communications—And at last, filled with its blissful hopes, to depart in the lively triumph of a triumphant faith!

I remain, my dear daughter, your affectionate father,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.



**Death of Thomas Campbell, Sr.**

BY R. RICHARDSON

January, 1854.

I have to announce to the friends and to the brethren of the Reformation, THE DEATH OF THE VENERABLE THOMAS CAMPBELL, Sr. He died on the evening of Wednesday, January 4th, having attained to the advanced age of ninety-one years, lacking about a month.

This event, though in the natural course of things, by no means unexpected, will doubtless awaken, in many a bosom, the deepest emotions and the dearest recollections. Our beloved Father Campbell had been so long and so earnestly devoted to the cause of religious reformation, for which alone he seemed to live and labor, and had made, while thus engaged, so many journeyings through different parts of the United States, that he had formed a very widely extended circle of acquaintances and friends, to whom he was justly endeared, not only by these labors of love, but also by personal qualities so engaging as to command universal love and veneration.

Never was there an individual who manifested greater reverence for the Word of God, or a truer desire to see it faithfully obeyed. Yet this trust in the Divine word was not with him a mere verbal confidence, a faith or knowledge, like that of some professors, merely intellectual—lexical and grammatical; for never was there one who more fully recognized the spirituality of the gospel, or sought more diligently to impress all around him with the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of the soul. And never was there one who more fully exemplified the doctrine he taught, or whose life was more evidently guided by the teachings of the Spirit, and controlled by the Divine principle of love to God and man. To the faith of Abraham and the piety of Samuel, he added the knowledge, the purity and the warm affections of the Christian, and combined in his deportment a simplicity of manners and a courtesy

singularly graceful, with a dignity which inspired respect of all who approached him. Oh, who that has to enjoy the pleasure of his society, can ever forget that countenance of benignity; those thoughtful eyes, beaming with affectionate regard; those venerable silvery locks, smoothly parted, with habitual neatness, upon the high and ample forehead, and contrasting so agreeably with the fresh and lively tints of his complexion; those kindly greetings and inquiries with which he so politely welcomed his friends; or that ready overflow of Christian feeling and instruction which he seemed unable long to repress within a heart filled with love and Divine truth! Oh! thou revered instructor of my early years, beloved guide of my youth, honored counsellor of my manhood, can thy image be ever obliterated from my heart! can thy teachings and thy example be ever absent from my remembrance! Oh! how great a blessing it has been to the multitudes, to have been allowed the privilege of contemplating thy character, and of hearing from thy lips words of truth and of grace! What thanks do we not owe to God for so precious an illustration of the power of the gospel, and of the beauty and excellency of the Christian profession!

From an early period of life until within about seven years, this devoted servant of God was actively engaged in the work of the ministry, he was connected, in his native country of Ireland, with the Covenanters and the Seceders, and continued with the latter some two years after his removal to this country. From this time he gave himself wholly to the cause of Christian union and religious reformation, having become thoroughly disgusted with the party spirit and the religious animosities of the different sects. He seemed to prefer the life of an itinerant, and visited every part of the country where he thought his labors might be useful, delighting to visit occasionally the brethren with whom he previously sojourned. He returned from one of these excursions so late as the summer of 1846; but being greatly exhausted with heat and fatigue, through the solicitation of his friends and relatives, to remain at Bethany, where, under the affectionate care of his son Alexander and the kind and unwearied attentions of his daughter-in-law, Mrs. S. H. Campbell, he has spent his last years in all the happiness and comfort which the infirmities of age permitted him to enjoy.

From these, indeed, he suffered comparatively but little, if we except the loss of sight, which occurred about five years since, and which debarred him from reading, and visiting his friends—a privation which he deeply felt, but patiently endured. It was his delight, during his blindness, to converse with his former acquaintances; to recite to them various hymns and passages of Scripture, with which his memory was stored, and comment on the sentiments they expressed, or to hear portions of the Scripture read. On one occasion, during this period, through the earnest entreaty of friends who desired once more to hear him from the pulpit, he consented to deliver a farewell address. He preached, accordingly, on the 1st of June, 1851, at Bethany, to a large audience, a last discourse, on the subject of the two great commandments—love to God and love to our neighbor. It was, indeed, a solemn, impressive, and most interesting occasion, the speaker being entirely blind and in his 89th year, yet with mental faculties still active and vigorous.

His health continued good until within some three weeks of his decease, when he became affected with a severe inflammatory affection of the mouth, which induced great debility and loss of appetite. Under these circumstances, he became gradually weaker, but without suffering acute pain, and at length expired so gently that it was scarcely possible to distinguish the moment when he ceased to breathe, having through his illness, manifested the same calm confidence in God and humble reliance upon his Divine Redeemer, which had ever characterized his life. He was buried on Friday, January 6th, by the side of his beloved consort, agreeably to the wish expressed in his affectionate notice of her death, contained in a letter to his daughter Alicia, and published in 1835, in the 6th vol. M. li., 1st series, page 284, where he says : (Note : See previous obit for this.)

I have given the above details, as I know they will be most acceptable to many friends at a distance, who have long known and loved the deceased. May we all contemplate with profit this peaceful end of a life spent in the service of God, and follow his faith, considering the end of his conversation—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever!

R.R.

**Farewell Discourse of  
THOMAS Campbell, Sr.**

Delivered June 1st, 1851.

BY W. K. PENDLETON

(The following discourse, at the request of several friends, is an attempt to reproduce, after nearly three years, the Farewell Sermon of the beloved Elder THOMAS Campbell, now no more on earth. I heard the sermon, and took notes of it during its delivery, and from these, I have written the following discourse. It is recognized by those who knew the departed well, as his, not only in thought, but, as nearly as could be under the circumstances, also in word. We do not hesitate, therefore, to present it to our readers, as the Farewell Address of this aged and eminent man of God, especially as we know there are thousands who will be deeply gratified to hear words of warning and encouragement from one so distinguished for his piety and learning, and so widely known and loved as he was, though those words should reach them in a form that must divest them of much of their original pertinence and power. The eloquence of the person we cannot give; his clear voice, tremulous with earnestness—his noble brow, radiant with love, and his silvery locks, white with the frost and the wisdom of eighty-nine years —these, the pious reader will imagine, as he reads the noble thoughts which are the solid value of the sermon which follows. —W. K. P.)

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself.—Matt. XXI:37-40.

BELOVED FRIENDS AND brethren: It has been the affectionate wish of many beloved friends and brethren in Christ, that, in view of the necessity which the infirmity of age and loss of my sight lay upon me to cease from my labors in the

public ministry of the word I should give a farewell discourse to those of my friends and brethren who meet stately in this place, and with many of whom it has been my distinguished privilege, for many years, to unite in the worship of our adorable heavenly Father. But I have heretofore felt myself discouraged, by my failing capacity, to undertake to perform a task so affectionately urged by you, and on that account, also, so much desired by myself. But it has pleased the heavenly Father to bring me here this morning, the subject of his mercy and the object of his unwearied care, and I am, by his strengthening grace, here to commune with you, as best I can, upon the common duties, privileges, and hopes of the people of God. May the God of all grace give me strength so to do, to the glory of his adorable name!

Here let me observe that in suitableness to my state of infirmity and age, and this solemn occasion, which we are impressively admonished to consider as the last public service of my long-protracted life, I have felt myself excited to call your attention to the due consideration of the great radical principle of our holy religion, so sententiously and comprehensively set forth by our blessed Lord, in the response which he gave to one of the Pharisees, a teacher of the law, who asked him a question tempting him, saying, "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" The reply of our blessed Lord to this seemingly perplexing question, is most sententious and comprehensive. It embraces the entire scope and design of all divine law, and leaves no room either for ignorance or doubt. Listen to his simple, yet all-comprehensive reply: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

My beloved brethren, you will please observe that this answer, apparently so extemporaneous and unpremeditated, is yet so explicit as to leave no room for misapprehension on the part of any, even the most ignorant; so that the wayfaring man, though a simpleton, can practically understand and obey it; and, at the

same time, so all comprehensive, that no thought of the human mind can conceive of any duty which it does not include—for we can do nothing more, either to God or our neighbor, than is required in these words. We are called upon to love God with all our powers, and our neighbors as our self. On these two commandments, our blessed Saviour assures us, hang all the law and the prophets. And it must be so, for we can go no higher in our duty to God, than thus to consecrate our heart, soul and mind, in adoring devotion to him,—nor to our neighbor, than to love him as our self in all things relating to his happiness and well being, both in this life and the life to come.

Here are two objects—1st. The Author of all being and blessedness calling upon us *to* love him; upon us, frail and perishing worms of the dust; not to perform some marvelous work; not to offer, upon bloody altars, the cattle upon a thousand hills; not to do painful penance, or torture ourselves with cruel scourgings, and starve ourselves with protracted fastings; but simply to love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind. This is all. To love him—the adorable Father. And who should not love him, who made us all, preserves us all, every moment of our being, and provides for us every blessing that earth can give or heart desire? To love him is all; yet what could we more?—for this includes the second object—the love of our neighbor. Our blessed Lord says the second commandment is like the first, and when we consider the character of our heavenly Father, we see it must be so. He is, essentially and eternally, Love, and he would have his creatures, whom he originally formed in his own likeness and after his own image, to be like him in Love. He so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son to die for lost, undone, perishing humanity; and can we love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and not love the being for whose salvation he spared not his own Son, but gave him up freely to the death, that they might not perish, but have everlasting life? No, my brethren. Truly is the second commandment like the first, we must also love our neighbor as our self. We cannot love God, as required in the commandment, without it.

But you will ask, Who is our neighbor? Our blessed Lord has beautifully and feelingly answered this question in the "Par-

able of the good Samaritan," recorded by Luke. I am sorry I cannot read it to you, for it has pleased my merciful heavenly Father—ever blessed be his name—in the wisdom of his Providence, to take from me my sight; but I trust you have your Bibles, and consult them continually, night and day, that you may know the will of him who has so graciously condescended to enlighten us; and that knowing it, you may be found continually walking in his commandments, for they are holy, just and good.

The poor creature whom the Saviour introduces to answer the question, "Who is my neighbor?" was in a most deserted and necessitous condition. There was nothing about him to attract the proud, nor to gratify the vanity of such as seek honor one from another; for he had fallen into the hands of thieves, who had stripped him of his clothes, and had beaten him till he was half dead, so that he could promise nothing but trouble and expense to any who would attend to his wants. Accordingly the priest, who, by chance, came down that way, saw him and passed by on the other side; and the Levite, also, when he had looked at him, went on his way. Yet this wretched, naked, half-murdered poor creature, was their neighbor; that is, their fellow-creature, made in the same divine image, with themselves, and therefore, worthy of their sympathy and assistance. Our blessed Saviour, by this example, teaches us that every man is our neighbor, no matter how poor, fallen, and wretched he may be; because he is our fellow-creature, he is our neighbor, and we must love him as our self.

But what does this mean, "We must love our neighbor as our self?" Our blessed Lord answers this question also, by presenting us with the conduct of the Samaritan, who took care of this unfortunate victim of the avarice and cupidity of the thieves, who had robbed and almost murdered him. He tells us that this humane Samaritan, "had compassion on him, and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast and brought him to an Inn, and took care of him"—providing all things necessary for his comfort and recovery. This was to love him, in the sense of the commandment; and you may perceive, my beloved brethren,

that it is no less to be forthcoming, as far as lies in our power, to every fellow-creature, whom we find suffering under any of the ten thousand ills to which our perishing nature is continually exposed, and to afford them all needed relief which the circumstances will allow. We thus see that the commandment is not only very broad, but also exceedingly plain; and that it is transcendently important, is abundantly manifest from the declaration of our Lord, that "*On these two hang the law and the prophets.*" Let us be anxious, therefore, and prayerfully striving continually to bring ourselves under subjection to those two all-important commandments, and to Love our Divine Father with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our strength, and with all our mind, and our neighbor as our self; for if this temper be in us and abound, we shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But, my brethren, thus to love God and our neighbor, we must be acquainted with their characters and our relations to them. True it is, if we love God as required, we but love him to whom we are indebted for all that we have and all that we are, and it is, therefore, most reasonable that we should thus love him. Yet as love is not a simple voluntary emotion, but one which can only be excited in the human heart by the presentation of appropriate and worthy objects and the application and use of suitable means;—our merciful heavenly Father, in the greatness and fulness of his abounding grace, has freely condescended to furnish us with all things necessary to our own obedience to these two commandments, on which, he declares, hang all the law and the prophets. Now, one thing is certain—we cannot love that which we do not know; and, therefore, in order to love God, we must have such a revelation of his adorable character as will captivate the heart and bring our every faculty of soul and body in entire subjection to his will and pleasure. This he has most graciously furnished us, revealing it to us by his word, so that if we avail ourselves of the means, and make ourselves acquainted with all that he has revealed, we shall have everything needed to excite in us the most intense and entire love, for we shall discover, not only that he is infinitely good, lovely and great, but that he is the Author of our



being, the preserver and protector of our lives, and the actual giver of every blessing which we enjoy in time or hope to enjoy in eternity. He feeds us, clothes us, warms us, and leads us safe through dangers innumerable, both seen and unseen—so that the destruction that wasteth at noon-day, and the pestilence that walketh by night, do not come nigh us or hurt us.

As, then, to love our heavenly Father as required, it is necessary truly to know his adorable character; and as he has revealed his character to us in his blessed word, we are led, my brethren, to consider the importance of studying the law and the prophets, as well as all things else that it has pleased him, in his infinite mercy, graciously to reveal to us concerning himself and our duty to him; for the end and design of it all is to make us love him as he is, and for what he is—the supreme and eternal Author of all being and blessedness, to whom be glory forever! It is only from the Divine Book that we can learn what he has done for us—is now doing for us—and will hereafter confer upon us; and it is only by the grateful contemplation of these things, under a realizing sense of our own unworthiness, that we can be continually excited to "Love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and our neighbors as our self. On these two hang all the law and the prophets;" and in order to excite in us continually these happy results, were they given to us. How all-comprehensive, therefore, the answer of our blessed Saviour! since it implies and includes in it all that is necessary either for us to know or do, in order to please him here and enjoy him eternally hereafter. Oh, my brethren, how industriously should we study his holy word, and treasure it up in our hearts, as the blessed means under God, of our illumination and sanctification, and ultimate and eternal deliverance from sin, death, and the grave. Our universal attention with respect to him, is challenged in the answer of the Saviour. There is nothing that relates to his unrevealed character, that must not be considered by us. His character is, indeed, infinite, and none "by searching can find out God" perfectly and completely, and in all his wonderful and adorable attributes. We can, then, only go so far as he has been pleased graciously to reveal himself to our limited powers of apprehension and comprehension. But, my brethren, what a boundless field is open for us here. We have

no lack of information to excite us to perpetual praise. May the Lord incline our hearts to reading, meditation and prayer, that we may exercise ourselves unto godliness, to the glory of his adorable name!

The display of the Divine character, which is made in his word, is perfectly overwhelming; for when we consider simply his eternity and his omnipresence, we are lost in wonder and amazement. There was no time when he was not—no place where he is not. From everlasting to everlasting he is the same unchangeable God, who filleth eternity and immensity with his presence; so that if we run our minds back for a hundred millions of years—and thence, again, a hundred million times as far, we shall be no nearer the external, self-existent, unoriginated I AM, than when we began; for there was no time in the unimaginable past, nor shall be in the boundless future yet before us, in which God has not been, and shall not be, before and after it all.

And there is no place where he is not. Boundless as his vast universe, he fills it all—is over it—beneath it, and beyond it—present to every part of it, for it is in and through him that we and all things exist. Astronomers tell us, that no less than a hundred million suns, like our own, have been disclosed from the depths of space, and that so far as speculation can reasonably conclude, the most distant star may be as far from the center or the circumference of the universe, as is our own planet. Each of these mighty orbs stands or moves, resting upon nothing, at a vast and solitary distance from its nearest neighbor, thus comprehending in their mighty whole a length, and a breadth, and a depth of space, in which the finite mind of man is utterly lost. But all this does not bring us to the end of creation; yet God fills it all infinite in his extension as in his duration. And this Being is our Father! Amazing thought! "Such knowledge is too high for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it:"—so that we may well exclaim with the inspired Psalmist—"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my abode in hell, behold, thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

But in especial reference to man and our earth, our heavenly Father has revealed himself to us as a being of the most attractive attributes, calculated to excite us both to fear and love him continually: so that we are not left in darkness and doubt concerning the character of the infinite and eternal Being from whom all things proceed; but, on the contrary, it is our distinguished privilege to know him as he has revealed himself to us in some ten or eleven attributes, in which are summed up the Divine perfections, as displayed in Creation, Providence and Redemption. It is in these three relations that the infinite Father of us all is perpetually presented to man; and accordingly, it is in these respects that we should consider his greatness, his justice, and his love.

But what do we see displayed on every side, in the wonderful work of creation, but knowledge, wisdom, power and goodness! These glorious attributes, in infinite perfection and completeness, are everywhere present in all the works of his Almighty hand; so that the more we study the wonderful arrangements of nature, the more are we impressed with the glory of its adorable Author. Vast and innumerable as are the stars of the firmament, he made them all; and wonderful as are the creatures that may inhabit them, he knoweth them all. In wisdom, too, are they ordered, and from the Divine goodness have they proceeded. Thus we see, my beloved brethren, that infinite knowledge and wisdom have directed the omnipotence of Jehovah in the creation of all things, which his adorable goodness moved to call into being; so that at the end of the sixth day, we are told that "God saw everything that he had made, behold it was very good.

But this almighty Being does more than create. He has not launched all these mighty and innumerable works into space, and left them to take care of themselves. He still governs and rules over all. He is their lawgiver, governor, and protector. Therefore, in legislation and government, in addition to the four attributes which I have named, as manifested in Creation, our heavenly Father presents himself to us in three others—to wit, justice, truth, and holiness. In each of these he is infinitely perfect; and in harmony with these does he make and apply law

for the government of his creatures; so that we can, not only exclaim with the Psalmist, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom thou hast made them all," but also, in beholding the displays of his Providence in the guidance and government of the universe, must we testify, with him, that "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne; mercy and truth go before his face perpetually." "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods! Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders!"

These seven attributes are displayed in infinite perfection, in the creation and providence of God; and if man had not transgressed the Divine law, and, in consequence, fallen under the condemnation of sin and the sentence of death, we could ask for no more. But this, unhappily for us in this world, was not the case. Our parents ate of the forbidden fruit, and thus sin came into the world, and by sin death; so that the whole creation travaileth and groaneth till now. But our merciful heavenly Father, blessed be his name, did not forsake us in our lost, wretched, ruined, and undone condition, but graciously came to our relief; and when there was no eye to pity, nor arm to save, laid help upon one who was mighty—able to save all who come unto God by him. Yes, my brethren, our merciful heavenly Father has graciously provided for us, in the gospel of his Son, a complete deliverance from the power of sin, death and hell; and in the development of this marvelous and transcendent salvation, he reveals himself to us in three other attributes, in a manner that surpasses all human comprehension. These are his Love, Mercy, and Condescension, displayed in the salvation of perishing humanity. And what has God done for man to save him! Why, my brethren, no less than to give his own Son, to die the ignominious death of the cross. Was ever love like this! In him he invested Divinity with humanity, that he might become Emmanuel—God in us, and God with us! So "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

Thus did our blessed Redeemer divest himself of the glory which he had with the Father "from the beginning of his way,

before his works of old," and in his marvelous condescension, stoop to our vile abode, and take upon himself our degraded humanity, and subject himself to suffering, and neglect, and insult, and cruel and inhuman outrage and torture; and finally, the terrible and tremendous sufferings of a painful and ignominious death, the accursed death of the cross, and all for us. Oh! my brethren, well might the sun hide his face from such a spectacle as this! For who is this that the insane rabble are spitting upon, and scourging, and deriding, and torturing, and nailing to the cruel and shameful cross? Who is it that the sun will not look upon and the earth trembles for! Who is it but the being that made them!

"Oh! for such love, let rocks and hills  
Their lasting silence break,  
And all harmonious human tongues  
The Saviour's praises speak."

Yes, my brethren, it was the Creator of all things who thus suffered; and why did he submit to trials and agonies so tremendous, but for our sins! he died a sacrifice for us, for it is "in him we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."

It is clearly apparent, then, my brethren, that our heavenly Father, in his own person and that of his Son, has not only all things in the universe, and provided for its government and preservation, but that he has also made ample provision for the ultimate and eternal salvation of a large portion of it; so that when we look at our blessed Creator in relation to

time, eternity and redemption, we have such a display of his glorious and transcendent attributes of knowledge, wisdom, power and goodness, in creation; justice, truth and holiness, in government and legislation; and mercy, condescension and love, in redemption, as utterly and infinitely exceeds all human comprehension, and overwhelms our souls in admiration, adoration and praise. For it pleased the Father that our blessed Redeemer should, in all things, have the pre-eminence. Thus Christ is above all created comprehension—infinite and eternal—no time when he was not—no space where he is not ;—nothing of which he is not the author, and over which he does not preside; for although being "in the form of God, and thinking it not robbery to be equal with God, yet he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in the fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." We are indebted to him for all things, and accountable to him for all things; and thus we see why we should love him as required, "with all our heart, and mind, and strength, and our neighbor as our self." In these are absorbed all the law and the prophets. Piety and humanity comprehend our whole duty to God and our neighbor; and in these two, our heavenly Father has shown us his will, both in the precepts and example of his Son. We must consecrate our self, supremely and entirely, to God—body, soul and spirit, as our most reasonable service, and so love our neighbor as to be forthcoming to him in his necessities, in all respects, as we would have him to do for us, in like circumstances. The Bible requires no more, the law and the prophets teach no more, and God will be pleased with no less.

Now, brethren, I have given you the key and the compend. I can do no more. Whoever has, by studying this blessed book, fallen in love with God, and is doing the things therein commanded, and which are comprehensively summed up in the two

great commandments which we have been considering, is on the way to eternal bliss, and he will see in all things nothing but God. If we have any desire to be eternally happy, and to exist for the purpose for which we are made, let us make the contents of the Bible our study night and day, and endeavor, by prayer and meditation, to let its influence dwell upon our hearts perpetually. This is the whole business of life in this world. All else is but preparation for this; for this alone can lead us back to God—the eternal and unwasting fountain of all being and blessedness. He is both the Author and the Object of the Bible. It has come from him, and is graciously designed to lead us to him "unto all the riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Let us make it our continual study, therefore, to search out its precious contents, that we may know and enjoy him who has created us for his own glory; so that we shall ultimately see him as he is, and be with him where he is, and sit down with him upon the throne of his glory. And this every one shall do, who fulfills these commandments, for on them hang all the law and the prophets: And it is also written, "*he* that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my Son : " And "of him are we in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," so that in all things we are complete in Jesus—glory to his ever blessed name! This sets man at the head of the whole creation, next to God, where Christ, who has saved us by his death, and now lives to intercede for us perpetually, also sitteth. My brethren, we are persuaded that our gracious Father, who has done so much for us, will withhold from us no good gift. Yea, he is more willing to give than we are to ask, for he invites us and exhorts us to ask. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you; for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of *you*, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye, then, being evil, know how to

give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven, give good gifts to them that ask him?" "All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."

How rich and precious are these promises of our blessed Lord! But, my brethren, why should we doubt, since we already have the greatest gift—even the Holy Spirit—the Comforter, or Advocate, whom our blessed Saviour promised he would send to abide with his disciples forever. And this is "the earnest of our inheritance," given to us who believe in Christ, "in whom, also" says the Apostle Paul, "after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory;" and again, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" Thus, my brethren, we are thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work. God our heavenly Father, hath not withholden from us his Holy Spirit, a part of the Trinity in Unity; so that Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are all graciously and mercifully united in providing, procuring, and effecting our salvation. The Holy Spirit, by the law and the prophets, puts us into possession of the salvation provided for us by the Father, in sending his well beloved and only begotten Son into the world, to die for our sins. It is through the Spirit that we have been furnished with this divine illumination, and from it alone have we derived all definite and reliable knowledge of the adorable character and attributes of our Creator, of our duties to him, and our own future and everlasting destiny.

Oh, my brethren, what an exalted position God has placed us in, with respect to his whole creation! he has not only said, "he that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God and he shall be my *Son*," but our blessed Lord also says, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." What is this, my



brethren? Did ye hear it? Who says this? The same who said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Yes, it was the divine word, and let us take heed to its blissful promises. Let us give ourselves up to the word of God, to its guidance, to the diligent study of its blissful contents, to meditation, to prayer, and to the love of God, that we may love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves, for this is the sum of the law and the prophets.

These things being so, my beloved brethren, "Let us run with diligence the race which is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of the faith; who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." his promises can never fail, for they are sure and steadfast as his unchangeable and eternal nature. Some things he has promised conditionally, but this does not affect his veracity. He is both willing and able to perform all things which he has graciously promised concerning us. Let us, therefore, fall back upon his word, upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, and God himself the author of the whole. For it all rests upon his infallible word—infallible both as respects authority and power, and sooner shall heaven and earth pass away, than one jot or tittle of it fail of its final and complete accomplishment.

We have thus, my beloved brethren, as fully as our time will justify and my failing capacity enables me, pointed out the road which will surely lead us to eternal life. Let us adopt the prescription given us for the way, and exercise ourselves unto godliness night and day, searching the Scriptures continually, that we may come rightly to apprehend and truly to realize the revealed character of our God, thus fully to enjoy his salvation.

In conclusion, my dear brethren, I can say no more to you, as the last words of a public ministry, protracted, under the merciful care of our heavenly Father, for more than three score years, in my farewell exhortation to you on earth—I can say no more than what I have already urged upon you, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy soul, and all

thy mind, and all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself," for in so doing, the powers of hell shall not prevail against you. May the Lord God impress these truths upon our hearts, and enable us all, "through faith and patience, to inherit the promises"—keeping us by his power, until it shall please him in his infinite mercy to take us home to himself, to the enjoyment "of the inheritance of the saints of light;" and the praise, honor, and glory of our salvation, be eternally his, through Jesus, world without end. Amen.

**Some Pioneer Answers – 1824 thru 1861**

BY

T. CAMPBELL, A. CAMPBELL, AND THEIR CONTEMPORARIES

Q. Against whom did the holy prophets of the Jews, and the Saviour of the world and his apostles inveigh with the utmost severity?

A. The popular clergy. Never were any things spoken by the Saviour of the world, or by the holy apostles with so much keenness, with so much severity, as their reproofs of, as their denunciations against, the popular clergy.

Q. Who were the popular clergy in those days?

A. Those who pleased the people, taught for hire and established themselves into an order distinct from the people.

Q. Who are the clergy now?

A. Those who are trained for the precise purpose of teaching religion as their calling, establish themselves into a distinct order, from which they exclude all who are not so trained, and, for hire, affect to be the only legitimate interpreters of revelation.

Q. What are the most effectual means to diminish the power and dominion of the popular clergy?

A. The same means which the Lord and his apostles used in their day against those of that time: chiefly to persuade the people to hold fast the holy commandments of the apostles, and to build themselves up in the Christian faith. Jude. 2 Peter 3:2.

Q. Did God ever call any man for a work for which he was not fully qualified? And in the performance of which he was not successful?

A. No, if we except the modern preachers at home, and those called missionaries abroad. They say they were specifically called, but neither their qualifications nor their success

warrants the belief of these professions. With an open Bible in my hand, I must say that God never called a man to any work for which he was not qualified, and in the performance of which he was not successful.

Q. If you believed yourself specially called to preach the gospel to the Birman, what would you do?

A. I would not ask the leave of any board of missions, nor their support; but confiding in the power and faithfulness of him that called me, I would, without conferring with flesh and blood, depart, and look to heaven for every provision, protection, and support, by land and sea, necessary for safe conduct thither, and also for success when I arrived. If I could not act thus, I could not believe myself called, nor expect success in the undertaking. This, reason requires. But enthusiasm, superstition, or covetousness would prompt one to apply to flesh and blood for patronage and support, and at the same time to be professed to be called by God and to reply upon him for protection and success.

Q. Was Jesus a priest while on earth? Did he make an atonement when he died on the Roman cross? Did he appease the wrath of himself according to the common preaching of the clergy? Did humanity die and divinity leave the Son of God? What kind of body will the ungodly rise with in the resurrection? My design is to understand the scripture and act accordingly, not fearing the frowns of the clergy nor the power of the Sectarians.

A. To the first question the scriptures answer, No. The life of the victim was taken without the tabernacle, according to the types of Israel, and the priest officiated in the holy place in offering or presenting the sacrifice and in interceding. The Messiah's life was taken on earth; and in heaven, the true holy place, he officiates as priest. He could not be a priest on earth according to the Law; but having suffered without the gate, he entered into heaven itself, and there officiates as our great high priest, consecrated by an oath, a Priest upon his throne after the order of Melchisedec. To the second question the scriptures respond, and inform us that he died {or our sins, or was delivered up for our offenses, and that by his death atoned or recon-

ciled us to God. The phrase "atonement of Christ" is unscriptural. We have, by him, received the reconciliation. It is rather our atonement by the means of his death.

God has reconciled or atoned us to himself by the death of his Son. His death upon the cross, then, is the means or cause of our atonement. To the third question the record gives no answer. It is an absurdity growing out of the dogmas of the schools. It was the love of God and his lovely character that required the death of his Son. The death of Jesus is the highest proof in the universe of God's philanthropy. To the fourth question the scriptures do not respond. It has arisen from the dissecting knife of theological anatomists. It is the northern extreme of frigid Calvinism. The immense ice mountains of these regions have prevented their most expert captains from finding a passage to those latitudes which would confirm their theory of sphere within sphere. They are as skillful to separate and treat of humanity and divinity in the Son of God, as is Colonel Symmes in forming this globe into so many hollow spheres, each having its own properties and inhabitants. To your fifth question the New Testament designs no reply. It is kind enough to inform us of the bodies of the saints at the resurrection, and thus sets before us an object of hope the most engaging, purifying, and ennobling, that is conceivable, and leaves the bodies of the wicked in impenetrable darkness and awful gloom, and it might be as impious and absurd for us to attempt to draw an image of that which has no model and which is as designedly as far from human view as those chains of darkness which bind fallen angels unto the judgment of the great day. Things not revealed belong unto the Lord, and those revealed belong unto us and our race in all ages. And happy are they who believe and obey what God has revealed, and who labor to stand approved before him at his coming.

Q. Has the gospel, as it now stands on record, influence or power in itself, without the agency of the Holy Spirit, to regenerate and make man a new creature? And if it is not, please tell us how that change is brought about.

Is not saving faith wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit; and can man have saving faith without that influence in his

Soul? I say saving faith, because it is evident the New Testament speaks of two sorts of faith, let the Philadelphia bishop say what he may to the contrary. What does the apostle mean when he says, "If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace?" And when he says, "Unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God," what sort of calling does he here allude to?

A. 1. To answer this question with yea or nay, might comport with a system already received or rejected by the querist; but either a yea or a nay would be incompatible with the genius and the spirit of the inspired volume. To separate and distinguish the spirit from its own word is the radix of unhallowed speculation. What the gospel, written or spoken, does in regenerating and purifying the heart, the Spirit of God does, the gospel spoken or written does. Those who resist the gospel proclamation, resist the Spirit of God; and those who resist the Spirit of God resist and reject the gospel proclamation. Suppose I were asked, "has the Sun, the earth, the water, and the air, power and influence of themselves, independent of the influence of God, to make an ear of corn from one grain deposited in the earth?" I could not answer it by yea or nay; but I could say that God creates the corn, and the sun, the earth, the water and the air were media through which and through which only, the divine influence was exhibited. So that they stand to the corn planted as the power of God. And if I were asked, why does not the word written or spoken exhibit the same power in all who read it, I would say it was owing to the same cause why every grain of wheat or corn which is deposited in the earth does not produce a ripe ear. The Saviour himself justifies this analogy between things natural and moral. See his parable of the sower and his seed.

2. From the answer given above from query first, I am authorized to say that "saving faith" is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit, and that no man can believe to the saving of his soul but by the Holy Spirit. I waive the question about two kinds of faith. Unfeigned faith or true faith is what is meant by "saving faith"; and feigned faith, or "false faith," or

"dead" faith, are not saving. 3. Paul means that grace or favor, and desert are antipodes. Whatever is of the one cannot be of the other. Everything in our salvation is of pure favor: A. by a mere act or favor, or a deed of gift, invests B. with a large farm amply sufficient for all the purposes of life. He afterwards writes him a letter, informing him that if he does not practice temperance, if he does not take exercise, if he does not mingle labor and rest, and avoid every excess, he cannot live nor be happy. Now he that argues that B. obtained the estate by his works, is in error; and everyone who says that, without works enjoined by A. in his epistle, B. can live and be happy, is in error; and everyone who says that B. got the farm as a reward for his works, says what is not true. 4. Christ is the power of God to all the called. The term called is used in a twofold sense in the New Testament: 1st. As descriptive of all those who hear the word of life—and 2nd. As descriptive of all those who receive it. The former is its general the latter, its special acceptation. The "many called" are all who hear, the "few Chosen" are all who obey. The former slight the call—the latter make it certain. The former treat their calling and election as idle and unmeaning compliments—the latter make them sure and enjoy the special benefits thereof. To the latter only, to those who accept the call, is Christ the power of God unto salvation. The obedient are "effectually" called, and the disobedient are ineffectually called. The writer of the above queries had not read the second volume of this work when he proposed them. Were it not for the extreme sensibility of some taught in the human schools either old or new, on these topics, we should exclude them from our pages, as the most fatal of all speculations in religion which are generated in the dark ages. That man has true faith or saving faith when he obeys the Lord Jesus Christ, and he that disobeys him has either no faith at all, or a dead faith. He is regenerated who believes and obeys the Lord Jesus sincerely, and he is unregenerated who does not. The truth believed purifies the heart—and no heart can be purified without it. And every question, which, when answered, does not lead to some good practice, is as idle as the theory of captain Symmes. His theory of the earth is as much use to my cornfield, as the grand things sought after in the above queries

for the soul of the querist. The next generation will admit this; but few of the present can. Many seem to be more concerned about my regeneration than they are about their own; than they are about the many good things I am habitually calling their attention to. While I cannot but feel grateful to them for their solicitude, I should like to see them evince very clearly, the purity of their hearts by holy life; that is, by a life of obedience to the Son of God, in all the commandments and institutions of the King, whether of an individual or social character. Happy only are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.

Q. If I have received the truth in the love of it—have become a believer in Jesus Christ to the saving of my soul, and now desire to walk in obedience to him;—while another person, enjoying the same external opportunities and means continues to resist the truth and neglect religion;—am I to ascribe the difference in my favor, to my own tractable disposition and improvement or to a special divine influence? and would there not be room on the former solution for self-glorying?

A. To make this answer as plain as possible, let us suppose that the privileges of the kingdom of heaven are compared to a splendid supper, which is indeed, the fact. The table is spread and covered with liberal collations of all that is desirable. A general invitation is given. Now for the:

Query.—If I have sat down at the table and refreshed myself by a liberal participation of the repast provided; while another person, who was as cordially invited as was myself, perishes with hunger; am I to ascribe my enjoyment of the dainties to a more tractable disposition, or to some special call, invitation, or drawings, which were withholden from others? And if I should answer not to the latter but to the former, would I not thereby be led to glorify in myself? Very good; and if I should say not the former but the latter, will I not make the whole matter, terminate upon some absolute, unconditional, and uncontrollable determination, if not put forth in my favor, makes a general invitation no better than a pompous flourish of pretended humanity, and leaves all the world to starve with hunger as far as lies in them; not because there was not an abundance for them all, not because a general invitation was with-



holden; but because a secret, non-de-script special drawing was withholden. In this case I will not be led to glory in an imaginary stretch of sovereignty rather than God's philanthropy; and will not boast in God be as selfish as boast in myself upon the former hypothesis? And query whether will boasting in myself, or in special favor, be more injurious to the general good of all my fellows, or to the general character of the moral Governor of the world? Under all these pressing difficulties, as puzzling as the Sadducean seven-sided embarrassment, I choose to rather say, that if I have sat down at the table and eaten abundantly of the provision, I bless the liberality of him that furnished the entertainment—and instead of blessing my hunger that made me willing to come without a cent in my pocket, I boast in the philanthropy of him who made me welcome; and when I see others standing off, instead of ascribing it to the want of a sincere and cordial welcome on the part of the founder of the feast; instead of glorying over them in my better fortune, or in my keener hunger, and believed the sincerity of the invitation, they would regale themselves with the Lord's provisions and feel as grateful as myself. So that not knowing the philanthropy of God nor the Holy Scriptures, men proposed in former ages such questions as these. I therefore neither, ascribe my participation of the salvation of God either to special calls or impulses, nor to my more tractable disposition; but to the philanthropy of God, and my greater need of goodness. I do not glory, then, in an attribute of the Deity, called his "sovereignty," nor in myself as possessing a better disposition, but in my heavenly Father's philanthropy; and if I think of myself at all, I am glad I felt so hungry and so much in need as to come when called. There is in contemplation an essay which will more fully develop this matter at some future date.

Q. Did Christ commit, during the period of gifted men, the extension of his kingdom or multiplication of his subjects, to any besides gifted men? And to whom, after their death, did he consign it—to a few specially as now, or to the whole body of his subjects indiscriminately? On what acts has Christ rested the multiplication of his subjects, and their confirmation in his service? Does preaching the gospel consist in publishing it as

found in the Spirit's own words, or in publishing discourses made about it by men?

A. I. During the apostolic age for the establishment of Christianity, the Saviour employed apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, all supernaturally endowed. To these alone was the work of establishing or laying the foundation of his religion in the world committed. 2. After their death, the congregation of the saints was entrusted with this work, that is, by the operation of parental authority; by proclaiming in word and deed the excellency of the Christian religion to all men, in all the several relations,—by the simple proclamation of the gospel facts, with their evidences, was the number of saints to be multiplied; and in their weekly meetings for reading the apostolic writings and for observance of the ordinances composing the Christian institution, the saints were to be edified.

A. Christ has rested the multiplication of the faithful on the exertions of the Christian congregations. On their holding forth in word and in their behavior the gospel facts and their import, and not upon the exertions of a certain class of individuals called Priests, Clergy, Preachers, Teachers, or Bishops. The giving up the conversion of the world into the hands of a certain class, however designated, chosen, and appointed, has been the greatest check to the progress of Christianity which it has ever sustained. A. 4. The preaching of the gospel never did mean making sermons or discourses about it, no more than the cure of diseases has been affected by disquisitions upon pathology or nature of diseases and remedies; but in the proclamation of the great facts found in the historical books of the New Testament, supported by such evidences and arguments as the apostolic testimonies contain and afford.

Q. What is the work of an evangelist?

A. It was the business of proclaiming the gospel to those who never heard it. It is the same thing still. Before the gospel was generally announced persons were devoted exclusively to this work. And now-a-days much of this work is done by Christian parents to their children, and by the overseers of the churches. 'So that in Christian countries there is not the same reason existing for an order of persons existing exclusively

devoted to this work as there was in the apostolic age. See the essays on the work of the Holy Spirit, volume second.

Q. What should be the qualifications of those who administer the ordinances of the Christian church?

A. "The administration of ordinances" is a popish phrase, and ought to be cashiered from the Christian vocabulary. Persons appointed by the church or Christian congregation, having the qualifications which Paul lays down for overseers, and public servants, or deacons, when attending their respective duties, are "administering all the ordinances" of the Christian church. The election or appointment of the church is that which gives them an official right to act in an official capacity. Any person appointed by a church to baptize, has a right to do it.

Q. Did not Philip and other primitive preachers usually take "a text"?

A. Philip's text was in Isaiah 53 when he converted the eunuch. And Paul preached in Athens from a text.

This is more like a quiz upon the textuaries than anything else. One might more easily make a pope out of Paul than a textuary. If there was anything like a text in the case of Philip it was the eunuch that selected it; and if answering a question upon any passage out of the Old Testament or New, or out of a Grecian poet, furnishes a model for text-taking and sermonizing—then the sprinkling of bells, and the wearing of official investments, and the laying of cornerstones, and the consecrating of grave yards, can easily be proved from the scriptures. This query does not merit a serious reply. No prophet nor apostle nor divinely called preacher ever took a text or made a sermon in our sense of the words, from the days of Moses till the days of Origen, the inventor of a thousand errors. The quoting "of any passage or the commencing with any sentence, no more makes that sentence a text in our usage, than the preaching of Balaam's ass made him a Christian evangelist.

Q. Three questions answered by an emphatic No!

1. Is a church or any member thereof, that lives in neglect of the duties enjoined them in the gospel of Jesus the Messiah, such as assembling themselves together on the first day of the

week, commemorating the death and resurrection of our Lord, contributing to the necessities of the poor, worshipping God in their families, or training up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and when called upon in the assembly of the saints, to pray, cannot, or will not do it, capable of judging of the correctness or incorrectness of the doctrines of the gospel? 2. Is any man or woman, walking in truth, that has united himself to a church, or assembly of the saints, to be whispering, backbiting, and defaming those persons and their doctrines and sentiments that he has never seen, knows nothing about them, nor will he read, or hear what they have to say about those doctrines? 3. Are men or women that have united themselves to a church or assembly of the saints justified from the gospel of the Messiah, in omitting to attend on every first day of the week, at the appointed place of worship, under pretense that they must go among their brethren in other churches, and that they are fulfilling their engagements to God in doing so?

Q. What is it to be "born again?" John 3:3.

A. The person who used this figurative expression was the Saviour of the world. And he explained it in the same discourse (John 3). He represented it as being born of water, and of Spirit. Every one that is born of water and of Spirit is born again. But if any one say, that being born of water, is a figure, we must say, that being born of the Spirit, is also a figure. We shall then, hear Patti, Peter, John and James; as they are the only writers who use any words or phrases similar to these. Paul in his letter to Titus (3rd chap.) says: "*he* has saved us, not only by works, but through the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." This is being born of water and the Spirit. The washing, or bath of regeneration, (or immersion) is contradistinguished from the renewing of the holy Spirit. These are joined together, and let no man separate them. Peter says, "*We* are born again, or regenerated, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, viz. through the word of the living God which remains forever; "and this word," he adds, "*is* the gospel." And John says, "*he* that believeth that Jesus is the Messiah, is begotten by God." James, in speaking of

begetting, says, "Of his own will he has impregnated us by the word of truth." This is the whole testimony upon this subject. I answer, then, every one who is immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus, and who is renewed in his heart by the holy Spirit, is born again.

Q. How can we be assured that this work is accomplished in us?

A. Our immersion is into the name of the Father, etc., is an act of which we are conscious at the time and which we can remember, and our spirit is, when renewed by the Spirit of God, also conscious that we love the brethren and love God; and we are assured, as John teaches, that we have passed from death to life when we love the brethren.

Q. What foundation from scripture have we to believe that we may be assured of our salvation or that our sins are forgiven?

A. This is a question of great moment, and bears upon the preceding. I answer it thus: 1. No person can forgive sins but God. 2. Nothing can assure us that our sins are forgiven but the testimony of God. Now, unless we can have the testimony of God that our sins are forgiven, we can have no assurance that they are forgiven. 3. I assert that there is but one action ordained or commanded in the New Testament, to which God has promised that he will forgive our sins. This action is Christian immersion (This is spoken of the salvation of sinners. Immersion is the action for the pardon of sinners; prayer the exercise through which erring saints are forgiven), to him that believes and is immersed, God has testified or promised salvation, or the forgiveness of sins. He has promised pardon through immersion; and therefore he believes and is immersed, has the testimony of God that his sins are forgiven. Paul was assured that his sins were forgiven when he came up out of the water—so were the three thousand on Pentecost—so were all who believed and were baptized in primitive times. Hence they rejoiced, were glad, and boasted in God. Hence John says, "I have written to you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you." This is the testimony of God. Hence said Paul,

"Forgive one another, as God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven you."

Q. May we believe that a conviction of forgiveness of sins in this life, is often or ever, an instantaneous operation of the Spirit; so strong, and so clear, so as not to be mistaken by the person so operated upon? Or is it more frequently a gradual work, by which the whole soul is drawn to God?

A. This question is in the language of scholastic theology, it is anticipated in the preceding question and answer; but we shall give it a distinct answer. Our convictions are very frequently the result of preconceived opinions, but our consciousness of forgiveness is not made to proceed from any inward impulses, voices, or operations, either instantaneous or gradual, but from a surer and a more certain foundation—the testimony of God addressed to our ears. If operations, and feelings, and impulses, were to be the basis of our conviction, 'it would be founding the most important of all knowledge upon the most uncertain of all foundations. "The heart of the man is deceitful above all things;" and "he that trusts in his own heart is a fool." But in the gospel our knowledge is made to depend upon the immutable and intangible promise of God. For example, I believe the testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth in the apostolic import of it. I then feel myself commanded to be immersed for the forgiveness of my sins. I arise and obey. I then receive it, and am assured of it, because God cannot deceive. Thus I walk by faith not by feeling. The belief of my forgiveness now rests upon the testimony of God; and my assurance of its truth and infallible certainty, produces in me the sense of forgiveness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. Thus I have peace with God which rules my heart; constantly too, for he is faithful who has promised. All the darkness, gloom, uncertainty, and conjecture, in the religious community upon this subject, are the genuine fruits of popular teaching. And so long as the present theories and systems are in fashion, it will not, it cannot, be any better. But so soon as men are led to rely upon the testimony of God rather than their own conceits; so soon as they understand and believe the ancient gospel, they will begin to experience the joys and the felicities which

were the portion of those taught by the apostles. It is the ancient gospel which will break down all superstition, schism, and sectarianism in this age. It is, as is daily proved to us, the most puissant weapon ever wielded; and, like a sharp two-edged sword, will cut to pieces all sectarianism of Christendom, and make infidelity stop its mouth and hang its head.

Q. Can we not be in a state of salvation without conviction that our sins are forgiven?

A. "The state of salvation" is a curious phrase. "The state of matrimony" is equivalent to the "married state." The "state of salvation" is equivalent to the saved state. Now, can we not be in the state of matrimony without the conviction that we are married? I say, No—unless we have very bad memories, and no conjugal affection. Schoolmen have bewildered Christendom with their reveries upon a "state of salvation," and a "salvable state." "Like priest, like people, is a general truth, with but few exceptions; and, therefore, under the present darkness, it is possible for persons to be believers in Christ, yet doubt whether their sins are forgiven. But this is not the only difficulty. There are many who conceit that their sins are forgiven, without any foundation. They reason themselves into this opinion. "I feel so and thus; but all who feel so and thus, have their sins forgiven; therefore I have forgiveness." In many instances the delusion is in the opposite conclusion from the same premise. One fancies himself forgiven, another doubts his forgiveness from the very same premises. But the ancient Christians had not to gather the conviction of their pardon from internal sensations or feelings; but all their happy sensations arose from the conviction that they were forgiven. This was derived from the divine testimony, the only certain foundation on which man can believe or know that his sins are forgiven.

Q. Has true faith in Christ these two fruits inseparably attending it—dominion over sin, and constant peace from a sense of forgiveness?

A. As a sincere or unfeigned belief in Jesus Christ is always an operative principle, and impels to obedience, they who possess it are not under dominion of sin, or under guilty con-

science. Any belief that leaves its possessor under the guilt and dominion of sin, is a counterfeit—a dead faith, and worth nothing.

Q. Is it, or is it not, through the faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, that we receive the remission of sins in the act of immersion?

A. I had thought that in my essays on immersion this point was fully settled. Every single blessing, and all blessings collectively, appertaining to salvation flow to us from the sacrifice of Jesus the Son of God. The value and efficacy of his sacrifice is the very document itself which constitutes the burden of testimony. Belief of this testimony is what impels us into the water. Knowing that the efficacy of his blood is to be communicated to our consciences in the way which God has pleased to appoint, we "stagger not at the promise of God," but flee to the sacred ordinance which brings the blood of Jesus Christ in contact with our consciences. Without knowing and believing this immersion is as empty as a blasted nut. The shell is there, but the kernel is wanting. The simplicity of this gracious provision has staggered many. Can forgiveness, they say, be obtainable so easy? Did they but reflect that the more easily and more sensibly it is obtained, the more agreeable it is to the nature of divine favor, which always makes the most needed blessings the most accessible. Again, as to an equivalent on our part, either as to the procurement of the blessing, or as a return for it, it is all one what that should be. We have nothing, and could give nothing. Let the wisest man on earth presume to show any thought, word, or action, by which, or on account of which, a person's sins are, or might be remitted, and I will undertake to show that there is more wisdom, i. e. fitness and propriety in making Christian immersion that action, than any other—but this always connected with faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, which blood is the only consideration in the universe worthy of bestowing such blessings upon the children of men.

Q. Is not baptism by sprinkling or pouring, a valid baptism, provided the candidate honestly believes either is the correct mode from having read the Testament?



A. Put the terms into English, and the question destroys itself. Is not immersion by sprinkling a real immersion!!! Or put it into Greek, and it commits suicide. Is not baptism or rantsim real baptism? And no honesty in thinking, will convert one action into another, or make one creature another. If I were honestly to think that the burning of a heretic was acceptable to God, my honesty in thought would not make the action acceptable.

Q. Have you any objections to man-made constitutions for the church?

A. I have. I object to both matter and form. Man-made covenants, among other matters, is objectionable because it admits an unimmersed person to all the ordinances of the Christian community or congregation, as an occasional member; and yet refuses to receive such as regular and constant members. I know of no scriptural authority for such a discrimination. It is arbitrary and unreasonable. If I can admit an unimmersed person once a month for a year to all social ordinances, I can for life or good behaviour. When I say, I can do so, I mean that all precepts, precedents, and scriptural reasons, authorize such a course. But I object to making it a rule in any case, to receive unimmersed persons to church ordinances:—because it is nowhere commanded, it is nowhere precedented in the New Testament. Because it necessarily corrupts the simplicity and uniformity of the whole genius of the New Institution. Because it not only deranges the order of the kingdom, but makes void one of the most important institutions ever given to man. It necessarily makes immersion non-effect. For, with what consistency or propriety can any congregation hold up to the world either the authority or the utility of an institution in which they are in the habit of making as little of, as any human opinion? In making a canon to dispense with a divine institution of a momentous import, they who do so assume the very same dispensing power which issued in that tremendous apostasy which we and all Christians are praying and laboring to destroy. If a Christian community puts into its magna charta, covenant, or constitution, an assumption to dispense with an institution of the Great King, who can tell where

this power of granting license to itself may terminate? For these five reasons I must object to man-made constitutions, however much I may respect the benevolence and intelligence of those who framed it.

Q. But will you not be considered uncharitable in so deciding?

A. Yes. In the current use of the term I must be so considered. But if we are to be governed by the censures of our worse informed Brethren, where is our courage? And besides we will still be considered uncharitable by some, if we do not go the whole way with them in their superstitious or enthusiastic notions and practices. Go with the Presbyterian until he calls you charitable, and then the Methodist will exclaim against you; or go with the Methodist until he calls you charitable, and then the Presbyterian will exclaim, how uncharitable!

Q. But do you not expect to sit down in heaven with all the Christians of all sects, and why not sit down at the same table with them on earth?

A. It is time enough to behave as they do in heaven when we meet there. I expect to meet with those whom we call Patriarchs, Jews and Pagans, in heaven. But this is no reason why I should offer sacrifice like Abel and Abimelech; circumcise children, like Reuben or Gad; or pray to the great Spirit, as an Indian; because some of all these sorts of people may be fellow-citizen in heaven. Perhaps I am too charitable now, for some. But be this as it may. I do expect to meet with some of "all nations, tribes, and tongues," in the heavenly country. But while here on earth I must live and behave according to the order of things under which I am placed. If we are now to be governed by manners and customs in heaven, why was any other than the heavenly order of society instituted on earth? There will be neither bread, water, nor wine in heaven. Why, then, use them on earth? But if those who propose this query would reflect that all the parts of the Christian institution are necessary to this state, and only preparatory to the heavenly, by giving us a taste of the purity and the joys of that state, they could not propose such a question.

Q. What then will you do with your Paido-Baptist fellow disciples?

A. Teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly; and tell them if they greatly desire our society, it can be had just on being born of water and spirit, as the Lord told Nicodemus. Our society cannot be worth much if it is not worth one immersion.

Q. But do you not make the schisms by so doing?

A. No. He makes no schism who does no more than the Lord commands, and all know that Christian immersion is a divine institution. It is he who makes a new institution, such as the sprinkling of an infant, and contends for it, that makes the schism. It is not he that obeyed the first commandments, but he that made the golden calf, who made confusion in Israel.

Q. Do you really believe, that if a man can simply say that he believes in the truth of the scriptures, and that they are the word of God—that the salvation of that man is secured to him; or in other words, that a mere belief of that kind will entitle him to the approbation of "well done," etc?

A. To this query, in the fair import of the terms, I answer positively: No. It is only they "who keep his commandments, who shall have a right to enter into the heavenly city." Those whom the judge of all will address with "well done," are those who have done well. No man, either at death, or in final judgment, will be justified by believing the whole, or any part of scripture; believing it in any way, historically, or in any popular style. Men are justified here by faith, and there by works: in other words, by faith they are introduced into a state of favor, so that their prayers may be heard, and their works accepted—But the justification here is of pure favor: it is God's own philanthropy which grants them acceptance through faith in his testimony. Arise and be baptized like Paul, and withhold not your obedience; and your historic faith and obedience will stand the test of heaven.

Q. Is a believer in Christ not actually in a pardoned state, before he is baptized? A. Is not a man clean before he is washed!! When there is

only an imaginary or artificial line between Virginia and Pennsylvania, I cannot often tell with ease whether I am in Virginia or Pennsylvania; but I can always tell when I am in Ohio, however near the line—for I have crossed the Ohio river. And blessed be God! he had not drawn a mere imaginary line between the plantations of nature and grace. No man has any proof that he is pardoned until he is baptized—And if all men are conscious that their sins are forgiven and that they are pardoned before they are immersed, I advise them not to get into the water for they have no need of it.

Q. What should a church do with a member for marrying her deceased husband's brother?

A. Let her live with him. However repugnant it may be to our feelings and customs, it is not condemnable from either Testament. It was for having his brother's wife, in his brother's lifetime, which procured a rebuke to Herod from the first Baptist preacher. In ranking John among the Baptists, I hope they will forgive me; for although John lived before the Christian kingdom began, he was upon the whole, as good a Christian as most of us Immerser preachers.

Q. Can you reconcile Acts 9:23 with Gal. 1:17,18? In the former Luke says, Paul went to Jerusalem from Damascus, immediately after his conversion; yet in the Galatians, Paul says, "After three years I went up to Jerusalem."

A. It does not appear, from Luke's account in Acts, that Paul went immediately to Jerusalem. Luke gives no account of Paul's tour in Arabia. It appears from Gal. 1:17, that Paul went from Damascus into Arabia; continued there for sometime, and again returned to Damascus; and then, after a long time, or "many days," when the Damascenes were determined to kill him, he was let down from the wall in a basket, and then went to Jerusalem, which was three years from his conversion. There is no real difficulty here.

Q. Was ever the saying of the Lord accomplished which says, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's stomach, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth?"

A. Not literally. For on the third day he rose from the dead. He spoke this as a sign to those who demanded a sign, in allusion to Jonah's interment in the whale. It was in the same style, though a little more figurative, that he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will rebuild it." Repeatedly the Lord declared, "I will rise on the third day," so that it could not be in any other than an allusive style to the case of Jonah he mentions the nights; and it is not improbable that just in the same sense in which Jonah was three days and nights in the whale's stomach, was he interred in the earth. When he spake without figure or allusion, he always said he would rise on the third day. Many say it was usual with the Jews to append the night to the day when it was not implied that the night was spent as the day; but such was their custom.

Q. What mean these words, I Cor. 15:29, "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead? If the dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for the dead?"

A. The next verse gives the key of the interpretation. "And why stand ye in jeopardy every hour?" Why should I, Paul, hazard my life in attesting the resurrection of Jesus Christ, if I had not the most unequivocal proof of his resurrection? Through this medium contemplate the preceding words. Only first recollect that the word immerse is used frequently for sufferings. Jesus said, "I have an immersion to undergo, and how I am straitened 'til it be accomplished." I have to be immersed in an immense flood of sufferings. *Also* the phrase, "fallen asleep for Christ," is equivalent to dying for confessing faith in him. Now these criticisms regarded, and the elliptical verse 29, is plain and forcible—"If there be no resurrection from the dead, what shall they do who are immersed in afflictions and distress for believing and declaring that the dead shall be raised? If the dead rise not at all, if they are not assured of their *resurrection*, why do they submit to be immersed in sorrows in the hope of a resurrection?"

Q. Why did Paul thank God that he had baptized none save Crispus and Gaius?

A. Paul did not do so. He thanked God that he had immersed

none of the Corinthians but a few individuals. And the reason was, "Lest any one should say that he had immersed into his own name, and thus afford themselves some pretext for calling themselves after Paul." Paul was inveighing against Christians for calling themselves by the names of human leaders, and was thankful in this instance that he had afforded no pretext for any of the schismatics in Corinth to call themselves after his name.

Q. Does the parable of the Talents apply to saints or sinners, as recorded in the 25th chapter of Matthew?

A. To neither as such. It is intended to represent the administration of the Reign of favor during the absence from earth of the King. The persons to whom the management of the affairs of this kingdom was committed during the time from the departure of the King till his second coming, were compared to the public servants or stewards of a prince or nobleman. To each of these public servants trusts were committed, and the management of these trusts was to be the subject of inquiry when the Prince returned. The stewards, according to their capacity for management, had more or less committed to their management. To one was committed a very large trust, to another a less one, and to a third a very small one. The same fidelity and diligence were exhibited by persons of very different capacities and trust. Hence he that had gained five and he that had gained two talents were equally praiseworthy, for as the ratio of increase was the same, so the diligence and fidelity were the same; and the reward was equal. Now had the steward who had the least trust, only one talent, managed it so as to have gained one he would have been as commendable as he that had gained five. But the error was that he thought himself disparaged, conceived himself neglected, and formed a very unfavorable opinion of the King. This paralyzed all his energies, and he did nothing. His evil eye was the cause of his apathy, and instead of going to work he set himself to frame excuses for himself. As is very natural for persons of this character, he threw the blame upon his Maker, and vainly expected to justify himself by criminating the administration of the King. The parable very forcibly demonstrates the consola-

tory and animating maxim of Paul—viz : "It is always accepted according to what a man has, and not according to what he has not." The widow and her two mites exhibits just the contrast of the one talent, and unequivocally teaches all disciples that it is equally in power of all to obtain the greatest eminence in the Kingdom of Jesus, whatever their earthly means or opportunities may be. This parable has been greatly misapplied when turned to the advantage of unconverted men.

Q. Is an unmarried person or youth who has never been married, eligible to the office of bishop or overseer?

A. If Paul be admitted a competent witness he is not. A stripling, married or unmarried, is not eligible. A person of middle age if recently converted, is not eligible. And a man who has had no experience in domestic management is illy qualified to manage the family of God. But Paul says a bishop or overseer must be blameless, and as very intimately connected therewith, "he must be the husband of one wife." That elderly persons were most eligible is evident from his adding, "having believing children," of a good behaviour too, "not accused of riot, nor unruly." We have very good reason to believe that if the apostle's qualifications were all literally observed in selecting such persons only as possess these qualifications to the discharge of the duties of this office, it would be much better with the Christian communities; and that the evils which are supposed to flow from the want of bishops of some sort, are much more imaginary than real.

Q. By what authority did the Apostles ordain Matthias to the Apostleship? Did he or Paul fill the twelfth throne?

A. By commandment of the Holy Spirit in the mouth of David, who said, "And his office let another take." This is the authority. Peter being competent to rightly interpret that commandment. Paul's call and mission were primarily to the C-en-tiles. He preached sometimes to Jews though not sent primarily to them—just as he sometimes immersed though not sent primarily to do that work—for while it was named in the commission of the Twelve, it was not once named in Paul's commission. Yet Paul sometimes preached to the Jews, and sometimes

he immersed when he could find no deacon or minister to wait upon him.

Q. Is it lawful for Christians to intermarry with the world? Is it according to primitive usage, etc.?

A. It was a necessary law in the Jewish nation, the family of Abraham, because of the promise concerning his seed, and because of the seductions to idolatry from the intermarriages with the pagan nations, who all were idolaters, that the seed of Abraham should not form such alliances with foreigners. The latter should have its full weight with Christians against alliance with idolaters. And certainly, no one, rightly instructed in the Christian institution, and possessing the spirit of the family of God, could become one flesh with an idolater. There is, indeed, no Christian statute—no law commanding, nor statute prohibitory, on the subject of Christians marrying only Christians. A Christian is not prohibited from marrying a Jew or Gentile by ordinance. But we must infer as well as feel the incongruity of a Christian taking into his bosom an opponent of Christ, whether Jew or Gentile. He that would prefer an unbelieving Jew, Samaritan, Pagan, to a Christian, could not stand high in the estimation of any Christian fraternity. That the members of our churches founded on the Book alone, should in no case marry a Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, etc., or the son or daughter of such persons, baptized or unbaptized, would be (I think) legislating out of the record, and would be in a good measure paganizing professors and non-professors out of the communities of our Brethren. I am, however, from all that is written in the good Book, strongly inclined, inferentially I mean, to the conclusion that Christians should intermarry only with Christians, especially when they look into the consequence of the domestic relation, and anticipate that the bearings that such a connection may have, and often must have on the destinies of the Offspring. But that a church should take an order, or decrees that any person who marries a non-professor, (not a professed unbeliever or infidel), or one from among the sects, shall forfeit his citizenship in the kingdom of heaven—is, in my judgment, a dangerous precedent, and wholly unwarranted by the living oracles of Jesus Christ.



Q. What is to be understood by the phrase, "*In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began*"? Titus 1:2.

A. "Before the world began" should be translated, "Before the times of the ages." It refers to the Jewish age or state.

Q. If any man or woman in the reformation refuses to break the loaf with a congregation, when among them, or leaves the congregation about the time they are to break the loaf, without giving a reason for doing so, ought they not to apologize for their contemptuous conduct before the Church of Christ before they ever break the loaf with them again?

A. I think as much, at least, is due to Christ's family as to yours or mine; I am sure if a member of either of our families, when the supper table was spread and furnished, and we are about partaking, should suddenly seize his hat and walk out, good manners require, if he return the next meal, that he should offer some explanation, if not an apology. For my part, I could not esteem a person a gentleman if he would not apologize; and is not a Christian gentleman?

Q. Have the elders of the church any example from the primitive disciples the right to refuse or reject any man or woman that confesses that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God, when they have heard of their disorderly character, without evidence of .reformation, before admission into the ordinance and the church?

A. Certainly they have. Would Peter and his companions have communed with Simon Magus after he offered his money for the Spirit, without reformation?

Q. Is it consistent with the gospel to bring into the church one who has been unfortunately immersed in disorder, when it would drive out its orderly members, or divide the Church of Christ?

A. No one has the right to cause any good and orderly disciple to stumble or be offended by forcing himself or any one else into a community without its consent, and more especially when there is any suspicion resting upon the character of the

person seeking for admission, or by experimenting upon a person of doubtful character.

Q. Should a brother be retained in the church who keeps a tippling house, or deals in ardent spirits?

A. There are two questions in one. The keeper of a tippling house, properly so-called, is wholly unfit for a place in the kingdom of God, either on earth or in heaven. And while I would not say that he who deals at all in ardent spirits is an unworthy professor, some there are who, because of their manner of dealing in such articles, are just as unfit for heaven as he that lives directly upon the tippling sins of the very cacaille of all society. Such at least is my opinion.

Q. Whether had we better, to save from the error of their way, treat as aliens, all unbaptized persons, or acknowledge them as true worshippers of God, and as a kind of half-way Christians?

A. We have no half-way Christians in fact, though we have many in practice. If turning away from a professor ignorant and prejudiced, or if telling him that we regarded him as no better than a heathen man or publican, and would neither sing nor pray, nor worship God in his presence, would propitiate his ears and give us access to his heart, and tend to his illumination, one might hazard it; but such a course only obtains for him that does it unqualified reprobation as a proud self-righteous Pharisee, and forever nullifies his efforts to gain a favorable audience—without which he can do nothing. Besides, we are to treat all men with respect, and give them full credit for all they possess, and without flattering them into a system of self-deception; like Paul, we should to the Jew become a Jew, and to the Greek become a Greek; yea, become all things to all men, without conceding the truth, that we might gain men to Christ. There are many good men, of large intelligence, possessed of many Christian virtues, who are not immersed; and who, though not constitutional citizens of his kingdom, would lay down their lives for Christ. These ought to have credit for all they possess; and as Aquilla and Priscilla took Apollos (who, though an eloquent man and mighty in the scriptures, knew only the baptism of John), and instructed him better; so ought we when

such persons come our way. Now many excellent persons there are in our day standing to the kingdom of Jesus just as Apollos stood before he heard these gifted disciples teach the way of the Lord more perfectly.

Q. What is the Church to do when its Elders leave them on the Lord's day and go to other meetings among the sects?

A. Appoint new Elders. Whenever the shepherds abandon their flocks, it is high time they were put into other hands. I do not know how such persons can watch for the souls of their flock, or give good account of themselves when the King of King comes.

Q. Ought Christians to pray with any with whom they would not commune in all religious or Christian institutions?

A. Christians may pray with all persons who wish to pray through the Mediator; and none else will ask them to pray. Prayer is not a Christian institution any more than singing psalms. They prayed and sang praises under all dispensations. But they did not observe any of the peculiar institutions of Christ's kingdom in the first or second ages of the world. Now as Christians, we can only commune with Christians in Christian institutions; but as religious men, we may perform any act of religion with religious men that is common to all dispensations. Hence both Jesus and Paul prayed and gave thanks in the promiscuous companies which flocked around them without asking any questions for conscience sake. John 4:22, Acts 21: 6, I Tim. 2:8, John 11:41,42, John 12:27,28. We are indeed under obligations to pray "for all men," and to "pray everywhere," "with all prayer and supplication"; and as our Lord addressed his Father in the presence of thousands whom he fed and to whom he preached, and prayed even for his enemies; surely so ought we to do as his disciples and followers.

Q. Did the Lord never use things in his parables that had no real existence—or, in other words, had all the things mentioned in the parables a real existence?

A. Illustrations, similitudes, comparisons, and parables must be drawn from facts, or things real, otherwise they are worse than useless—unless they are deceptive. To explain, illustrate,

or set forth a hypothesis, would not be more unsatisfactory and powerless, than to explain a fact, a doctrine, an institution, an event by an imaginative creation. There are points in a parable or comparison which are to be illustrated or set forth, and these are to be compared with the fact, or the reality, or the thing introduced for illustration. All the rest is but ornament or drapery of the similitude. Our Lord's parables are all taken from nature, real life, or acknowledged facts, without a single exception, so far as I can understand them. For example—the parable of the Sower. Have we not the sower, the seed, the different sorts of ground, the different products, etc., in nature and fact? The parable of the Tares—have we not a field, wheat, darnel, harvest, reapers, etc., and is there not a resemblance between wheat and darnel at first, and a danger of rooting up the wheat in pulling out the darnel? The parable of the Sweep net—have we not such an instrument, fishermen, good and bad fish, and vessels, and dragging the net to the shore? In the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus have we not poor Christians, and rich Sadducees, high living, sudden death, angels, Abraham's bosom, hades, and future torment? The parable of the Prodigal Son—have we not fathers, good and prodigal sons, repentance, amendment, forgiveness, etc.? Those who presume to except one out of all the parables of Christ, because it thwarts their views as an exception to a universal rule, had need to have infallible evidence that they are not grievously mistaken, and wresting his words to get rid of their force against their wild and unlicensed imaginations.

Q. What was the promise referred to Heb. 11:39, which none of the ancient saints had received?

A. The question here stands for the thing promised, or for its accomplishment. So in other places: "When the time of promise drew nigh." Acts 7:17—i.e. its accomplishment. "I send the promise," Luke 24:29,—the thing promised. What, then, was the thing promised? Not Canaan, because most all of these men of faith and mighty deeds had lived and died in it; but the thing signified and prefigured in the promised land. Now what that was Paul and his cloud of witnesses shall declare. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, all "died in faith," not of

Canaan, for they lived and died in it; but of certain good things promised them through this type. These things they saw "afar off"—farther than two or three centuries; and, embracing them, "they confessed," by their conduct, that, even in the covenanted land, they are strangers and pilgrims; plainly declaring as Paul declares, though obscurely to many of us—that they sought something better than Canaan; that they saw and earnestly sought a better, that is, a heavenly inheritance. It was not the land that they had forsaken, any more than the land which they occupied; for, as Paul says, had they desired that, they had opportunity to return; but, says he, in truth they desired a better—a heavenly country. God, therefore, is called "their God," and "has prepared for them a city." This heavenly city and inheritance, seen afar off through the type of Canaan, and ardently embraced by a faith which confidently expects its object, as well as sees it, was the promise which all the men of faith of the olden time believed, expected, and joyfully cherished, but did not receive while they lived in the land of Canaan. Though other "promises were obtained," and accomplished to them, this of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading, remained in hope. Paul in Heb. 11:1 greatly enlarges our views of things seen afar off by the believing ancients. Noah became "heir of righteousness which is by faith"—Abraham expected a city founded and builded by God alone—Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, earnestly desired a "heavenly country"—Abraham saw the resurrection of the dead in a figure—Moses esteemed the reproaches of Christ greater treasure than those of Egypt, he saw the invisible God, and endured persecution, looking off to the promised retribution in another life—Women would not, in a cowardly manner, escape the horrors of persecution, that they might obtain a "better resurrection." Yet none of all those received this promise. They obtained renown by their faith; but not the promised eternal inheritance.

Q. What the better thing provided for us? "God," says Paul, "having promised something better for us." Heb. 11:40.

A. It is not something better than the eternal inheritance; for nothing can be better than that; and both they and we shall finally attain to the final inheritance. But, in the mean time, as

if parenthetically, Paul says we have a better covenant, established on better promises, administered by a better Mediator, affording us brighter and better developments of this anticipated inheritance; consequently affording stronger incentives to the mighty deeds of faith than the dispensation under which they cherished this hope; for they will be perfected at the same time.

Q. What is the perfection spoken of? Heb. 11:40.

A. The completion of man must necessarily precede this perfection; and this cannot possibly occur until new heavens and new earth are created, and man raised from the dead, bearing the image of the Lord from heaven; for the perfection of man is the perfection of body, soul, and spirit, which cannot possibly precede the resurrection of the incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual bodies of the saints.

Now in this the ancient saints will not anticipate us. Had they obtained this promise, then, indeed, God would have provided something better for them than for us. Their spirits are with the Lord and made perfect, but their bodies are in their graves, waiting a new creation; and therefore they were not made perfect at death. God, then, indeed, has provided something better for us—a better dispensation of grace—clearer light, brighter prospects. Life and immortality are made evident by the gospel. We have illustrated, in the resurrection and perfection of the Lord's body, as well as proved what they expected; and besides, without us, and before us, they shall not be raised from the dead, nor glorified in their persons. They and we shall be glorified together.

Q. Mr. Hendricks says that there are but two arguments against infant baptism. The first is, "A person who has a right to a positive institution of God's house, must be expressly mentioned as having that right; but infants are not so mentioned, therefore they have not that right, and are not to be baptized." This argument he sets aside on the ground that it excludes females from the Lord's supper. How do you answer this objection?

A. I answer it as follows: First, the argument is so manu-

factured that it may be easily be refuted. I know of no Baptist who so expressed himself so on baptism. We affirm that positive institutions are not to be gathered from circumstances, nor made up of inferences; but are always based on positive precepts as respects three things:—1st. the *action* commanded. 2nd. The *qualification* of the subject (not the "person") as stated above. 3rd. The *design* of the institution. Positive institutions require precepts on these three points—action, subject, design. Such were the precepts for the Sabbath, circumcision, passover, sin offerings, and the various offerings under the Law —baptism and the Lord's supper. These precepts are either in express words, or express examples—often both.

Now, my dear sir, not "the person," but the character must be pointed out. It is not infant, adult, man or woman, as such; but qualified persons—that is, characters, who are pointed out as the subjects of baptism. There is "neither male nor female," blood, family, nor condition in life, "bond or free," Barbarian, Scythian, Greek, Roman, etc., in Christ's institution; but a believing penitent. The qualifications for Christ's church are not blood nor family, but faith. The qualifications for Christ's church are not blood nor family, but faith. The argument when corrected stands thus; The qualified subjects for positive institutions must be expressly stated in the laws of these institutions. But, unintelligent and unbelieving persons are not found in the laws concerning baptism; therefore no unintelligent nor unbelieving person is a proper subject for baptism. Now what has this to do with male or female or infant? It is a downright and palpable sophism. I do not adopt this verbiage to get rid of any difficulty concerning female communion; but for the sake of placing the subject on its proper merits. The perverse, or perhaps quizzical ingenuity displayed in trying to evade the argument for positive institutions by a reference to female communion, only proves that however innocent other errorists may be on this subject, the inventor of this maneuver is not among them.

But suppose we show that there is nothing in this exception, then the argument, even as stated by Mr. H., is by him unanswerable. Thus, in Christ there is no male or female as respects ordinances of religion. In Moses there was. Consequently females as well as males are proper subjects of all Christian in-

stitutions. But if this will not satisfy this morbid taste, we can show that females were received to the Lord's table by the Apostles. See Acts 1st and 2nd chapters. The names of some of the women and men that composed the one hundred and twenty disciples are given in the first chapter. In the second we are told that three thousand were added unto them—the one hundred and twenty; and then we are told that after their baptism, they (3120) continued steadfast in breaking the loaf. Here then is positive evidence of female communion in the loaf. Can any one show the same for infant sprinkling or infant immersion? When this is disposed of we may find another instance or two.

The second argument against infant baptism, which he honors with the name of argument, is, that, "The scriptures require faith and repentance as requisites to baptism." But as infants cannot have those they are not therefore fit subjects for baptism. This he refutes by alleging that the conclusion is not found in the premises, because the scriptures "require faith and repentance only in adults." What glaring sophism, says he, "adults in the premise and infants in the conclusion!" What still more glaring sophism, I say, to have infants either in the premise or the conclusion! This is another domestic argument made for home consumption, and farther displays the same sophistical ingenuity! The argument used by me is this: 1st. The subjects of all religious ordinances are qualified persons. 2nd. The specification of any qualification positively excludes all these persons who have not that qualification. 3rd. Therefore when it says, "Repent and be baptized," it is equivalent to saying, Unless you repent be not baptized, just as positive affirmative and negative precepts always prohibit and command their contraries. Be honest, forbids theft. "Thou shalt not steal," enjoins honesty. "If thou dost not believe thou mayest not." To name infants at all on the same page with baptism is always an assumption, because they are not once found in Old or New Testament on the same page with that sacred ordinance which by the Apostles was never administered to any but to an intelligent person.

Q. Is it a violation of the law of Jesus Christ in any case, or under any circumstances for brethren to go to law with one another?



A. So Paul would have decided—nay, did decide, I Cor. 7. They may go to Christian law—to the courts of Jesus Christ, and by its decisions they must abide. But then the Church must promptly and faithfully attend to such matters. The church has no power of compulsion, save the holy, spiritual, and divine obligations of the Christian precepts, promises and their proper motives. While, then, the parties submit to the decisions of the church, justice will be dispensed; for church officers are bound to administer justice in all matters to the Christian morality. But if either party absolutely refuse to submit to the Christian law and the church, then he must be given over to the secular power, which has its own sanctions and ministers of justice, that can, and often do compel acquiescence. Such is my opinion in the matter. Indeed, no member of the church can be allowed to do any injustice to a brother, if so be the church is properly organized, and has a sensible, judicious, and efficient presbytery to preside over its interests.

Q. Can an individual belonging to the church assign or transfer to an alien, for the purpose of coercing a claim payment or debt which he holds on his brother in the church, without an infraction of the law of Christ?

A. A person is always understood to do what his agent does, provided his agent acts only according to his views. This being incontrovertible, he that sues through an agent, sues. The concurrence of the agent with him, because of its having been made his interest to sue, does not alter the nature of the action of the principal. A brother may, as honorably and acceptably to the Lord and his people, coerce payment by a civil action, as put the claim into an alien's hand to do it. He may hide himself from the reprehensions of the church, or of the world, who know it not; but he cannot escape the reprehension of God and his own conscience for such unbrotherly conduct.

In matters of contract—of covenant—indeed all business transactions among brethren, whether natural or spiritual brethren, the same exact regard to justice, promise, punctuality, etc., ought to be cultivated, as from the most perfect strangers. Otherwise confidence fails and covenants cease to be of any value; and when once the habit of violating engagements and break-

ing promises is formed, there is no predicting in what bankruptcy of faith and morals it may end. It is uniformly better to make no engagements than to break the least promise. The Lord does not require it, and cannot be pleased with covenant breakers of any sort.

Q. To whom is a bishop (when there is but one) amenable

for improper proceedings, or the inculcation of false principles? A. The Christian system makes no provision for one bishop in a church, it supposes a plurality in all cases. And I presume the case you have adduced is a full demonstration of the wisdom and necessity of a plurality. Still as the church of Christ in all the world is one church, made up of many independent congregations; when parties agree to refer matters from one church to another, as to a committee from different congregations, there is no better way of settling difficulties in a free and voluntary one, than by such reference.

Q. What shall be done with a bishop who claims that his appointment has placed him above the rebuke of his brethren for any thing, and that he is only amenable to a council of bishops! who can and does talk faster and louder than any member of the society, and has seldom decorum sufficient to hear out any objections against his views, and by this course carries many of his points; and supports his assumption of powers with similitudes like these: A bishop of the church is like the captain of the ship, the members like the sailors—The captain's orders must be obeyed without inquiring into their propriety. Again—the carpenter, at the raising of the building, must also be obeyed implicitly in order to success—the bishop likened unto him. Several other similitudes could be transcribed.

A. Such a Diotrefes had better be permitted to lord it over himself. The church can do this for him by giving him a letter of recommendations to those who desire to have them a sprig from the papal tree—a little pontifex maximus. Such arrogance proves him to have been weighed in the scales and to be found wanting. The trying of a bishop by a council of bishops, unless by express agreement, is like trying the Governor of New York by the Governors of Ohio and Pennsylvania—a case without law, without precedent, and consequently without law.

Q. What are we to understand by the expression? I Tim. 3:10.

A. The meaning of this injunction is determined by the conjunction "also"—which signifies, in like manner—always referring to something immediately preceding, as mentioned or described. Now the preceding text is descriptive of the character and qualifications which a person must possess to render him eligible to the office of a bishop. And how could this be ascertained but by personal and social investigation?—that is, by conversing freely with the person himself upon the subjects both of knowledge and practice; and also with his acquaintance, both in the church and out of it: see verse 7th. Thus were his qualifications and character to be proved, before he could be lawfully chosen to occupy the office of a bishop.—The apostle having given these directions for selecting proper characters for the bishop's office, immediately produces in like manner with respect to the deacon's office, verse 8, saying, "likewise must the deacons be grave," etc. "And let these also first be proved"; that is as he had ordered those to be, who were designed, or desirous, to occupy the office of a bishop: for it appears from verse 1st, that a man might lawfully desire the office of a bishop, and, of course, offer his services to his brethren for that purpose; but that he could not lawfully assume it without a legal trial or ordination; and, for this purpose Timothy is solemnly charged—to lay hands suddenly on no man, lest, by so doing, he should become partaker in other men's sins: see chap 5:22—by thus introducing unqualified persons into those sacred offices. Therefore the apostle enjoins a similar attention to be paid to the characters of the candidate for each.

Q. What is meant by the expression, I Tim. 5:20? "that others also may fear".

A. It evidently appears from the preceding verse that the apostle meant, that if any of the elders were accused and found guilty, being tried according to the process described in said verse, that he being publicly rebuked in the presence of the church, would be a terror and a warning to others, to excite them to abstain from similar evils.

But it is also asked—"Did it require Timothy, and, more gen-

erally, all evangelists to rebuke elders of the church?" A. It appears that Timothy was prophetically called to the evangelical office, as Paul and Barnabas were to a special missionary work by the prophets and teachers of the church at Antioch: see Acts 13:1-3, with I Tim. 4:14. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery:" (All ministerial offices for the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints, are called gifts: see Eph. 4:8,11,12); Now this must have been the gift of office; for none would confer miraculous gifts by the imposition of their hands but the apostles: see Acts 8:5,6,14-17. For although Philip astonished the Samaritans with his miracles; this was reserved for the apostles Peter and John. Now, Timothy being thus divinely favored with the gift of the evangelical office, and, no doubt, with the gift of the holy Spirit also, by the laying on of Paul's hands: see II Tim. 1:6,7, with Acts 19:6,7; he was, therefore, duly qualified to perform all the duties of the evangelical office; namely, to preach, teach, and rule: see I Tim. 1:3,4 and 4:11-16, and II Tim. 4:1-5, with Titus 1:5, etc.

Q. Lastly it is queried whether the Apostle may not intend the elders of the churches, whom he thus instructs and requires to admonish disorderly members.

A. It appears from the context immediately preceding, that the Apostle is instructing and authorizing his beloved and faithful cooperant, Timothy, how he should proceed with respect to the different classes of character, both natural and official, which constitute Christian society; beginning first with the elderly men and women, verses 1-2, and ending with the ruling elder, verses 17-20. Now it is evident that Timothy was instructed both to authorize him, and also to instruct and authorize others, how to act toward each other as Christians. The elders that ruled well, were counted worthy of double honor, (that is, with respect to support;) especially they that labored in word and doctrine, (that is, both preaching and teaching). The former of those epithets, namely, the word or gospel, being connected with its proclamation for the conversion of sinners; the latter, namely, doctrine, or teaching of divine truths,

for the edification of saints. Now the elder that both evangelized the world, and taught the church, would incur so much more experience, than he that confined his labors simply to teaching and ruling the church; that he, therefore, would "especially" need a prompt and liberal support. These things being evidently so, it follows, of course, that Timothy was to exemplify the apostolic injunction for rebuking the faulty, as well as honoring the worthy, amongst the elders. Indeed, the obvious import of the 19th verse, and its immediate connection with the 20th, which contains the subject of the proposed query, renders it impossible that it should mean anything else, but the rebuke of those impeached elders that should be found guilty when tried in the manner prescribed in the preceding verse: "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." It is also evident from that most solemn charge immediately following, that the apostle is speaking directly and immediately to Timothy: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing through partiality."

Upon the whole, the sameness and close connection with the subject, from the commencement of the chapter to the end of the 22nd verse, being all an enforcement of relative duties, by the agency of Timothy, according to the Apostle's directions, addressed to him for that purpose, renders it impossible to admit that the Apostle is addressing any other.

Much respected brother, son Alexander not being at home, I undertook, at the request of Brother Pendleton, to consider your queries.—And, upon a close investigation of the text, have been induced to present the above answers, as unexceptionably evident.

Yours very affectionately,

Thomas Campbell.

Q. Who are they that are "of no account in the congregation"? I Cor. 6:4.

A. The word here rendered "of no account" and "least es-

teemed" is in Acts 4:11, "set at naught," in the passage, "This is the stone which was set at naught by you builders," etc. Again, in I Cor. 1:28, we find it—"Things that are despised," etc., also in Luke 8:9, "*he* spoke this parable to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others." If we suppose the epithet "least esteemed" or "of no account" to be applied to certain members of the church, as the common version would require, we recognize a distinction in the church of a very equivocal character. It is true that Christ himself speaks of some who were to be accounted great in the kingdom of heaven, and others who from disobedience to one of his least commandments, and corresponding teaching, were to be regarded as least in this kingdom. Matt. 5:9. And Paul complains bitterly of some whom he affirms that they walk "as enemies of the cross," that their "God is their appetites," that they "glory in their shame," that they "mind earthly things." So that it might be urged with some plausibility that as there were then in the church persons of worldly disposition, too much occupied with business or pleasure to attain any distinction in the church as Christians, and, on this very account regarded by the pious as "least esteemed," it was very proper to refer a controversy respecting worldly business to such persons. And this for two reasons: 1st. Because they would be best judges in such cases, being so conversant with worldly affairs; and 2nd. Because of such affairs being of small importance compared with the matters appertaining to the kingdom, might well have their trifling nature made more evident by being referred to the least esteemed in the church for adjudication. But before any practical application could be made now of this view, it would be necessary to suppose that there are in the churches of this day, the same description of persons, having all the qualifications above specified, to constitute the proper judges in such cases.

Or, on the other hand, it can be asserted (and this is a view greatly favored by the clergy), that the distinction is not spiritual and carnal, but into clergy and laity. Here the private members of the church, or laity, are those who are "least esteemed," or regarded as of "no account," and it is to them that all differences of a worldly nature are to be referred, the clergy

being too much occupied in spiritual matters to be troubled with worldly concerns of this description, in which they would have no interest. But there are many who do not admit such an official distinction as must be supposed to exist, upon this hypothesis. Another view of the passage, accordingly, has been taken which does not involve such consequences, and is most generally adopted. It is this : That the epithet "*of* no account," applies to unbelievers—to those out of the church, who were to be held in no estimation as judges of church members, being disqualified by their very position in respect of the church, and ineligible, from the fitness of things, to sit in judgment over those who themselves were the constituted judges of the world. To carry out this view, the 4th verse must be understood as an interrogation, as printed in the later editions of the new version : "If then you have the cognizance of such matters, why do you set those to judge who are of no account in the congregation?" Why do you set infidels to judge? "For shame to you I say it. So, then, there is not among you a wise man, not even one who shall judge between his brethren! But brother with brother it judged, and that by infidels!"

It is evident from the whole connection that the charge the Apostle brings against the Corinthian disciples, is, that they went to law before the unrighteous instead of being judged by the saints, and while he deprecates litigation altogether, he authorizes the institution of a secular seat of judicature, filled by one or more brethren, to decide questions of a worldly nature, in respect to which brethren might disagree. The epithet in question is, then, undoubtedly applied to unbelievers, who are here rejected by the Apostle as judges in such cases, not perhaps so much from any incompetency on their part, as because a reference to them would place the brethren in a false position.

Q. Is the "eating," spoken of I Cor. 5:11, the Lord's supper or a common eating?

A. It is common eating. These characters spoken of were to be excluded from every social and religious intimacy with the members of the church.

Q. What is the import of the phrase, "end of the commandment"? I Tim. 1:5.

A. Some suppose "commandment" to signify the charge committed to Timothy by the Apostle. Others, with better reason, understand it of the gospel itself, whose objects are precisely those here attributed to the "commandment." There is no impropriety in thus designating the gospel, for it is something which is to be "obeyed." Rom. 10:16. The Law itself is so denominated on various occasions.

Q. In what respect is the Christian superior to the Jew as regards the enjoyment of the holy Spirit?

A. In order to understand this subject, it is necessary to take a comprehensive view of it, and to make just distinctions between the general administration of the divine government and any particular institution set up for special purposes. The people of God in no age, and under no dispensation, have been without the assurance of pardon, and the fellowship of the Spirit. That "God gives his holy Spirit to them that ask him," is a general declaration, not restricted to any particular dispensation, and hence verified in the case of King David, among the Jews, equally as in that of Sergius Paulus, deputy over the land consecrated to Venus by the Gentiles. Faith and obedience have been always, in every age, the terms of salvation, and pardon and fellowship with God its constituent elements. The just have ever lived by faith the only means by which a man can approach God or be accepted in his sight; and the spirit of God is enjoyed through the obedience of faith, and not through works of law. See Gal. 3rd chapter.

We find, indeed, that the ministration of the Spirit is emphatically a distinguishing feature of the gospel of Christ; and that, in this point, among others, the Mosaic law is strikingly contrasted with it. The reason is, that the gospel of Christ recognizes faith and obedience as means of access to God—that it makes these its fundamental principles, and that pardon and fellowship with God are, as ever, the blissful results. It embodies, since it is the most comprehensive communication of the divine will, and the full revelation of the nature of the divine government, and the attributes of the divine character, those simple and natural, yet grand and immutable principles, in conformity with which alone God can be approached, or his



great and precious promises (among which is that of the holy Spirit) be enjoyed. The gospel, therefore, is glorious beyond all previous divine institutions, which, indeed, were merely designed as primary lessons, to prepare the world for its reception. The law was such a lesson. The Apostle calls it "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." It taught a most important lesson—the knowledge of sin—a lesson which always must be learned before salvation can be understood or appreciated. It did not propose to afford access to any one to God. On the contrary, the people under it, as at Sinai, were to stand "afar off" and were not able even to gaze upon the face of Moses resplendent from that high and holy communion he enjoyed when through the obedience of faith, he entered into the thick darkness "where God was." It granted exemption from death, and temporal prosperity to those who obeyed its precepts. "he that doeth these things shall live in them," was its language. Its lesson of instruction was then completed. It professed not to communicate the Spirit of God to those under it, and could not, because it did not itself require faith, through which alone the sinner alone could please God and enjoy his favor. There is a difference, then, between the Jew and the Christian as it respects the Spirit. The Jew (as such) had not the Spirit at all —had no promise of it in his institution, and could not obtain it through the law. The Christian (as such) must have the Spirit of God, because it is the great promise of the gospel—the very consummation of its privileges, and the only true evidence of its reception. Consequently, "if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." he is neither washed, sanctified, nor justified. He has neither "part nor lot" in Christ's salvation, whatever may be his pretensions. The gospel, proposing nothing but obedience of faith, must of necessity secure enjoyment of the holy Spirit, the very purpose and result of this obedience. This being absent, we know that the obedience of faith is absent also. This, however, being present, as evinced by its fruits, we know that the obedience of faith has been rendered, and that the individual "blessed with faithful Abraham," is one of the children of God, having the Spirit of adoption—the earnest of a future eternal inheritance. And all this irrespective both of Judaism and Gentilism; for here "neither

circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith that works by love." Gal. 5:6.

Q. Talking a short time since (as I believe) with a most conscientious gentleman of the Baptist church, one that I heard in a church meeting make a most excellent argument upon the plurality of Elders, I was surprised to find his views so radically changed by learning that Macknight has decided that the term Elder comprehends other and different officers in the church than Bishop, Overseer, Pastor, etc., and includes minor officers, as Deacons, etc., that when it is said they ordained Elders in every church, it means they ordained an Elder and Deacon in every church, and not necessarily a plurality of Bishops in every church but refers to all the officers of a church or congregation.

Again, it is said, "They cast lots, and the lot fell on . . ." how were these lots cast? Was it an intelligent viva voce vote, or drawing by chance from a hat or place?

A. With regard to the ancient application of the word rendered Elder, Dr. Macknight does indeed say as follows: "In the first age it was given to all who exercised any sacred office in the church, as is plain from Acts 20:28, where the persons are called bishops, who, verse 17, were called Elders. The same thing appears from Titus 1:5, where those are called elders, who, verse 7, are named bishops; and from I Tim. 4:14, were collectively all who held sacred offices in Lystra, were called the presbytery, or eldership, and are said to have concurred with the Apostle in setting Timothy apart to the ministry." Dr. Macknight, however, is not to be depended on as a critic when his party tenets are in question, and we could not well have a more glaring instance of this than in the above quotation, in which we have nothing but assertion without proof and the substitution of one question for another. Acts 20:17, 28 and Titus 1:5, 7, do indeed prove that the term elder and bishop are used interchangeably, but they do not show that "all who exercised any sacred office in the church" were called elders. To show that different names are applied to the same class of officers is one thing; but it is quite a different matter to prove that all the different classes of officers are included

under these names. The latter he has not attempted; and the former, a totally different question, is not denied. He quotes also I Tim. 4:14, and asserts that all who held offices in Lystra are called the presbytery or eldership; but he does not inform us upon what authority he makes the assertion. Certainly it has not the slightest foundation in the word of God.

With respect to the manner of casting lots, nothing is said in scripture, except a slight allusion in Prov. 16:33, where it is said, "the lot is cast into the lap." The word lap here may signify vase or urn into which pebbles were usually cast in order to be shaken. There was no voting of any kind in such cases. It was a direct reference of a matter, usually of solemn and sacred importance, to the Lord for decision. In the case of Matthias, therefore, the Apostles prayed, "Lord show which of these two thou hast chosen." Acts 1:24.

Q. What is the meaning of the 17th verse Of the fourth chapter of I Peter? Does "house of God" mean the church? If so, what does "judgment" mean? Does it mean the persecution offered to Christians, or does it mean the destruction of Jerusalem? If the former, where is the proof that persecution of wicked men mean judgments? If the latter, wherein consists the judgment against Christians? Is the verb "is" in the original Greek? Will some one please give information?

A. "House of God" here undoubtedly means the Christian church, as is evident from the next clause "if it first begin at us," the pronoun "us" representing or being substituted for "house of God." "Judgment" is used here in a general sense, in which sense it will apply to the righteous as well as to the wicked. The righteous were at that period judged, condemned or punished by the unbelieving, and that through civil authority, the great persecutions having been ordered by the government itself, because the profession of Christianity was considered an offense against the established institutions and customs of the country, and as meriting reproach, disgrace, confiscation of goods, and death by torture. Such was the "judgment" which had begun at the "house of God," as is manifest from what precedes, this being the very subject under consideration. Thus the brethren are exhorted to rejoice in these sufferings for

righteousness' sake, and not to fear. They are informed that it is the will of God that they should suffer thus, and that it is better to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. The example of Christ is then adduced for their encouragement, he also having suffered in the flesh, but having been rewarded for this suffering, and they are urged to "arm themselves with the same mind," and to disregard the evil-speaking of the ungodly, "who," says he, "shall give an account to him that is ready to judge the quick and dead." We have thus introduced suffering on two accounts: 1. for well-doing; 2, for evil-doing. We have the condemnation of Christians as evil-doers by men in the flesh; and the threatened condemnation of the wicked by him who is ready to judge the quick and the dead. The word suffering or condemnation then is here used in its general sense, and is equally applicable to the different classes the righteous and the wicked. When the Apostle soon after comes to speak more particularly of that fiery trial through which some were to pass, he refers them to the same sources of consolation—viz, the example of Christ, the anticipated rewards of the righteous, and future judgment of the wicked. "If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of; but on your part he is glorified." v. 14. Again, v. 16: "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on that account." "For," says he, "the time has come that judgment must begin at the house of God." That is to say, It is now the time at which judgment or punishment (in this case inflicted by men in the flesh) must begin at the Church of Christ; and if it first begin with us, (the righteous), what will be the end of those that obey not the gospel, when their punishment will be inflicted by the judge of the quick and dead? "Judgment" or "punishment" may be applied equally to the sufferings of those who are really criminal, or those who are supposed to be so.

The Christians were judged and punished as criminals by the civil authority; but their persecutors would be judged and punished by the Judge of the quick and dead. The punishment in the first case, being undeserved, was a persecution; in the latter, being merited, it would be a just retribution; but it is

to be remembered that it is punishment in both cases. God permitted or willed that his people should suffer with Christ, that they might afterwards reign with him. Their enemies, therefore, were allowed to judge, to punish, and persecute them. Those punishments seem to be contrasted with those which the disobedient are to suffer in two points of view : 1st. as to order of time or progression. "If punishment begin first with us, what shall be the end of the disobedient?" As yet the suffering was all on the side of the Christians, the unbelievers being unmolested, and the Apostle therefore well asks: If punishment be the beginning with us, what shall the end be with them? If the divine arrangements require that the righteous should suffer now, in the commencement of the desolations and miseries which announce the approach of the end of all things, how great will be the suffering of the ungodly in the final consummation? 2nd. As to difference in character in those who suffered. He asks: "If the righteous with difficulty escape, where will the ungodly and the sinner appear?" If the righteous can hardly evade or escape sufferings, what shall be the certainty of punishment in the case of the ungodly and the sinners? If the righteous can hardly escape from men, how shall the ungodly escape from God? A remark of Christ when on his way to Calvary is quite similar: "If it fare thus with the green tree, how shall it fare with the dry?" If I, the innocent and righteous, the green tree, am thus consumed in this fiery trial, how shall the wicked and impenitent, the dry wood fitted for the flames, fare in the fire of divine vengeance?

This passage has no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, as Macknight supposes. He imagines that the escape was from this destruction; and that the sufferings referred to were those experiences referred to by those Jewish Christians from the Romans, as being confounded with Jews and regarded only as a sect of Jews. In this case they would have been suffering as Jews, but the Apostle especially characterises the sufferings of which he speaks as for the "Name of Christ." "If any man suffer as a Christian," etc. But the epistle is not even addressed to Jewish Christians, nor specially to Christians at ail in Judea, as any one may see by referring to the first verse. The verb "is" is not expressed, but implied in the original.

Q. A brother, not of our connection, a Baptist minister of the South, states the following for our consideration: "I was in the time of great excitement, when very young, induced to make the Christian profession, and was accordingly, after the Baptist manner, received for baptism, and immersed. But by degrees the excitement went off—I gradually declined into the world again—became cold and worldly, and my last state was worse than the first. I became an apostate—associated with ungodly and impious company—delighted in their company, forsaking the society of the pious. But the Lord laid his hand on me. I was chastened, and severely, too, for my falling away. I became penitent, I returned to the meetings of the faithful, and felt my heart become a little more warm and interested. On my solicitation I was received into the communion of the church; I was induced to exhort a little—I then preached. I was fully ordained to the ministry, but now, on more diligently searching the scriptures, and upon reflection upon my former conversion and baptism, I am not satisfied with myself. I desire to be useful in the kingdom of the Lord, and would devote my feeble powers to his glory, if I were assured that I could do it acceptably to the Lord. As it is, the people desire me to officiate for them in preaching and teaching, but they cannot enter into—they do not comprehend my views and feelings. I want the full assurance of pardon; I desire to be baptized on a simple confession of the faith in Christ, and to devote my life, my all to his service. Still, having been formerly baptized, I feel embarrassed on the subject. What should I do? Your advice is earnestly sought. What think you, my brother?"

A. The case, as you have submitted, demands a sincere sympathy. To be perplexed and harassed with doubts and misgivings on such premises is not to be endured in case where relief is so easily obtained. "God is love," and will shed abroad his love in the hearts of the believing and the obedient. But we must feel that we are in covenant with God, according to his own publication of it, and not according to everyone's edition of it. God's covenant, through the Lord Jesus Christ, is, that after hearing and being taught by God, the way of acceptance, and pardon, and salvation through the mediation of his son, we

make a public confession of that faith, and are then immersed into his death.

It must, then, always be referred to the individual whether he was enlightened in the covenant, believed in the Lord, and was, on that foundation immersed into his death. If he was so enlightened, and so believed, and so confessed, and was baptized, he is constitutionally in Christ, and can claim all the blessings of his salvation, according to the conditions of that covenant. The only difficulty, then, on the premises is, whether the failure to enjoy these blessings depends upon a want of belief, or upon an imperfect or obscure view of the whole premises. If there was not a faith in the premises, there could be no confession of it, and no baptism into it. And in the above case, I should think there was no faith in the gospel of Christ, and it appears to have been a mere panic or movement of the passions. And, certainly, for all the reasons these baptists give for immersing all those who were either sprinkled or dipped in their infancy, the subject of such an impulsive and unrealizing immersion ought to put an end to all his doubts, by being immersed into the Lord and believingly accept the covenant of life at his hand. While, then, a mere enlargement of faith, or a mere increase of knowledge as to design as to baptism would not justify a second confession of faith, and a second immersion, this case of doubt as to faith itself; is not to be endured, but to be removed by a confession of faith never made before, and a baptism into that belief.

Q. What is the design of the Lord's Supper? Does not a Christian, in partaking of the Supper, in a proper spirit, and understanding its nature and design, as really receive the remission of his sins, as the penitent alien in baptism?

A. For those in the Messiah's kingdom there is no ordinance for remission, except the ordinance of repentance and confession. The Lord's Supper is emblematic of the Messiah's sacrifice, and commemorative of his death, and is to us a weekly memento that our sins have been expiated by his blood. It is not an ordinance for receiving new blessings, but for commemorating those already received.

Q. I wish your opinion on a case which I will state, as the

individual is desirous of uniting with the church. He and his wife are separated; he has put her away, not for adultery, or any thing of that kind, for he believes her to be perfectly virtuous, but for uncongeniality of disposition. He says, "she is incapacitated for managing my domestic affairs, is exceedingly contentious, wants to rule, stirs up the children to disobey their father, shows no affection for her children, and will not afford either them or him the necessary attention they require; he has tried every means but all to no purpose. He is willing to make provision for her support as far as his means will allow, but declares it is impossible they can ever live under the same roof again." Both belonged to the Methodist church, he was a class-leader among them, he is a man of intelligence and tolerable education, a very peaceable and well disposed citizen and neighbor. Does not I Cor. 7:10, 11 apply to this case? The case of the husband is not so full as that of his wife, but are we not allowed to complete the sentence by these words-"But if he put her away, let him remain unmarried, or be reconciled to his wife." Again, in Mark 10:11, 12. "Are we to consider the putting away as a separate act from marrying, or the whole to have been confined to one act, namely, that he must not put away, as well as not marry, except on the conditions specified?"

A. On such a question I speak with much diffidence. A private answer to the query has been solicited in this case, but we have had several such cases propounded, and therefore, suppressing all names connected with this question, I will at once give my opinion, and let him that cannot receive it, reject it. The two passages which most expressly refer to this case are referred to by the querist. The passage in I Cor. 7 reads as follows: "And to the married I command, yet not I but the Lord, let not the wife depart from her husband; but if she depart let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband, and let not the husband put away his wife." The Apostle refers to a precept given by the Lord; we shall, therefore, hear him, Mark 10:12. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, (whoredom) and shall marry another, committeth adultery against her." On these words, reported by Mark, the Saviour makes the commission of



adultery in marrying again, and not simply putting away his wife. But a question arises: may he not separate from her or put her away, and remain unmarried, as in the case of which Paul speaks; and especially because Paul allows the wife to depart from her husband if she cannot live in peace and amity with him, without the charge of adultery, on condition that she does not marry again. I confess, from all the premises before me, I see no good reason why the husband should, any more than the wife, be thus bound. If he cannot live in peace with her he may depart or separate from her on the condition that he does not marry again, then he falls under the condemnation of the Lord, according to the fair construction of Mark 10:11, 12. Our brother will see that we agree with him in our construction of 1 Cor. 7 and that we think the supplement he alleges would be justifiable on principle, as fairly implied in the precept of the Apostle.

Q. What is "trespass" as spoken of in the 18th chapter of Matthew? Is it a generic or a specific term?

A. The term "trespass" is certainly used generically. Under the law, there were both sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings. The former seem to have been for those offenses which were committed through ignorance against negative precepts, (Lev. 6:2-13,22,27), or "things which should be done." The latter were appointed for certain offences committed unwittingly—that is, without a knowledge of the facts in the case—as touching the carcass of things unclean without knowing it; or taking an oath leading to consequences which were not foreseen, (Lev. 5:2,6) and five other specified cases: 1st. Sacrilege. (Lev. 5:16). 2d. Regarding things stolen, etc. (Lev. 6:2-7). The injury against a bondmaid named in Lev. 19:20-22. 4th. The case of the Nazarite as detailed in the 6th chapter of Numbers. And 5th. The offering for the leper as described in Lev. 14. An examination of these cases will show that while only two of them are for offences against individuals they include both kinds of private offences. The first is against the right of property, and the second against the rights of person. Even under the law, then, trespass was a generic term, signifying fault, blame, guilt, and was limited in its import only, so far

as the qualifying terms of the law required. But our Saviour uses no qualifying words except such as limit the term to individuals, and it therefore must be allowed its full signification. Indeed the Greek word (*hamartia*) which the Saviour uses, is the common word in the New Testament for Sin; and Isaiah, in the 53rd chapter, uses the Hebrew *asham* with respect to the sacrifice of our Saviour, translated sin-offering. The Saviour, speaking of the sin against the Holy Spirit, says, "All manner of sins," etc., (*pasahamartia*). Of course this is generic. The true point of this part of the Saviour's discourse, taken in its entire connection, seems to have been to teach the great doctrine of forgiveness. Under the law private offences, both against person and property, authorized the exaction of penalties. It was eye for eye, tooth for tooth; or a full restoration of the principal and one-fifth added thereto. Instead of this system of penalties, the disciples of Christ are taught the principle of forgiveness, unlimited forgiveness, unto repentance and confession. "Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king," says the Saviour. This was hard doctrine, whereas the Apostles said unto the Lord, "Increase our faith." That this was the real object of the Lord is further evinced by the fact that the mere forms of procedure prescribed were such as the Jews were already accustomed to, being the same as employed in the synagogue. The pleadings remain the same, the law, the principle by which the difficulty must be settled, only is changed.

Q. In the injunction, "Let him be to you as a heathen," etc., does the word "you" refer to the congregation or to the person trespassed against?

A. The pronoun "you" is "thee" in the common version, which more definitely expresses the number of the original, which is singular. The Saviour keeps up the supposed case-"If thy brother offend thee," and is prescribing the rule for the individual throughout. But for the person offended to treat the offender as a heathen and a publican, and this by the decision of the church, and the church at the same time to treat him as a brother; would be absurd. He must be excluded upon the grounds of insubordination to Christ.

Q. What is meant by "as a pagan or publican?" I have spent many anxious days and nights studying the 18th chapter of Matthew, and long since come to the conclusion that there is no chapter in the New Testament less understood than it. If you can elucidate it, you will doubtless add much to the common stock of religious knowledge and confer a real favor on your brethren.

A. The highest order of ecclesiastical punishment among the Jews, was the shemetha, or casting out, by which the offender was no longer treated as a citizen by the rest of the Jews, but regarded as a heathen and a publican. Our Saviour brings the matter to the same result in the discipline of his kingdom, and requires those who refuse to submit to its laws shall no longer be regarded as members of it, but shall be excluded from its blessings and privileges. We hope these reasons may prove satisfactory; if not, we are ready still further to lend our aid, as far as we are able, to every inquirer after the truth.

**Questions and Answers on Baptism**

BY

A. CAMPBELL

Q. (This special series of questions and answers formed a tract which Alexander Campbell published in March, 1849, explained by himself as follows:) We designed this tract especially for the most uneducated portion of the reading community, embracing in its details the whole SUBJECT, ACTION and DESIGN of baptism. We, therefore, adopt the method of question and answer as most instructive and impressive, only premising that our answers shall always be those, and those only, which the Holy Scriptures, history, and human experience authenticate and sustain. Query:

1. Who was the first Baptist? A. John, the harbinger of Christ, called "John the Baptist."

2. From whom did he receive authority to baptize? A. Not from men, but from God. He was sent by God to baptize, and did not institute it himself, nor learn it from the Jews. Jno. **1:33**.

3. Where did he baptize? A. In the Jordan, and at Aenon, "because there was much water there."

4. Did those he baptized make the confession? A. They "were baptized by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins."

5. Were they led or carried to baptism? A. "There went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about the Jordan, and were baptized by him in the Jordan."

6. Who was the most distinguished person whom he baptized? A. The Saviour of the world.

7. For what purpose was he baptized? A. Neither for confessing his sins nor for receiving remission of them but to "fulfill all righteousness," or to honor the righteous institutions

of God.—"Thus," said he, "it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness," or observe every divine institution.

8. How old was Jesus when baptized? A. About thirty years.

9. Had Jesus been circumcised when an infant? A. He was circumcised the eighth day.

10. Had all those that John baptized been circumcised? A. Yes, they were all Jews.

11. What do you infer from this fact? A. That baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, else no Jews would have been baptized.

12. When was Christian baptism introduced? A. Not till John the Baptist had been beheaded, and Jesus Christ crucified, almost four years after the baptism of John.

13. Where was it instituted? A. On a mountain in Galilee. 14. By whom? A. By the Saviour in person.

15. In what words? A. "Go. teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you;" or according to Mark, "Go ye into all the world; preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

16. To whom was this commission given? A. To the Apostles of Christ.

17. When and where did they begin to act under it? A. On the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus into heaven, and in the city of Jerusalem.

18. How many were there and then baptized? A. Three thousand souls.

19. What qualification was required by the Apostles acting under this commission? A. Repentance.

20. Repeat the words. A. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus."

21. Any other indication implying whether none but professed believing penitents were baptized on that occasion? A. "They that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts 2:41.

22. Are infants capable of understanding, believing, and gladly receiving a preached gospel? A. Not such as we have in this age of the world.

23. What, then, would you infer concerning the first three thousand persons baptized by the Apostles of Christ? A. That there were no infants, nor families having infants, baptized by the Apostles in establishing the first Christian church ever planted on earth.

24. Had all the males baptized by the Apostles on this occasion been circumcised? A. Being Jews, they must have been circumcised; for the Jews were "the Circumcision."

25. And what would you infer from this? A. That baptism was not a substitute for circumcision, as some vainly imagine; for then how could the Apostles have baptized those who had been circumcised?

26. What accommodations were there for baptism in Jerusalem? A. There were pools of water, public and private baths in Jerusalem, as well as the brook Kedron, near the public garden where Jesus often resorted with his disciples.

27. Where did the second great baptism occur? A. In Samaria.

28. How is it reported? A. Philip, an evangelist, went down from Jerusalem after many thousands had been baptized there, to the city of Samaria, and preached to them the same gospel. Many of the Samaritans, we are informed, "hearing, believed and were baptized, both men and women."

29. Why did not the history say, 'Men, women, and children?' A. Because, I presume, there were no children; for in being so particular in detailing who had heard, believed and were baptized, so far as to respect the sex of the parties, the same particularity would have induced him to have added children, had children been amongst them. Thus it is that silence by force of circumstances is sometimes equivalent to a negative.

30. But is this not already indicated in the text? A. Yes, in the qualifications of those baptized there are enumerated those which exclude speechless babes. We are informed that they believed Philip's preaching, hearing and seeing the miracles which he performed before they were baptized. They were

capable of seeing or contemplating a miracle, of perceiving the meaning of it, and of believing the preacher before they were baptized.

31. Were the Samaritans circumcised persons? A. Yes, they were the circumcised children of the covenant that God made with Abraham; for though at this time a mongrel people, they practiced circumcision.

32. Having, then, neither found amongst the Jews at Jerusalem, nor amongst the mongrel Jews of Samaria, a single instance of baptism without hearing and believing, or professing faith in the Messiah, we have all scriptural evidence against infant sprinkling or infant baptism; to whom shall we next look? A. To the next case reported.

33. And what is the next case reported? A. It is that of the Ethiopian officer, Treasurer of an Ethiopian Queen, who heard Philip preach the same gospel, and was, on profession of that faith, baptized in a certain water to which they came on their journey.

34. And what was the next baptism reported in the Acts of the Apostles? A. That of Saul of Tarsus. Doubtless he was a believing subject.

35. How was he baptized? A. Neither while sitting or standing. We are not informed in what place, but he was commanded to arise, and of course to accompany Ananias somewhere. "Arise," said he, "why tarriest thou, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." he accordingly arose and accompanied him to a suitable place, and was baptized.

36. Having seen from an introduction from the first converts in Jerusalem, Samaria, Damascus, and Ethiopia, that all baptized persons were first taught and instructed in the way of the Lord before their baptism, and not one indication of a different practice, what is wanting to complete this chapter of evidences? A. We must look from the Jews—whether in Jerusalem, Samaria, Damascus, or Ethiopia, to the Gentiles. Perhaps, there was a different dispensation of baptism to the Gentiles.

37. And what were the circumstances of the conversion or baptism of the aliens? A. The Gentiles, were, indeed, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise. But admission to the new dispensation was proposed to Jews and Gentiles on the same premises, because, God is not a God of the Jews, but of the Gentiles also; and he made no difference, says an Apostle, between them, "purifying their hearts by faith."

38. But give us a case. Where was the first baptism of Gentiles? A. At Caesarea. Cornelius, an Italian Captain, an intelligent, pious, and prayerful soldier, with his family and his personal friends, were the first fruits of the nations to Jesus Christ. All the converts of that day heard, believed, and received the Holy Spirit before they were baptized. It was in reference to these that Peter challenged the Jews, his companions, from Joppa, asking if any one of them refuse baptism to these enlightened and dignified Pagans. He then commanded them so distinguished with knowledge, faith, and the Holy Spirit, to be baptized in the name, or by the authority of the Lord. Such Gentiles, as believed and were enlightened were to be baptized by the authority of the Lord.

39. Have we any other public baptisms reported among the Gentiles? A. We have the baptism of the Corinthians under the ministry of the Apostle Paul.

40. What are the details of their baptism? A. We are solemnly told that many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized.

41. Had infant baptism been preached in those days, how would it have read? A. 'Many infants, being baptized, believed and heard.'

42. Would it not be incongruous to say that they first believed and then heard? A. Not in the least more unprecedented or more unreasonable than to say they were first baptized and then believed. According to the Acts of the Apostles and the tenor of the New Testament, it is as good sense, as good style, and as fully authorised to say many infants believed and then heard the gospel, as to say many infants were baptized and then believed the gospel.



43. But is it generally true in fact that baptized infants do afterward believe the gospel? A. It may sometimes happen, but the experience of accurate observation, would prove, according to our observation, that, taking Pedobaptist Christendom into account, not a tithe of baptized infants do ever really believe the gospel.

44. Of sixty millions of Russian baptized infants—one hundred millions of Romans sprinkled infants—of fifty millions of Lutherans, and Episcopal, and Presbyterian, and Methodistic sprinkled or poured infants, can any one reasonably conclude from all published data, that, in the aggregate, ten or eleven millions of them really and truly believe the gospel to the salvation of their souls! A. If so, surely the Millennium must be at the door.

45. Waiving all matters of doubtful disputation in the premises, what was laid down in the Acts of the Apostles as indispensable qualifications necessary to baptism? A. "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest."

46. Did you ever read of the baptism of any infants in the scriptures? A. No.

47. Did you ever read of the sprinkling of any infants in the scriptures? A. No.

48. Whose commandment, then, do we obey in having our infants baptized or sprinkled? A. The commandment of the clergy.

49. Do we transgress any divine command in neglecting to have our infants baptized? A. No : I never read of any one being accused of this sin in the Bible, nor of any commandment that was thereby transgressed.

50. Did you ever read of any sponsors in the Bible? A. No.

51. What do you mean by a sponsor? A. I mean one that promises and engages for another in baptism.

52. Did you ever read in the scriptures of any one promising anything for another in baptism? A. No: no promise of parent nor child, at baptism, is ever mentioned in the Bible.

53. Whence originated the custom of promising and vowing in baptism?  
A. From the clergy.

54. Did you ever read in the scriptures of any vows that minors or adults were under in consequence of baptism? A. None.

55. What are the promises given to baptized infants or minors in the New Testament? A. None.

56. What are the threats announced against them that fail to have their infants baptized? A. Many from the Clergy, but none from the Bible.

57. Is baptism a command? A. Yes: "Be baptized, every one of you."

58. Should not every divine command be obeyed? A. Yes.

59. In what does religious obedience consist? A. In a voluntary act of an intelligent agent.

60. Is a person active or passive in obeying a command? A. Active

61. Is an infant active or passive, conscious or unconscious, in receiving baptism? A. It is passive and unconscious.

62. Can a being that is passive and unconscious in suffering an action, be said to be obeying a command in that same action? A. By no means.

63. Can those persons who have been baptized in infancy be said, on the foregoing principles, to have obeyed the divine command, "Be baptized." A. No: Impossible.

64. Is baptism an act of religious worship? A. Yes: all divine ordinances were appointed for us to worship God thereby.

65. How must acceptable worship be performed? A. "In the spirit and in truth." "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

66. Can any unthinking and unconscious infant worship God in spirit and in truth? A. No.

67. Can they, then, in conformity with these principles, be baptized as an act of religious worship? A. No.

68. Is baptism appointed for the benefit of the subject? A. Yes.

69. Are there any benefits resulting from baptism in this life? A. Yes.

70. What are the benefits resulting from baptism in this life? They are briefly comprehended in one sentence—viz. "The answer of a good conscience toward God."

71. In what does the answer of a good conscience consist? A. In three things: 1. The knowledge of the meaning of baptism. 2. A belief of the fact and import of the death and resurrection of Christ, to which baptism refers. 3d. In the consciousness of our own minds that we have voluntarily and intelligently-obeyed the divine command. See Rom. 6:1,6; I Pet. 3:20-22.

72. Can any infant be conscious of these things in baptism; or can it afterwards reflect that it intelligently, voluntarily, and cheerfully obeyed the divine command? A. It is utterly impossible.

73. Is there, then, no way in which an infant can obtain, by reflection or otherwise, the answer of a good conscience from baptism? A. None.

74. Can an adult, when instructed in the import of baptism, receive any consolation from reflecting that his parents had him baptized when an infant? A. No, unless it is a delusive consolation; for the answer of a good conscience can be enjoyed through an inward consciousness that the subject has intelligently and voluntarily obeyed a divine command.

75. How does any adult know that he was baptized in infancy? A. By the report of others.

76. Is there any duty inculcated in the New Testament that requires us only to have testimony of others for our having performed it? A. Not any.

77. Is there any promise accompanying our obedience to the commands of God? A. Yes: "*In* keeping of them there is great reward." Ps. 19-11, Prov. 3:16-18, Jam. 1:25, etc.

78. Is there any reward accompanying infant baptism? A. None, except, "the praise of men."

79. Is there any peculiar promise accompanying baptism? A. Yes, the promise of the Divine Spirit as a "comforter." Acts 2:38; 19:2-7.

80. What are the immediate duties of those baptized? A. Union with the church and obedience to all the ordinances and commandments.

81. How soon were the baptized added to the church? A. "That same day," and "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in breaking of bread, in fellowship, and in prayers."

82. Is this true of any infants after baptism? A. No; it never was, nor in the nature of things can it ever be.

83. What is the necessary qualification to all parts of Christian practice? A. Faith.

84. Is there no Christian duty to be performed without faith in the subject? A. None.

85. Why so? A. Because "without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. 11:6.

86. Can it be pleasing to God then to baptize and sprinkle infants? A. No, seeing that without faith it is impossible to please God.

87. Can the infant itself, in receiving this rite, please God? A. No, for it is destitute of faith.

88. How do you know that infants are destitute of faith? A. Because they cannot believe in him of whom they have never heard. As saith the Apostle, Rom. 10:14.

89. But may there not be two kinds of baptism?—one suited to believers, and one to infants destitute of faith? A. No, for the scripture speaks only of one baptism.

90. Why did John baptize at Enon? A. "Because there was much water there."

91. Would not a few quarts of water baptize hundreds? A. No; a few quarts of water might sprinkle hundreds, but could not baptize one.

92. Who appointed the sprinkling of infants? A. The Clergy. 93. When did sprinkling become general amongst Roman

Pedobaptists? A. The Pope, in the year 1311, declared sprinkling or immersion as indifferent—either would do very well. But in England it did not become general till after the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

94. Why do you sprinkle water upon the face? A. Because thus the clergy have ordained.

95. Why do they not sprinkle the foreskin, seeing the Jews circumcised it? A. Because it would be indecent and impolite.

96. Was not, then, circumcision indecent and impolite? No; for it was commanded of God.

97. Can you give no better reason for sprinkling the face than that given? A. No; the Clergy have pitched upon it, and perhaps they had some reason for it.

98. To what is baptism compared to in the New Testament? A. To a burial and a resurrection.

99. Does sprinkling the face resemble a burial? A. No.

100. Does immersing the whole person resemble a burial? A. Yes, "buried with him." Rom. 6:4-6.

101. Does a child, carrying away from a preacher, resemble a resurrection? A. No.

102. How, then, is a resurrection exhibited? A. After the subject has been immersed in water and completely overwhelmed in it, his rising up out of it is an emblem of a resurrection.

103. Is baptism compared to anything else in the scriptures? A. Yes; to the regenerating influences and operation of the Spirit of God. Hence we read of "the washing of regeneration" and of "the baptism of the Holy Spirit."

104. Is sprinkling an emblem of the operation of the Spirit? A. No.

105. What is there in an immersion in water that is an emblem of the regenerating of the Spirit? A. The application of water to the whole person of the subject, and the consequent "putting off of the filth of the flesh," is an emblem of the operation of the Spirit upon the soul of man affecting the understanding, will, and affections, and the consequent, "putting

off of the sins of the flesh," or "the old man with his deeds." This, immersion beautifully exhibits; but sprinkling cannot.

106. How shall the illiterate man know the meaning of the Greek word for baptism? A. By inquiring how the Greek church practises this rite. It is certain they ought to understand their own language best.

107. And how does the Greek church administer this ordinance? A. Even to this day they immerse every subject, in all climes, and in all cases in which they may be placed.

108. Has not immersion in cold water been a dangerous practice? A. No; not in the frozen regions of Russia and Canada, in the midst of coldest winters, and in the warmest climates of the torrid zone, it has been practiced without danger, and with manifest safety to the administrators and subjects.

109. Why was sprinkling substituted for immersion? A. To gratify the caprice, the pride, and the carnality of the human mind.

110. Why were infants baptized or sprinkled, seeing there is no such command or precedent in the Bible? A. Why did the Israelites make a golden calf—Uzzah touch the sacred ark—and Nadab and Abihu offer strange and uncommanded fire upon the altar of the Lord? From the same principle, and for the same reason, was this practice first introduced.

111. Did you ever read of infant church membership. A. Yes, in the books of Discipline, but never in the Bible.

112. What do you understand by "infant church members?" A. I understand the phrase to mean, that infants are members of the infant church.

113. Are there any directions given in the scriptures for the proper discipline and management of infant members? A. None; the Bible knows of no such members: it addresses all members as equally qualified by faith and grace to attend all the ordinary duties of Christianity.

114. Do we ever read of any members of the church who are qualified for attendance on the other institutions of it? A. None.

115. Can infants, then, be considered members of the visible church, seeing they are not qualified for the observance of the ordinances of it? A. By no means.

116. Is Jesus Christ represented as King of his kingdom or church? A. Yes. Rev. 19:16.

117. Wherein does the honor and glory of a King consist? A. In reigning over a willing people; a people who love and esteem him, and serve him as volunteers, and in governing them in wisdom and justice.

118. Where is Christ spoken of as a King? A. Ps. 110:1,2,3; John 18:37.

119. What is the character of his subjects? A. They are said to be "a willing people"—"of the truth"—"taught of God"—"born from above"—and "true and faithful."

120. Are infants of such a character? A. No; consequently cannot be subjects of his visible kingdom.

121. In what point of view are we to consider infants? A. As inheriting an evil nature—"conceived in sin"—"brought forth in iniquity"—"prone to evil"—guilty and subject to death, "the wages of sin." Ps. 58:3, 51:5; Job 14:4; Jno. 3:6; Eph. 2:3.

122. Can any or all of them be saved before they are capable of receiving instruction? A. Yes; by the merits and atonement of Christ.

123. As our greatest concern is with them that live, how should we manage them during childhood with regard to their spiritual concerns? A. We should "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—that is, we should make them well acquainted with the scriptures of truth; make them commit to memory the most plain and striking parts, respecting their present state and condition, the character of God, and of his Son Jesus our Lord, and the doctrine of Christ. Above all, we should exhibit a good example before them for their illumination, renovation, and salvation without endeavoring to force a profession of religion upon them or the views of any particular sect.

124. Should we ever urge them to profess Christianity? A. No; we should teach them what it is to be a Christian, and the awful consequence of rejecting the gospel and dying in infidelity; but leave it to their own conscience when and how to profess Christianity.

125. Would the sprinkling of them in infancy tend to accelerate their conversion—would it secure that they ever would be Christians, or confer upon them any Christian benefit? A. Not in the least.

126. Have not many Christians had their infants sprinkled or baptized in infancy? A. I make no doubt but there were, and there are Christians in this practice.

127. But would you make this a reason why we, who are convinced that this is a mere tradition of man, should practice it? A. No; for then we might pray to the Virgin Mary, believe in purgatory, make the sign of the cross in baptizing, swear to "the Solemn League," believe the doctrine of consubstantiation and transubstantiation, go into a monastery to take the vow of celibacy, because some good men have done some of these things.

128. Is not the same action alike good or bad to all who practice it? A. No; for there is a great difference between a person performing an action, thinking it right, and one performing the same action, doubting of its propriety or knowing it to be wrong. The former is a simple mistake; the latter, a wilful transgression. Even civil law discriminates between the different degrees of merit in the action, arising from the knowledge and determination of the agent. Hence we have different kinds of murder, and different punishments attached to each, according to circumstances.

129. Are there two kinds of ignorance? A. Yes; there is an unavoidable ignorance and a wilful ignorance. The former exists where there is no possible means of information; such as the Indian's ignorance of the Saviour; the latter exists where the subject might know, if he would avail himself of the knowledge which he possesses, such as the Pedobaptist's ignorance of the true subject and object of baptism. Whatever



excuse can be plead for the former, there is no extenuation of the latter.

130. If infant baptism be an evil thing, as it is often represented, it is strange that the Almighty should have tolerated its continuance so long and suffered it to extend so far with impunity.—how do you account for this? A. The Almighty has suffered many errors to exist for a much longer time. The whole system of Anti-Christ is now more than 1200 years old, and Paganism is several thousand years old. The future state only will exhibit the reasons for this.

131. How do you view all Pedobaptists with regard to this ordinance of baptism? Can you, according to the Scriptures, consider them baptized persons, or do you consider them un-baptized? A. There is but one baptism, and all who have not been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, after having professed the faith of the gospel, have never been baptized, and are now in an unbaptised state.

132. What is the design of baptism? A. Besides your putting on Christ, and having the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit put upon us, we are baptized for the remission of all past sins through faith in his blood. Thus Peter, Acts 2:38, commanded three thousand Jews to be baptized every one for himself, for the remission of sins; thus Ananias told Paul to "be baptized and wash away his sins," etc. Hence baptism is "the washing of regeneration," thus the church is cleansed through the bath of water by the word, and thus, "the like figure" to Noah's being saved by water in the ark, "baptism does also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God through the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ."

133. Why are so many good people so much divided in their views of scripture, seeing they have but one Bible, and all read it in the same language? A. Because they belong to different sects and have different systems, and they rather make the Bible bow to their own systems, than make their systems bow to the Bible; or, in other word, each man, too generally, views the Bible through the medium of his system; and, of course,

it will appear to him to favor it. Just as if A, B, and C should each put on different colored glasses: A puts on green spectacles; B, yellow; and C, blue. Each one of these through his own glasses looks at the Bible. To A it appears green; to B, yellow, and to C, blue. They begin to debate its color. It is impossible for any one of them to convince another that he is wrong; each one feels a conviction next to absolute certainty that his opinion is right. But D, who has no spectacles on, and who is standing by during the contest, very well knows that they are all wrong. He sees the spectacles on each man's nose, and easily accounts for the difference. Thus one professor reads the Bible with John Calvin on his nose; another, with John Wesley; a third, with John Gill; and a fourth with someone else. Thrice happy the man who lifts the Bible as if it had dropped from heaven into his hands alone, and who, with a single eye, reads for himself!

134. Who is most likely to understand it? A. He who practises what he already knows.

(To the reader: Thus ends the special series of queries on baptism. OJS.)

**Questions and Answers**

FROM MILLENNIAL HARBINGERS, BY A. CAMPBELL  
AND THE EVANGELIST BY WALTER SCOTT

Q. Is it not indispensable to the unity of the body of Christ, that the churches should respect each other's acts in matters of discipline and refuse to countenance a member who has been excluded by a church in good standing? A. Such a course is unquestionably essential to good order. The action of a congregation in good standing and regularly organised, must be respected by other congregations, else there can be no good feeling between them. It is quite absurd to suppose that the Saviour would have given to the church of which an individual is a member, the right to try and excommunicate him, when at the same time, he intended to allow that other churches should disregard such a sentence, and treat the offender as though he were a member in good standing and full fellowship. Each congregation is but a part of a great whole, which we call the Kingdom of Christ. These parts, however, are equal; and, so far as official power is concerned, within the proper limits of its jurisdiction, each one is supreme. It will not be denied, that the power to exclude offenders is vested in the particular congregation to which they belong. In the exercise of this power therefore, the congregation is acting as the commissioned agent of Christ, and thus, exclusion from their fellowship is exclusion from the visible Kingdom of Christ on earth. How, then, can any member of that kingdom treat him as a law-abiding subject? Is not the reversal of the rule indicated in the above inquiry virtually taking into the bosom of the church one who has been declared, by the constituted authorities of Christ, a heathen man and a publican? If so, who can justify the practice? Surely none who fear and honor Christ more than they do their fellow men.

The following extracts from a letter, from an intelligent and

talented brother in Alabama to a brother in Tennessee, on the subject of receiving the testimony of the world, in cases of discipline in the church, presents some of the best remarks on it with which we have ever met. Though this language is, in some places, very strong, his reasoning is clear, able and conclusive, and well sustained by the Bible. the query. "Is it right to take the testimony of the world, in a matter concerning the conduct of a brother?" A. I answer unhesitatingly, yes. If the person sustains a good character for truth, he is just as competent to state facts concerning the conduct of a Christian, as any other person could be. Nor is there any rule in the New Testament, that I have been able to find, which excludes them. It is gross injustice to honest men of the world, to say that they will not speak truth concerning the conduct of Christians; and to exclude them as witnesses, amounts to such a declaration. The Apostle frequently cautions disciples in reference to their conduct, "To them that are without," and recommends us to use the greatest prudence in not giving offence. In one place he virtually allows them a voice in selecting Christian bishops, for he makes their "good report" of a man a qualification for this office—I Tim. 3:7. It is hardly possible that the Holy Spirit would pay this deference to the "good report" of "them that are without," and yet disallow their testimony against an offending disciple! In II Thess. 4:12, we are commended "to walk honestly to them that are without." In Col. 4:5, he tells us, "to walk in wisdom to them that are without." And again, "See, then, that you walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time."—Eph. 5:15-16. I am unable to see either the honesty, wisdom or circumspection here enjoined by the Apostle, in the conduct of those who refuse to believe a truthful man, when he speaks of the sinful and disorderly acts of a professed disciple. Indeed, if such testimony be excluded, there would be no proof in many cases; for the hypocritical pretender to discipleship is generally cautious in the presence of Christians, while he is sinful and reckless while with the world. Again, few men sin without temptations. In Christian society, these temptations seldom arise; whereas, when herding with the world, they beset us constantly. Adopt then, the rule that none but Christians be

allowed to testify against an offending member, and you effectually close the door, against the conviction in at least two-thirds of the cases; retain a corrupt member in the body, who brings it into contempt before the world, and you hinder the advancement of the cause of Christ, and suffer just reproach and loss of influence with those whom you are bound "to seek and save." If, in such a course, we act wisely, honestly and circumspectly towards "those that are without," I confess I have greatly mistaken the import of these terms. The rule by which such proof was excluded, was borrowed from the Baptists, and not learned from the Holy Spirit. The sooner, therefore, we return the useless and dangerous article to its legitimate owners, the better it will be for the peace and purity of the church. To show its absurdity, let me put a case which has happened (except as to retaining the party in the church,) and may occur again: Suppose a man, in the fellowship with the church of Christ, is indicted, arraigned and tried, for the crime of horse-stealing. The proof of the testimony consists only of men of the world, but it is clear, conclusive and overwhelming. He is convicted before the judicial tribunals of the country, and rightfully sentenced to the penitentiary. Here you have a rogue and a felon, convicted according to the law, disgraced and punished justly, before all the world, and yet a regular member of the church of Christ, without censure, and without reproach!! A rule that will produce such results, can only be an emanation from the arch enemy of all righteousness. The force of this cannot be broken by saying, that his judicial conviction would be received as evidence of his guilt, for, as this conviction is the result from proof by men of the world, it is as clearly objectionable as the testimony on which it is founded.

Q. According to the teachings of the present Reformation, God does not reveal anything to man by his Spirit or otherwise, in the present day. How, then does he answer the prayers of his people?

A. Let it be granted that God does not make any new revelation to man, and we can only infer, from this principle, with respect to the answering of prayer, that God does not

answer such prayers as ask for a supernatural revelation by the Spirit. This is all. And this is nothing more than saying that God does not answer prayers, which ask for blessings that he has not promised to confer.

Q. Does prayer have any direct influence with God whatever?

A. Certainly, if the scriptures speak truth. When Moses and Aaron went out from Pharaoh, after having promised that the frogs should depart, "Moses cried unto the Lord, because of the frogs which he had brought against Pharaoh: and the Lord did according to the words of Moses," etc. Ex. 8:12:13. Again: when the Israelites fell into idolatry at the foot of Sinai, and bowed down to the golden calf which Aaron had made for them, God said to Moses, "I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people; now, therefore, let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." But Moses besought the Lord, and remonstrated with him, and prevailed by prayer against his declared purpose, so that we are told in the strong metaphor of the 14th verse, that "the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people." Ex. 32. After Samson had slain his enemies with the jaw-bone of an ass, "he was sore athirst" and, in the flush of victory, made to feel his dependence upon God. He cried unto the Lord, and he heard him. Water gushed forth from the hollow in Heli, in answer to prayer, and Samson was refreshed. Judges 15:18, Jereboam's hand was withered, and restored again, by the prayer of the man of God. The blind man mentioned by Luke 18:38, received his sight in answer to prayer. The prayer of the Church, which was made incessantly for Peter, opened the prison of herod, and shook the chains from the hands of the apostle; and it was when "Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God," at midnight, in the jail at Philippi, that the Lord sent his earthquake to shake the foundations of the prison, and open the doors, that the captives might go free. Acts 16:26. But we need not instance examples farther. These must suffice to answer the question, and to satisfy every man who believes the scriptures, that God is directly influenced by prayer.

But it may be said, that these are miraculous cases, and do not meet the spirit of the question propounded. It is true that they are miraculous, but so much the more to point, since they afford a demonstration of the proposition, that "God is directly influenced by prayer," which cannot be explained away upon the doctrine of chances, or the skeptical evasion of "fortunate or accidental coincidence." Yet, if any one will not regard them, let him consider that the Saviour exhorted and commanded his disciples to the exercise of this high privilege. In his sermon on the Mount, he says, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you": Whilst, in the parable of the importunate widow, he taught, "that men ought always to pray, and faint not." The spirit of these instructions the apostles reiterated in oft-repeated precepts, and exemplified, in abundant instances, of prayer offered in behalf of the saints, for blessings spiritual and temporal, individual and social, general and particular. We cannot think that these precepts were given to lead us to a practise which is of no use; nor that the prayers, uttered by the Saviour and his holy Apostles, were vain and empty wishes, dying in echoes short of the ear of our Father in heaven. Rather, we must believe that they were offered in an enlightened view of the divine economy towards us, that they rose with a moving efficacy to the ear of him who has promised "mercy and grace to help in time of need."

Q. What God does for them that pray to him, does he not also do for them that do not pray to him?

A. It is true, that the Saviour taught that our Father "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust;" and if it were not for this general benevolence of his Providence, the remedial dispensation, which is a dispensation of mercy, could continue. But this is a totally different order of blessing from the special mercies and favors promised and conferred in answer to prayer. These are restricted to the members of his family—the adopted ones. They are promised to such only; and if we have shown as we think we have, that "God is directly influenced by prayer," it follows that blessings do flow through it, which would not be conferred

without it. Besides: "We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth:" and James saith, "Ye lust, and have not; ye kill (or envy) and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not; ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." hence, we are taught that men receive not, because they ask not and that blessings are granted unto those who ask, that would not be conferred without asking. The scriptures, then, answer this third question in the negative, affirming, in so many words, that "effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much."

Q. When Paul says, "*My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved,*" was that prayer of Paul answered or not?

A. We cannot tell. Doubtful this fervent desire of the Apostle had its due weight with God, and may have been answered, to some extent, in the case of such Israelites as were converted to Christianity; and, for aught we know, may yet be still further regarded in the final fates of that ancient and down-trodden people; but we are not informed, nor is it necessary that we should be, in every case, what prayers are answered. No one, I presume, holds the doctrine, that every prayer which we offer is answered, or even where they are heard, that God confers the blessing sought, exactly in the way it was desired or anticipated. Paul asked that the thorn given him in the flesh might depart from him, but God chose, rather, to give him strength to bear it. We must remember that the divine government and providence are determined by other principles and motives than the parental kindness of our heavenly Father and the desires of his children, and expand our minds beyond the narrow conception, that because prayer alone —the prayer, too, of a blind worm, grovelling in ignorance and sin—does not always and altogether, control the purposes of Jehovah, that, therefore, it is of no efficacy whatever, and fall unheeded upon the ear of him who himself taught us to say, "Give us this day our daily bread." All the attributes of Jehovah are honored, and made to blend and harmonize in his



providence, and any abstraction which regards any one of them isolated from the rest, and ascertains its workings, without considering the modifying influence which the others exert, will necessarily lead to erroneous conclusions, and involve us in false notions of the principles on which divine government is based, and according to which it is administered.

Q. Does God answer prayers when made to him, or does he defer the answer to some future time?

A. This is a singular question, and has been, no doubt, asked without due reflection. Common sense teaches us, that the time of answering a prayer, in the sense of conferring the benefit asked, depends upon the object of the petition. In some cases, the answer must be immediate; in others, after some delay. We shall suppose that the propounder of these questions has a family, and that one of his sons has fallen into a deep water, and is in the very act of drowning. He looks up with anxious eyes to his father, standing upon the shore, and prays to him to deliver him from a liquid grave. In the very nature of the case, the answer must be immediate, because the aid prayed for can only be rendered at the moment. The father must extend help at once, or refuse it, and let him perish. But suppose another son goes to him on New Year's morning, and says, Father, I desire to enjoy the benefits and advantages of a good education and have come to ask your permission to attend the next session of Bethany College. This request could not be answered, in fact, till the opening of the next session, and, for many good reasons, it may appear wise to the father not to answer it immediately in promise; and hence he defers the matter for consideration. In this case the answer of the petition is delayed, whilst, in both cases the request may be granted. Just so with respect to the prayers we present to our heavenly Father. Instances of both may be cited from the scriptures. Daniel's prayers were answered immediately, and so with others; whilst the parable of the Saviour, already referred to, by which he encourages us to importunity in prayer, shows that God will, and sometimes does, delay his answers to our petitions; he will not always refuse to hear, but "will avenge his own elect, who cry day and night unto him, though he bear

long with them." In the answer I have given to the first question, I have confined myself to the difficulties suggested in the preamble by which it was introduced. It seemed to be said, that because God did not reveal anything to man by his Spirit in the present day, therefore, he does not answer prayer. We have showed that this conclusion is more general than the premises, and that we can only logically conclude that God does not answer prayers, which ask for a spiritual revelation. Still, the question will be asked in a different sense—how does God answer prayer? The question is, indeed, asked daily, and by thousands—not in all cases, I trust, irreverently, or with unlawful desire to inquire into untaught questions. Think not, indulgent reader, that it is with a presumptive spirit that I venture to throw before you a thought or two on a subject so difficult, or that I would attempt, with unholy step, to invade the secret places of the Most high. No: it is because I see some who are feeling—I trust honestly—after God, stumbling over this rock, that I would try to remove it out of the way, that those whose prayers are hindered by it, may be induced, nothing wavering, to draw near to God, and in the full assurance of faith, call upon him for "mercy and grace to help in their time of need."

It cannot be too distinctly noted, that, however God may have answered prayers in the past, he does not now answer them by a miraculous interference with the present order of nature. I do not say a supernatural, but a miraculous interference, for no pious mind, who has thought much upon the ways of God, can hesitate to admit that he does not always exercise an influence over the order of nature, which is supernatural, though not miraculous. Man can influence the laws of nature to a certain extent; he may direct them or concentrate them to a certain result; but he must work by them, and in accordance with them, he cannot work without them, nor beyond them; hence, he cannot work a miracle. But God can work by these laws, and in perfect harmony with them, to any extent; to a degree, therefore, and in a manner altogether supernatural; yet, so long as in harmony with them, not miraculous. God can also work without them and beyond them, and against them, but in this he works miraculously. Let the reader bear in mind this distinction between a miraculous and a supernatural influence,

and I shall proceed to inquire, What is the present course of nature?

Whether we examine into the operations of the moral or material universe, we shall find that, whilst there is a most definite system in each department, yet these systems do not work themselves. They determine the mode of operation, but do not furnish the *primum mobile*—the moving cause of their own motions. Like nascent atoms, they are ready to move in obedience to whatever force or influence may urge or attract them, but always in accordance with a law and order of their own. I shall suppose that, under this system, or according to the present course of nature, certain things are necessary to the production of an ear of corn. These things nature furnishes; but there is a certain preparation, collocation, arrangement, and application of them, which she does not and cannot make. In this respect she is inert. This is partly the business of the farmer. He pulverizes the soil; plants, at a suitable season, the grain; watches and nurses the expanding germ; cultivates the growing plant; and brings to maturity the ripening ear. He has thus controlled the energies of nature; he has concentrated and directed her powers, and led her to results which, without his influence, she never would have produced. But he has wrought no miracle; he has done nothing without the aid and use of the powers of nature, nor contrary to the system of natural powers by which they work. Yet he says, and with propriety, too, I have made this ear of corn; .... I have produced this, that, or the other result :." nor do we cavil about the truth of his assertions, because all that he has done is sensible; that is to say, it can be and is presented to the understanding through some or all the avenues we call senses. But the thinking mind, searching higher than the phenomenal, strives to trace the chain of concurrent causes beyond the mere chemical laws and human agency which observation and experiment reveal to him. He struggles on and up to the mystery of life, and feels himself lost. From out of the darkness, upon the verge of which he loses his way, he discovers a system of influences which he cannot altogether control nor comprehend. Here are the „spirits of the vast deep," which come not at his bidding. Electricity, magnetism, light—what are they? how do they operate upon matter

and mind? Who moves them, and by whom are they directed, in their wild and restless journeyings? True, man can do something with them; and with his cylinders, leyden jars, and Franklin rods; his steel needles, U magnets and helices, his prisms and his lenses, build up plausible theories, whereby to give "a local habitation and a name" to his fancies; but how little is all this! When we have studied and learned it all, we must still exclaim with Job, "10, these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him? but the thunder of his power, who can understand?" Yes, The profoundest science leads us to darkness or to God. The sceptic loses himself in a circle of reacting causes, with neither beginning nor end; whilst the man of faith, standing upon the confine of sensible demonstration, sees, in all beyond, the mystery of God, veiled, not with darkness, but with glory.

Now, what if we conjecture, that upon these outer media, these imponderable, and, despite our familiarity, mysterious instruments, God may be always operating; will the thinking reader call it presumptive speculation? If so, then I shall ask, Where do the creator and his universe touch? But I cannot allow that God has vanished from the world he has made; and if, over parts of it, he has given control to the being he has formed in his own image, so that man can claim to be a creator himself in some sense, let it not be thought strange that, over these other portions that lie, for the most part, outside of our dominion, it hath pleased God to erect the throne of his providence, and thence to exert those influences, not miraculous, but supernatural, which, working in perfect accordance with all that we know of the course of nature, yet work with an efficacy and a subtlety which we can neither anticipate nor resist. Through these and other instruments, trembling under the Spirit of God, what effect may he not produce, without a miracle, in harmony with the laws of nature?

It would be injustice, were any one to infer from these hints, which I have thrown out as merely suggestive to the mind of faith, that I have designed, to prescribe the *modus operendi* of my Maker; the prime instrument, or the casual sphere of his ever active and benevolent providence. An humbler purpose

induced me to suggest that, if in perfect accordance with the course of nature, man can and does control and direct some of her agents to the specific results of his own will, so it is reasonable to believe that God also may and does, through the mighty working of his power, in like harmony with the laws of nature, educe results according to his will; and thus we may see how it is reasonable to believe that God, who has said that he will hear us, can grant our requests without a miraculous or immediate communication or revelation of his Spirit. We have much more that I feel induced to say on the "reasonableness of prayer," but our last page is full, and, lest it should be deemed too speculative for practice, let it be reserved for our own meditation and comfort.

Q. Did John the Baptist ever baptize in the name of Christ?

A. Never. He neither baptized in the name nor by the name; neither to the name nor into the name of Christ. He was sent by God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to prepare a people for him, and to baptize them into the fact that he was soon to become both Lord and Christ.

Q. What ought to be done with a brother who will buy a barrel of spirit, or brandy, and will drink and sell it to his neighbor?

A. If, on remonstrance and admonition, he does not reform, put him away from the church.

Q. What ought a congregation to do with an elder, who keeps a public house and drinks, gives away and sells ardent spirits?

A. Divest him of his office, and then put him out of the church, unless he repents.

Q. Is it right for a brother to erect a distillery and manufacture liquor, but promises that he will not sell it to his own neighborhood?

A. Very far from it, anything but right. Better witness the fruit of his labor at home, than hide it from his own eyes.

Q. Ought a unanimous vote of the church to be taken, or expected, in order to the reception of a person who has just

been immersed into the profession of faith in Christ, either as to his baptism, or reception, after baptism, into the church?

A. There is neither precept nor example for such a custom in the New Testament.

Q. Please give me an exposition on the 20th verse of the 1st chapter of the Ep. to the Romans.

A. See conversation in the Carlton house, M. H. vol. vi. 3rd series, and yet in progress. In addition to what has been said on that subject we remark, that the invisible attributes of God, even his eternal power and godhead, are clearly seen from the creation of the world the things that are made being considered and properly reflected upon.

But another question arises here of a speculative, and perhaps somewhat a practical nature. It is this: Does Paul teach, in this place, that the works of nature originate the idea of God and his attributes, or only demonstrate them? Is nature, in other words, both the proposition and the proof? We are decidedly on the side that tradition, oral or written, propounds "that God is," or exists, and that the material universe only proves or demonstrates the truth of the oracle, "God is." The best and most laconic demonstration that God is, will, as I conceive, be found in the two words, we are. We did not make ourselves. And as to his nature, we argue, whatever is in the effect, was in the cause. But it follows not that all that is in the cause is in the effect. For many effects may be in one cause, and yet the cause may not be exhausted. But this only by the way. This is-a grand lesson, and would furnish thoughts and arguments for a volume. Verbum sat.

Q. What ought a congregation to do, when a brother, who has been excluded, presents himself, confessing the sin for which he was excluded, and a brother notifies them that he is guilty of an indictable offense, which he can prove?

A. They should investigate the matter, and settle it according to the scriptures.

Q. If a person thus accused, is received into the congregation without an investigation into the matter, would those having

personal knowledge of the fact, or believing it on good testimony, be justifiable in going to the table with such a person?

A. Abstaining from "the table," is not the scriptural mode of settling difficulties. The preparation for the Lord's table consists in self-examination, not in examination of others. 1 Cor. 11:28. To abstain from the Lord's table when it is scripturally spread in his house, because some unworthy intruder may be there, is nowhere commanded, nor, that I can see, authorized in the Word of God. We might as well forsake the church itself.

Q Under these circumstances, would a brother, having knowledge of the fact, be justifiable in entering a complaint before a legal tribunal?

A. If the offender does not stand in such a relation to the church as to have his offence tried and settled by her, then, of course, the only resort is to the civil authority. If the nature of the offence is such to justify a Christian man in going to the law with an alien, (which is not always the case,) then this is his proper remedy; but "what have we to do with them that are without;" and if the indictable offence is not in injury of our own rights, of person or property, what law calls us to volunteer in the forbidden work of a "busybody?"

Q. I have herein taken a liberty which I hope you will forgive. From your reputation as a scholar, and your character for goodness, I have been induced to address you. In addition, some uneasiness of mind, and an earnest desire for some information, had their weight. I lately heard a minister preach from the 30th and 31st verses of Acts 17, in which we read of a day appointed for judgment, by Christ, whereof assurance has been given to all, in that he was raised from the dead. Now, sir, this assurance is precisely what I want. Where shall I seek it? Where can I find it? Will you do me the kindness to name me the best English authority on the subject; or, if not too great a tax, answer it yourself?

A. In response to your very important query, I would state, that the word here rendered assurance, is *pistis*, properly translated faith. He has given to all men faith, Jews and Gentiles—

that is—abundant proof or evidence that he will judge the world by Jesus Christ, and render to every man according to his works, in the fact of his raising Jesus from the dead.

The evidence of the ultimate judgment is, then, based on the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, inasmuch as God would not have raised him, had he not spoken the truth. Now, as that fact is the best proved fact in the annals of time, the highest moral certainty is given to all mankind, Jew and Greek, who have this testimony. The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead being a sensible fact, is confirmed by the martyrdom of so many of those who suffered death by proclaiming it, or that they saw him after he rose. So that all that suffered death, as witnesses of that fact, sealed their testimony of its verity with their own blood. And to this, the next strongest evidence or assurance is the consecration of the day of his resurrection, once every week since, by the observation of all Christians. These constitute the highest moral assurance that man can have by faith, in any testimony whatever. No historic fact, universally admitted in Christendom, is so indisputably evident and demonstrable, as this one. Hence God has given the full assurance of faith to all who candidly examine the premises connected with his resurrection. In our own style, to give evidence to faith, and that is to give assurance. Hence, millions are as much assured that Napoleon, Washington, and Franklin, lived and died, as their wives and children are now alive, that there is such a city as London and Jerusalem, as that there is the state of Ohio, in which they live.

I trust Dr. S. will pardon the liberty I have taken, in giving his letter to my readers. There are many who, like himself, that desire more light on this subject. I would refer him to my debate with Mr. Owen, a new edition of which is about being issued at Cincinnati. That God will judge the world by Jesus Christ, is proved by his raising him from the dead, the fruit of a judgment held upon him and his murderers; the prison was opened, and the prisoner falsely accused and condemned for blasphemy, was discharged. This is the proof or assurance of his innocence; and that proved, a resurrection and a future state is proved beyond a doubt. Hence, there is more evidence



Of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, than for any event in the history of man.

Q. What should be done with a Christian brother who would sue his brother at law, without first making demand of the claim?

A. Let such an offender be rebuked publicly in the church, as a transgressor of the law that enjoins brotherly love and as one that has divested himself of that chief attribute of discipleship by which the world is to recognize us as the disciples of Christ. Then let him be admonished of the evil tendency of indulging a covetous spirit, and exhorted to walk in love toward his Christian brethren.

Q. What should be done with a member of a Christian congregation, who habitually uses ardent spirits as a beverage?

A. The habitual uses of ardent spirits as a beverage, is always a breach of the law of Christian society, and also a sin against the physical laws of health. And especially at the present time, when an enlightened public opinion denounces it as a moral evil, as a habit, not of good report only, but most disreputable to Christian character. The offender is, therefore, to be admonished of the sin, and exhorted to desist from a practice ruinous to the soul and body; and if he desist not, when duly admonished, he is to be shunned and avoided as a person no longer worthy of Christian affection or fellowship.

Q. What should be done for or against the Christian brother, who absents himself from the house of the Lord upon the first day of the week, for the alleged reason that some of the members are not as good as they ought to be?

A. Let such an one be dealt with as a delinquent. His reason for absence is as destitute of reason as of piety. He excommunicates himself from the household of faith, and refuses to eat and drink at the table of the Lord, because he sees those there whom he conceives to be "not as good as himself." Would he absent himself from the family table, because other members of the family were there who were "not as good as they ought to be?" Or does he, like the Pharisee, think himself as good as he ought to be, and should, therefore, fellowship only those

like himself. Such a person, if not a pretender, is certainly but a babe in knowledge, and needs to be taught the elements of the gospel and discipline of the Lord's house.

Q. What use did the apostle make of the expression, "*If the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches?*"

A. By the above figurative language the apostle intended to teach the believing Gentiles that the rejection of the Jewish nation was not to be a final rejection. But as the great mass of the nation had rejected the Messiah, God, therefore, determined to cut them off for a time, from the blessings of his reign; and in the meantime, grant to the Gentiles an opportunity of accepting the gospel. And after a certain period, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have been completed, then shall the gospel be again offered to the Jews, with such evidence of its truthfulness as to result in the conviction and conversion of the nation, when all Israel shall be saved. This he indicates by the above figures. The fruit being holy, the mass must also be holy, exactly in the same sense. The first fruit was in kind the same as the harvest—it was a fit material for an acceptable offering. So, also, with respect to the root and the branches. They are alike homogeneous, and, in the same sense of the Apostle, alike holy, and illustrates the relation in which the fathers of Israel and their posterity stood to God. For to them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, etc., which were the marks of a peculiar people, and, in the sense of the inspired writer, a holy nation.

Q. Can a good linguist in Hebrew and Greek, translate the Bible correctly, if he does not understand it?

A. Of necessity we must answer this question in the negative. He cannot, But it may be said in truth, that a classical rendering of the words of the Greek New Testament would not give the meaning of the Spirit by whom it was dictated. There are Grecian Hebraisms in the New Testament which requires more than classical knowledge of the Greek to translate correctly. He will, however, understand both Testaments the better by reading them in the original tongues. There is a doctrinal, as well

as a grammatical and philological knowledge, necessary to do justice to the text of either Testament.

Q. Is Acts 15:16—"Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways"—translated correctly?

A. All the Gentile nations, from the days of Abraham to the time of Cornelius, the Roman Centurion, were permitted to walk in their own ways. God vouchsafed to them no special revelation of his will. All their knowledge of God during this long interval was purely traditional, orally delivered from father to the son. Is not this a fact—a truth? Why, then, call in question the accuracy of the version that declares it?

Q. What does the word fellowship mean in Acts 2:42?

A. This word occurs some twenty times in the New Testament, and is rendered from the Greek by fellowship, communion, contribution, and distribution, as a consequence. Hence we have the phrases, fellowship of the Spirit, fellowship of the mystery, communion of the body, contribution for the saints, and your liberal distribution. The circumstances of the church at Jerusalem will throw light upon the meaning of this word. The company of Disciples there was large—many of them at a distance from home—many of them were poor, and shortly many were to be rendered poor by persecution and confiscation of goods; and some, from the common misfortunes of life, will be found poor in all churches, and in all age of the church. "The poor you shall always have with you." hence, the benevolence of the gospel scheme required that there should be a standing ordinance, for the maintenance of such persons, as well as for the provision of such things as the secular interests of the church may require. The primary idea was, doubtless, at the time of its institution, that which is expressed in Rom. 15:26.

Q. Is it consistent with Divine rule, to receive testimony from the world in a case of church discipline?

A. The trial of any case is a very different thing from its final judgment or decision. The trial is a process for the discovery of the exact and entire truth, so far as applicable to the particular case; and during it, the best evidence must be

received from any source, of which the nature of the case will admit. The final judgment, based on such investigation, must be made through the church by its elders—they being the judges of the decree of credibility to be attached to the evidence, whether it come from within the church or from without.

Q. Circumcision a sign and seal of what?

A. This is a question of grave importance. Our Pedobaptist friends have never considered it. A proper answer to this query will show that it never can be replaced or substituted by an ordinance of the Christian religion. The rite of circumcision was to Abraham what it never was, or can be, to any of his posterity. To Abraham it was a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had in uncircumcision. Was it such a seal to Isaac or Ishmael, or to any of his infant posterity at the age of eight days? Abraham alone, as the father of believers, received circumcision as a sign and a seal of the righteousness of faith. Baptism, it is said, came in the room of circumcision. If so, wherein is the analogy or correspondence? What spiritual blessing does baptism seal to the infant of the Gentile believer? Assuredly not the righteousness of faith! Or what temporal blessing does baptism seal to the infant of the Pedobaptist, that may not be enjoyed by the infant of the Baptist believer? But is there, indeed, no analogy between these two institutions? There undoubtedly is. But it is not between the infant of the Jew and the infant of the Gentile believer, but between the circumcision of Abraham and the baptism of the believer. But we shall let Paul show the analogy. "You Christians," says he, "are circumcised with the circumcision not made with hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein you are also raised with him through the faith of the operation of God, who has raised him from the dead." If, then, baptism can, with propriety, be called a sign and seal, the analogy is at once apparent between circumcision as a sign and a seal of the righteousness of the faith of Abraham, and baptism, as a sign and seal of righteousness of the believer in Christ Jesus; for the faith of the latter is accounted to him for righteousness, as was the faith of the former. Here, however, the analogy is not perfect,

or it would prove that the believer obtains the righteousness of faith without baptism, and would, consequently, contradict what the apostle has said, as quoted above.

Q. How may a person know when he is led by the Spirit of God?

A. A person is led by the Spirit of God when he is led by the teachings of the Word of God.

Q. What is the Spirit's manner of bearing witness?

A. Like that of a man, by declaring or speaking.

Q. How does the Spirit of God bear witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God?

A. When we do the will of God, as it is taught by his Spirit through the Apostles, then we have his Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are his obedient children. For as many as are led by the teachings of his word are led by his Spirit, and are, therefore, the children of God.

Q. Are the same words to be observed for understanding the words of God, that we use for understanding the words of men?

A. Yes; unless he has given us some special rules for interpreting the meaning of his words. But this he has not given. us, and, therefore, if he is not to be understood, when he speaks, by the common rules of interpretation, we have no revelation of his will.

Q. Is it in accordance with the teaching of She head of the Church, for her Elders or her Evangelists to assume the honorary title of Reverend?

A. The Christian Church has no honorary titles to confer upon any of her members. Her titles are all official, and refer to a work, or class of duties to be performed.

The titles of Reverend, Right Reverend, Most Reverend, Reverend Father in God, Reverend and holy Father, Most Reverend and holy Father, Lord God the Pope, are all titles of the same category, and we have placed them in the ascending series, from the positive of spiritual pride to the superlative of blasphemy.

These are all contraband wares in the city of our God, but very saleable and desirable in Babylon the Great, where the articles are manufactured. The Great Teacher inhibits all such titles and distinctions among his followers. "Call no man Rabbi, or Father, for all ye are brethren." You are all, professedly, alike holy. "To the saints at Corinth; To the saints at Philippi." Nor are they without titles and honors; which, unlike those impious assumptions above named, are worthily conferred by him who knoweth the hearts. They are styled Kings and Priests—a royal Priesthood—and are co-heirs with the Lord of the universe.

Q. After the resurrection of our bodies from the grave, shall we recognize our friends?

A. We shall then know even as we are known. We shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the Kingdom of heaven. We shall see Prophets and Apostles. And we shall see and know those who have turned many to righteousness, shining as stars of resplendent glory. As to the recognition of our beloved friends in a future state, we are of the opinion that, as there is now a personal identity present to our minds when we think of our absent friends in the body, so there is a spiritual identity as peculiar and characteristic, and will be as obvious then as the assemblage of properties that now enables us to certainly recognize our friends on earth. If, moreover, the Creator delights in variety as in multitude, as we see he does in this lower creation; and if he now gives to the human body and countenance all that variety of form and feature which we perceive; and if there be, as we believe there is now in every person, a mental or spiritual physiognomy as peculiar and distinguishing in its features as those that now distinguish the human face, is it not most reasonable to suppose, that this mental identity will continue unchanged in a future state; and if so, we shall thereby be able to recognize our friends out of the body, in a future state.

Q. Will you please give, through the harbinger, your opinion upon the last clause of the 11th verse of the third chapt. of Matthew, viz: "and with fire?" By complying with this request

you will, I presume, oblige many Of your readers, especially the young, of whom I am one.

A. In these words John bears testimony to him who was to come after him, who would do what he could not do. He could only baptize men in water, he had no power to baptize men in the Holy Spirit. But when the Lord would come in his reign and kingdom, as on the day of Pentecost, he would first "pour out his spirit," and then baptize men in it, of which the tongue on Pentecost was a visible and sensible symbol. This is, upon all the premises, probably preferable to the interpretation that he would baptize the Jews in the Holy Spirit or in fire. In the Holy Spirit, if they believed: in fire, if they did not. These are the only interpretations that can be given of the verbiage in question, consonant to the letter and spirit of the passage or of the whole book.

Q. Is it consistent with Christian Scriptures, for a congregation to extend the hand of congratulation to a penitent believer, after he has confessed the name of the Lord Messiah, and before being baptized? Your opinion in reference to this matter is earnestly solicited by many of the brethren.

A. Most assuredly it is consistent with the benevolent spirit of the Christian Scriptures, for a Christian congregation, like the father of the prodigal son, to meet the penitent sinner who has come to himself, and extend to him a cordial welcome, seeing that he has humbly and nobly resolved to quit the services of Satan and to return to his Father's house. If the angels rejoice at such a spectacle, why should not the saints?

If the querist looks for a special command to do the promptings of the love of Christ in the heart, he has mistaken the character of the Christian Institution, in supposing it to be a ritual or a perceptive religion, like the Jewish, rather than one of grace and reality—the ruling principle of which is love to God and man.

Q. Does it not appear, that before the Son of Man entered upon his mission, he ascended to his Father, saw, heard, and descended, and, as a witness, testified to what he did see and hear? See John 3:13; 31-32; 6:62.

A. The querist, in his profound musings upon the above passages, seems to have been carried away, on the wings of imagination, to the summit of the holy Mount of Vision, from which he beholds the Saviour returning from the temptation in the desert, and preparatory to entering upon his mission, ascended to his Father to receive the things which he was to show his disciples, and which he was to testify to the people. Such, in purport, if not a vision of the night, when deep asleep falleth upon men, is one of those day-dreams which great thinkers are inclined to indulge in, when excogitating some charming theory, which accounts for some natural or spiritual phenomenon not to be accounted for upon any principle either of induction or prior reasoning. We would here wish to make a *Nota Bene*, that we are ready, at the earliest moment, to publish answers to all queries tending to edify our readers in the truth; but should we pass by, without notice, those of an opposite character, such as savor rather of curiosity, and those untaught and unprofitable questions, the querist, we hope, will not take it amiss.

Q. As long as a Christian church holds sacred the principle, that the sanction of a decided majority of its members is necessary to the validity of its acts, has any other church the right to dictate how such sanction shall be ascertained? If such a church, in excluding a member, does not choose to ascertain the sanction of her majority by a popular vote, but in the way which to her seems best, how should the church be treated who presumes to declare that act unscriptural, and to fellowship the members so excluded? If a preacher of the gospel, who may know the facts if he will, shall preach with, and endorse the members thus excluded, and seek to force him on other churches, in what light should such preacher and his conduct be viewed?

A. Answer to the first of the foregoing queries, we would state, that no church has the right, from anything expressed or implied in the Word of God, to dictate to a sister church how she shall determine the will of her majority. In this respect, the authority of a church shall not be intermeddled with by an impertinent neighbor. The church, moreover, presuming so to



dictate or intermeddle, converts herself into an engine of tyranny, and is to be henceforth, till she reform, disregarded. To the second, we respond, that the church presuming to declare such an act unscriptural, either formally, or by receiving into her fellowship such excluded member, or by suffering him to preach for her, if he have been a preacher, should be treated by all other churches just as the excluded member should be treated whom she endorses—that is, she should be non-fellow-shipped. We conclude by stating, that such a preacher should be treated as a factionist of the worst cast, by all churches of Christ, and by them to be repudiated as a schismatic, until he reform and make confession for his sins.

Q. What is the germinating part or power of man that enters the grave? spoken of by Paul in I Cor. 15:42-44, inclusive.

A. No such power or part, as our brother supposes, is spoken of by the Apostle, either here or elsewhere, in his writings to the churches. The power that raises the body from the dead is not inherent, or interred with the body, but extrinsic to it. The spirit that now dwells in us as members of Christ's mystical body, and which reanimated the mortal body of Christ, is that power which is to revive our mortal bodies at the last day. Our bodies are consigned to the tomb in corruption—in dishonor—in weakness, without having inherent, or interred with them, any principle as a germ, or power, by which they are to be resuscitated. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwells in you."

Q. I take the liberty to ask your views in relation to a point which I consider as an evil, but it is one, I am sorry to learn, is, to some extent, prevailing in our congregation. The thing to which I allude is the purchasing of lottery tickets, and, at the same time, pleading that it is not a violation of Christian duty, and that they are as justifiable as they would be in common transactions of business. I wish you to give your views, through through the harbinger, at as early a period as practicable, to the following queries, To wit: Is the purchasing of lottery tickets immoral? Is a lottery a system of gambling? If a lottery is

a system of gambling, is a purchaser of lottery tickets a participater in the act of gambling?

A. I do not, because I cannot, answer half the queries sent to me; and half of them that I could answer I would not, because they present me in a position which I never desire to hold, and still less desire as my experience increases. The office of a dictator, has ever been to me most repulsive. I, therefore, avoid, as much as in me lies, even the appearance of it, and yet, sometime, there happens an unfortunate event, which I have thought a few words of caution and remonstrance, might have prevented, if timorously offered; for not offering which, I have, in retrospect, censured myself. But here are a few queries which, I presume, I may in all propriety answer.

..... *Nec Deus intersit*  
*Nisis dignus vindice nodus.*

These three queries, considered separately and apart, or, if all compressed into one, may be with an unfaltering tongue and unpalpitating heart, answered in the affirmative. Purchasing lottery tickets, for one's own benefit, is an appeal to God unsanctioned by the Bible and by every fundamental principle of religion and morality.

Why ask or tempt God to take. a hundred or a thousand dollars out of the pockets of my neighbors and put them into mine; and why should I desire to place in my coffers the money earned by fifty or a hundred of my neighbors, without giving them any valuable consideration? And are not both of these ideas cherished in the heart of every man who purchases a lottery ticket, to enhance his own fortune? he voluntarily gives a small consideration, to furnish a temptation to his neighbor to give a similar small consideration, that he may have a chance to pocket the labors, or the fruits of the labors, of so many of his neighbors as will innure to his own personal interest.

Besides, it is profanely calling upon God to interfere, or to direct my interest and behoof, without any other reason than the price paid for my lottery ticket. It is impiously asking God to so direct the Wheel of Fortune as to pool thousands of dollars into my pockets, for the lure of ten or twenty that I have paid to make a company like myself, willing to unite with me in

said prayer. Here are one hundred men upon their knees, all praying to God, and each one for himself asking the Lord so to turn the wheel as that the stake of ninety-nine of my neighbors shall roll into my pocket. But few think or believe thus on the premises. And why? Because they neither believe the Bible nor hearken to the voice of reason, nor the demonstrations of human experience. Is not the lot cast into the lap by men and drawn out by God? So, to my ear, the Holy Spirit saith, "The lot is cast into the lap, but the disposal thereof is of the Lord." he draws it, in plain English. For where shall "luck" be found, and where is the place of chance in the land of the living? True, to our eyes, there are many things that appear to be matters of chance. But though so in appearance, they are not so in fact. "All chance direction which thou canst not see." The fortunes of the whole world were once depending upon the chance of drawing a lottery ticket. Joseph was the lottery ticket. The pit was the lottery box.

The patriarchs were the managers. But God drew out Joseph, and sent him to Egypt to save them, their children, and much people alive. The lot is lawful only in one class of cases, and these are those which justify a solemn appeal to God for a decision, on which rests the most solemn interests, and which, in no other way, can be satisfactorily decided.

Q. Can a member of the church be set apart to the office of Bishop, whose practice is that of usurer—loaning money at an exorbitant interest, even beyond what the law of the State allows, and who is not in good report with those without?

A. That church must, indeed, be in suffering need of an overseer, to make one of such material. Unless there be something in the act of conferring an office that exorcises a money-loving spirit, and imparts in its stead a spirit that is in love with good men, I cannot see how a Christian Church can improve its spiritual condition under the oversight of such an elder. I would say, its last condition is worse than the first.

Q. Can we, as members of the Christian Church, maintain the ancient faith, as delivered to the Apostles, without the aid of a written creed?

A. Were it even true, as we are charged by the advocates of

human creeds, that, "we have among us men preaching all sorts of doctrine," yet we believe we are as well off as our neighbors, who have made their own creeds, to prevent the evils with which they charge us. With the Westminster creed in their hands, the descendants of the Puritans of New England have become Unitarians, although no creed is more strongly Trinitarian.

If scriptures be true, despite of any creed, human or divine, men will depart from the Faith, giving heed to seducing spirits (Spirit Rappers) and doctrines concerning demons, or spirits of dead men, speaking lies in hypocrisy.

If the Scriptures of Divine Wisdom and Truth cannot furnish us with the means of detecting error and heresy, and with the authority of separating heretics or schismatics from the church; and if men, by their wisdom and knowledge, can accomplish this by their creeds and books of discipline, the question with the sceptics will be, whether inspired or uninspired men are the safer, and, of course, the better guides to our fallen world?

Q. Should I commune with a Pedobaptist church, when I am so circumstanced that I cannot have fellowship with a church of my own faith?

A. The faithful Disciple, however circumstanced, is bound to contend for the faith as delivered to the Apostles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. As the Church of Christ is, in its faith and ordinances, the Pillar and the Ground of the Truth, its members are never, by their fellowship, to countenance those who have instituted other bonds or terms of union and communion. To do so, would be to build up what we are in duty to oppose. It is never expedient to do evil that good may come. There is a wrong way of doing what is right, but no right way of doing what is wrong.

Q. What does John the Revelator mean by the earth helping the woman?

A. Some understand, in the above connection, the earth to have reference to political governments, and the woman to represent the Church of Christ. But it may be objected, that

political governments, so far from helping, have generally persecuted the church. This objection, however, predicates what is not true of political governments, as such, but it affirms what has always been true of politico-ecclesiastic governments. No merely political government since the days of Pagan Rome, has ever unsheathed the civil sword against the Christian church, till it had permitted itself to be tampered with by a corrupt

Hierarchy. It was then, but not until then, that the government laid hold of the sword in defense of a corrupt religion.

It was not, then, the unholy alliance of church and State, that is here intended to be represented by the earth. But it is a political government like that of the United States, which, while it repudiates all connection with the church, as a constituent element thereof, possesses the mild, liberal, and tolerant spirit of a religion which, while it has taught the politician the true principles of religious toleration, asks nothing in return but that it be permitted to live and flourish by its own inherent power. This is all the help and protection that the Christian church has asked, or ever can legitimately ask, at the hand of this or any other government. And all that any political government can justly ask of the church, is that she render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Our political government, while it wisely interferes with no religious controversies, leaving every man to determine for himself "the things that are God's," will never permit that glorious instrument, the constitution, that Magna Charta of political and religious liberty, to be infringed by any hierarch of the Old or New world.

Q. In the ordination of Elders and Deacons, should it be done by the laying on of the hands? And if so, who are the proper persons?

A. Again we are called upon to answer this off-repeated question. The church has the bestowments of the gifts of office. Two of these gifts or offices are for her own sake, and the other, (for they are but three,) for the benefit of the community outside. They are elders, deacons, and evangelists. Evangelists, as missionaries, preach the Word, gather believers together, and, by the imposition of hands, ordain elders and deacons, and thus organise churches. Should a church, thus

organised, require more elders, then the whole church selects suitable persons, and their eiders set them apart by the laying on of hands. See Acts 13:3, I Tim. 4:14, 5:22.

Q. Has a majority of a Christian Church a right to let its meeting house be used for any other than its ordinary religious purpose? For example, to let it be occupied as a school house, by a person of another denomination, when there is a minority of its members that strongly oppose such a measure?

A. Whatever is right for a church to do that requires the voice of the church, it is to be determined by a majority, when a unanimity is not attainable. If it be right, under any condition, for the church to let its house of worship for any purpose other than that for which it was built, the majority has the right to do so. But, now-a-days, when the generous public are as willing to build school-houses as church edifices, we presume the necessity of using a church building for the purpose of a common school-house, must be very rare.

Under such rare circumstances, (if, indeed, they can exist,) the good sense of the brethren meeting in a house requested for aforesaid purpose, would grant the request, rather than their children go uneducated. The house certainly would not be desecrated by such use of it. We are, however, decidedly in favor of using a church building exclusively for the purpose for which it was built, unless some stern necessity should, for a short time, demand some other additional use for it.

Q. Ought not every church in a city, and most churches in the country, have a brother wholly devoted to the pastoral of flee?

A. Next to the work of an evangelist, is that of pastor or elder importance, for the perfecting of the saints in the Christian character. It is, however, rather the private labor of the pastor amongst the brethren through the week, and his public labors in the congregation on the Lord's day, that are most needful for the building up of Christianity in the life of its professors. It is the great want of the age for giving life and power to the Christian profession. When shall we have faithful pastors, who shall fully do the work of their ministry, and feed

the flock over which they have been placed as shepherds? They must also visit from house to house—instruct, exhort, reprove and entreat, with authority, as well as with longsuffering. See that these means of building up the good cause be not withheld from the pastors, through a worldly spirit in the church. If Christians love the cause of truth above all others, they will not hesitate to confer double honor, a liberal support, upon those who labor both in word and doctrine.

Q. How long should a church continue Bishops in office who cannot be induced to pray in public, or return thanks to the Lord's .Supper?

A. As they were put into office without first being proved, such men, if not deemed worthy of excommunication from the fellowship of the church, should at least be removed from office for which they have proved themselves utterly unfit, provided the church have wisdom enough to see and correct so palpable a mistake in the election of brethren so utterly incompetent for an office, in the proper exercise of which the well-being of a church must ever depend.

Q. With what propriety does Paul say, that "When in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, through the foolishness of this proclamation, to save them that believe"?

A. The gospel scheme the Apostle Paul represents as the wisdom of God to save men, but as it requires faith in a dead man, raised to life again, the Greek philosophers treated the proclamation of these facts as a foolish ridiculous affair, and called the hope built upon the belief of them the hope of worms. The preaching of the Cross, or death of Christ, as the means devised by infinite wisdom to save man, was to the Greeks foolishness. But the Apostle appeals to its power in reclaiming men from vice, and shows the futility of their systems of philosophy to reform men. The inference was inevitable, that what the Greeks called foolishness, was wiser than men, and what they called the weakness of the gospel, was stronger than men.

Q. Is it compatible with scripture, for a widow, presiding

over a family, to attend to morning and evening worship, as the head of a family?

A. A Christian widow, who is the head of a family, stands in the same relation to her family as does a Christian widower to his family. In Christ there is neither male nor female, with respect to the duties involving upon them in relation to their families. Each, as a head of a family, is alike bound to bring up those committed to their trust in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Apostle alludes to this duty while describing the character of those widows that were taken into the number of those who were to be assisted by the church. "If she have brought up her children." "She who is a widow indeed, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day."

Q. Dear Brother Milligan—I have just risen from perusal of your article in the harbinger, on the "Permanent Christian Ministry." I most heartily thank you for this most systematic and logical arrangement of what, to me, has hitherto been confusion and chaos. Your remarks especially on the order of the evangelists, is to me most satisfactory, and fills a large vacuum in all other systems that I have seen.

Knowing your willingness to impart instruction to those who desire to learn, I respectfully solicit an answer to the following queries:

Q. Is there any reason why the same person may not fill two or more of these offices at the same time? If, for instance, if the church thinks it important to put an elder on the financial and secular committee, is there any reason why it may not be done?

A. This is a question of expediency. The more complete division of labor, the more perfect, in general, will be the performance of the work in every department. The general rule, therefore, as well as scriptural precedent, is against the union of two or more ecclesiastical offices in any one uninspired man. But in the congregation at Jerusalem, the holy twelve were at once apostles, evangelists, elders, and deacons. And extraordinary circumstances may still render such a temporary arrangement justifiable.



Q. If an evangelist settles with, and preaches for any one congregation, does he lose his office as an evangelist; and is he, to that congregation, anything more than an elder?

A. The duties of an evangelist are not merely to convert sinners and plant churches. He must also water them, and set in order everything that is wanting to perfect their organization. This was the charge committed to Timothy while he labored in and for the Ephesian congregation. But such a charge was never committed, by divine authority, to any one elder. In some cases, the labors of an elder and of an evangelist may be entirely identical in kind and extent; but the functions of their respective offices never are. The evangelist, therefore, retains his own proper official character and authority, even when employed in the services of one congregation. When Timothy was in this relation, Paul said to him, "Do the work of an evangelist;" and so he says to all his successors in office.

Q. If a man who is in sentiment a Universalist, desires to unite with the church; to be baptized, and to observe all the commandments and ordinances of the gospel, what should be done?

A. The mere abstract opinion, that all men will be saved, is in itself neither virtuous nor vicious; it neither saves nor destroys any man. Hence it is not a sufficient reason for withholding church membership from any one who believes with all his heart that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God, and only Saviour of mankind; and who proves the sincerity of his faith by a holy, pious, and godly walk and conversation.

It must be admitted, however, that such vague notions always imply imperfect comprehension of the scheme of redemption.

Hence, in all such cases, there is danger that those who entertain and cherish them, may, through their influence, be turned from the plain truths of the gospel, to various speculative questions, which minister strife and debate rather than godly edifying. Such persons should, therefore, be treated as the lambs of the fold; and daily fed on the pure milk of the word, that they may grow thereby. R. M.

In the same article to which some of the preceding queries refer, the following remarks are made respecting the qualifications of an elder: "*he* must not be a person who gains money by base and dishonorable means. This would exclude from the eldership, for example, many who are engaged now in the traffic of ardent spirits."

From this, Bro. O'Conner, of Ohio, thinks that much evil is likely to accrue to the reformation; because, forsooth, he infers that we teach, that persons who make gains by base and dishonorable means, may be retained as members of the Christian church, though they are not eligible to the office of a bishop. But is not this inference wholly illegitimate? Because Paul says a bishop must not be a striker, must not be greedy of filthy lucre, must not be given to wine, does Bro. O'Conner thence infer that the quarrelsome, the covetous, and the drunkard, should be retained as private members of any Christian congregation? Surely a little sober reflection will convince him that his conclusion is what logicians call a "non sequitur;" that he has, in fact, himself imagined premises from which he draws this very objectionable inference.

We yield to none in a sincere desire to elevate the standard of piety, morality, and propriety in the Christian church. And as one means of attaining to this, we greatly desire to see our organizations perfected by the appointment of well qualified deacons, elders, and evangelists, to their respective offices.

R.M.

Q. What does Paul mean when he says to Christians, "Be not conformed to this world?"

A. To conform oneself to any condition or state of life, implies that the individual acts in harmony with all the requirements belonging to that state, whatever it may be. It may be that of a parent, a husband, a wife, a master, a servant, a citizen. Or the person may occupy several of these states at the same time.

Now, whatever the state or relations of the person may be, the perfection and true dignity of character consist in a conformity of conduct therewith. But this requires intelligence

as a pre-requisite to such conformity of life. Hence the apostle enjoins upon the Christian, first, in the order of cause and effect, The renewing of the mind, in order to a transformation of conduct, or character; such as evinces to the world that the individual "approves what is that good, and perfect will of God." To conform to this world—a world made up of lusts and the pride of life—requires no renewing of the mind by the knowledge of the divine will, but an ignorant disregard of it, as all-sufficient to work out the desires of the flesh and of the carnal mind. The true Christian life in this world that will be rewarded in the next with eternal life, is a life in conformity to the will of God. The Christian as a new creature, as a child of God, as a citizen of a heavenly kingdom, as an heir of glory, must make good these relations and these titles, by a life comporting therewith. The new creature is something more than the old man with a Sunday suit, going through the forms of religion at church. The child of God is something else than a professed member of the family of God, taking its lessons and models from the gay, the witty, and the admired of this world, who spends more days examining the outward person, by aid of toilet and mirror, in order to its improvement, than is spent of viewing the hidden man of the heart in the mirror of divine truth, that it may be adorned with the heavenly graces of the meek, humble, and gentle spirit, which in the sight of God is of great value.

A citizen of the heavenly kingdom is something different from the man who swears allegiance to the King of kings in an ordinance of his Lord's appointment, and afterward shows himself more the friend of Cesar than to him whom he has vowed to serve, adopting the policy of a worldly kingdom rather than the safer one—that of rendering to God the things that are God's.

Nor is an heir of glory one who has professedly and in due form joined the wealthiest family in the universe, and yet seeks far more the wealth and honors of earth, preferring the merchandise of silver to the merchandise of wisdom, and the gain thereof to the knowledge of divine love, compared with which the latter has no charm.

Such are the ways of every one who attempts a new life, whose mind and heart have never been renewed by divine truth to perceive what is good, that acceptable, and perfect will of God.

Q. If a Christian church, or a majority of its members, are well convinced that a sister church holds in full fellowship an unworthy member, is it the duty of said Christian church to inform said sister church of the fact?

A. Duty and prudence, with us, are not exactly the same terms, though nearly allied. As there is a wrong way of doing what is right, we should avoid, if possible, acting in any case of difficulty hastily. The presence of wisdom and prudence will generally aid us in the manner of righting the wrong. They are twin-sisters of dignified mien, occupy the same mansion, and are ever ready to give counsel when respectfully waited on, but they hasten leisurely.

With reference, then, to the case submitted, in view of every possible contingency connected therewith, we would say, it is the duty of said Christian church to notify, in a becoming manner, said sister church of the fact, that she holds in fellowship an unworthy person—one who has openly shown himself a wicked person.

Q. What is the duty of said sister church toward said unworthy member, after they have been informed of the fact?

A. That he be treated according to the demerit of his conduct. If he have scandalized the cause of Truth by some act of gross immorality of behaviour, and unrepented, he is to be excommunicated. Or if he be guilty of teaching what would be subversive to the truth, he is to be silenced, and, if need be, excommunicated. This first step, in case of a factionist, is always necessary, and the second may be, that a church may stand firm in the faith.

Q. If said sister church, after being apprized by a Christian church of the wicked course of one of her members, takes no notice of the matter, and still holds him in full fellowship, what course ought the neighboring churches to pursue towards said sister church?

A. If the unworthy person be a factionist, or heretic, and is permitted to teach and to seduce the brethren to commit sin, in rejecting the faith and the teachings of the apostles of Jesus Christ, and the church allow itself to be turned away from the Truth, it becomes, ipso facto, an apostate church, and the bond of Christian union and communion that formerly united them to each other and to sister churches, is necessarily broken. \_As to the necessity or propriety of special or formal act of excision being passed by a church or district of churches, declarative of their non-fellowship with said apostate church, it may be a question involving some difference of opinion; but not one, we presume, of very grave moment.

But if the unworthy person be one of a different class of offenders—such as being a scandal upon a good cause by the commission of some great iniquity, affecting the character of others as well as his own—such an one, when the iniquity of his conduct has been brought to light, could not be retained in Christian fellowship in any church, without its incurring the blame of conniving at sin, and receiving the censure of him who has commanded "to put away that wicked person from among you." For the members of a church to treat a brother thus guilty as a righteous person, would be to make themselves partakers with him in his iniquity, and would equally incur the frowns of avenging justice. Nor, for the same reason, could a sister church fellowship a church so reckless of consequences. But may we not hope that our brother querist is presenting us with an ideal, rather than a real difficulty?

A. W. C.

Q. Was Christ a first born of the dead, or the first born of the dead? You will oblige some of your more learned readers by answering this question.

A. The word in the Greek, first born, is found nine times in the New Testament, translated twice first begotten, and seven times first born, common version; twice in the plural and seven times in the singular here used as a participle of existence, from, *primumpario*—I bring forth first. There is neither propriety nor law requiring the omission of the article in our language in this case, merely because it is wanting in the

original. It is true that indefiniteness is generally indicated by the absence of the article in the Greek language. Arians, Socinians, and humanitarians, have made much false capital through their real or assumed ignorance on this subject. After a participle, indicating existence without the article, it is not necessary to omit the English article; on the contrary, it is often obviously demanded. Take an example: Acts 5:17—"The chief priest and his party rising up, being a sect of the Sadducees," would be the version of this passage on the principle adopted by some who repudiate the common version. But this would be simply absurd, and quite as much so to say Jesus was an image—a first born of every creature. This is both false in fact and in grammar—I mean in the whole grammar, and in the philosophy of the Greek language. Jesus was not an image, nor a first born, for he was the image, and the first horn. The article, in Greek, is properly omitted after participles indicating existence. Take another example, from John 10:12. Translate this—not being a shepherd—rather than—not being the shepherd, and you simply convert the passage into nonsense. Apply this principle to the above text, and you annihilate the sense or greatly obscure it. Jesus, without this grammatical fact, becomes an image, a first born. Can there be two first borns!! If not, how could he be only a first born? he becomes, too, only an image of God, instead of the image!! We solemnly believe that Jesus Christ is the only image, and the only first begotten of the Father—not a Father.

The difficulty, in part, in such construction, is this: The Greeks had only one article. We have two, and then we have the anarthrous form. Take the word man, for example. The Greeks had only anthropos. If they excel our language in many points, we excel theirs in this, that we have two articles; besides, we have the anarthrous, or the unarticled noun. We have man, a man, and the man. Man is, with us, the genus generalissimum, or the most comprehensive. Man includes the whole species; a man, an individual; and the man, some particular individual. Take the anarthrous, or unarticled word man, in the following example, and observe what a havoc it would make of sense:

The proper study of mankind is man. (Good sense.)  
 The proper study of mankind is a man. (Nonsense.)  
 The proper study of mankind is the man. (Nonsense.)

To sum up the whole: To read that Jesus was an image of the invisible God—a first born of the whole creation, would indicate that there were other images of the invisible God, and other first borns of the whole creation.

Q. (From the American Preacher and Disciples' Miscellany.): "Is A. Campbell's baptism the baptism of the scriptures? .... I presume not."

—J. M. Pendleton.

A. Such is the query and answer which have recently appeared in the Recorder of this State, and which were selected from the "Tennessee Baptist." We have no means of knowing the query, but the answer is given by Elder J. M. Pendleton, a Baptist minister of Kentucky. This great Sir Oracle of the Baptists, when asked whether the baptism taught by Mr. Campbell is scriptural or not, replies, "I presume not"! Then, of course, it is invalid, and all who have been the subjects of it remain unbaptized [That is to say, that the man who has believed the gospel with all his heart, and has repented of his sins, and has been baptized upon an intelligent confession of his faith in Christ, for the remission of his sins, in Mr. Pendleton's opinion, has not been baptized at all! Such must be the conclusion, if Mr. Pendleton's answer be correct.

And pray, what does Mr. Pendleton baptize for? Because the candidate's sins are already pardoned? Yes, because he says they are he is baptized "into the fellowship of the Baptist church!" And, let me ask, is this all? If so, it is a prostitution of the ordinance to a sectarian purpose. In the apostolic age, no one was immersed because his sins were forgiven; but, on the contrary, that they might be forgiven. No one was then immersed "into the fellowship of the Baptist church," for there was no such church; but they were immersed "into *Christ!*" Whither are some of the Baptist scribes going? They seem to have lost their balance in opposing us. They are actually in danger of making shipwreck of the faith. They have whittled baptism down to nothing! This is its whole value! It is of no account at all! A man can be a Christian without it, (though

he cannot be a Baptist!) he can be saved without it, and he can go to heaven without it! But, strange to tell, he cannot eat the Lord's Supper, nor get into the Baptist church, without it! It is not "for the remission of sins," nor the "gift of the Holy Spirit;" it has nothing to do with salvation, in the present or future. Baptists of North Carolina, are you prepared for this? If so, go join the Quakers, and let baptism go to the winds. But, if you are not thus apostate in your views, in the name of the Lord do not let a few hot-headed Baptist leaders lead you back to Rome. Baptism is for "the remission of sins," or it is for nothing under heaven! And if there be a Baptist minister in this State who denies it, we will give him a fair and full opportunity to defend his position. If baptism, administered to a penitent believer, is not for the remission of past sins, now is the time to show it. Who will try? Where is the minister who will stand on the defense? Our pages are open. Come, now, and let us reason together. The truth is, the Baptists—many of them—are abandoning their old ground, and leaning strongly towards Rome. We see it, and deplore it. We would call them back to apostolic ground, but many of their leaders say to us, "Get you hence[ .... You are heretics! .... You believe in water regeneration]" These men should have better sense. Do they not know that "baptismal regeneration" is regeneration without faith and repentance? And do they not know that not one of us ever believed or taught it? If they do not, they are too ignorant to write on this or any other subject.

God grant that the Baptists may not thus suffer themselves to be deluded by a few hotheaded partizans. "To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to these, it is because there is not light in them."

J.T.W.

Q. Is communion confined to the citizens of Christ's kingdom, or is it free for the citizens of both kingdoms?

A. Communion at the Lord's table is confined strictly to citizens of Christ's kingdom. No others have a right by the Word of God to this privilege.

Q. Is communion confined to immersed believers who are walking in the Lord, and perfecting holiness in fear; or is it open



and free to those who have had water sprinkled or poured upon them?

A. None but immersed believers have rights at the Lord's table, for no others are in Christ's kingdom.

Q. If a man thinks sprinkling or pouring right baptism, does his thinking make it so; or is it right to be immersed just because God commanded it?

A. Baptism is the immersion of a believing penitent, by the authority of Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Nothing else is baptism. And since a man cannot by thinking transmute sprinkling into immersion, of course his thinking that sprinkling is baptism can never make it so. It is certainly right to be immersed because Christ has commanded it.

M.E.I.

We have in our querist's drawer an unusual number of knotty questions, some of which have been answered, right or wrong, many a time before, and some of which never have been, and perhaps never can be answered to the satisfaction of but a few of reading public in any age. We give a specimen.

Q. 1. Does it violate the injunctions of the apostles, 1st Tim. 2, and 1st Peter 3, for Christians to wear gold?

2. Have Sisters a right to vote in the selection of officers?

3. Is it in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and Christian harmony for a Christian church to have an organ to assist in church music?

4. If an apostate comes before the church and makes a confession, has the church a right to judge whether he is penitent or not?

5. What constitutes the soul of men?

6. What baptism does the Apostle refer to, 1st. Cor. 12:13?

7. Two queries on the 3rd chapt. of John; of course the 8th verse?

8. What is your exposition of the parable of "The Prodigal Son?"

9. If the Messiah's humanity was derived from his mother and she was of the tribe of the Levi, how was he made the seed of David according to the flesh?

10. Can the existence of a Supreme Being be proved independent of Divine Revelation?

A. 1. Dress is only an outward expression of the spirit within. If that be frivolous, vain, or proud, it may show itself in fantastic, gaudy or costly apparel. When the dress betokens this state of heart, it is useless to cry against the dress. The sin lies deeper, and we would be as the blind pharisee "were we to seek first to make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, while within they were full of vanity and pride." Matt. 2:25. Ecclesiastical legislation against this outward folly cannot correct it. This, our Methodist friends have tried, but in vain. The Advocate, a Methodist paper published at Charlestown, Mass., says that notwithstanding the prohibition of the Methodist principle, "it is a serious fact and one to be deplored that there is more jewelry and superfluous dress worn by the Methodist of this day than there is by any other class of religious professors in our land." This is an instructive fact, and shows us how idle are all the reforms that reach not the heart and which are not founded in religious and moral principle. We may quote with appropriateness the words of the pious Leighton, "It is not impossible that there may be in some an affected pride in the meanness of apparel, and in others, under either neat or rich attire, a very humble and unaffected mind: using it upon some of the aforementioned engagements, or such like, and yet, the heart not at all upon it. Magnus qui fictilibus utitur tanquam argenta, nec ille minor qui argento tanquam fictilibus, says Seneca: "Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were a plate, and not less great is the man to whom all his plate is no more than earthenware."

But the forms of sin steal gradually upon us, and therefore it is necessary to admonish and warn one another, lest by thoughtlessly conforming to the garb of vanity and pride, the heart shall be gradually subdued to their power, and turned from the simplicity and modesty of the Christian life. Beloved sisters, in chaste conversation coupled with fear, let your

adorning be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even that of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God a great price. I Peter 3:4. If this be your daily aim and effort, we have but little to fear that you will dress to your hurt; but if these are wanting, though your garb be humble as the beggar's you are of no worth in the sight of him who shall judge you at last. Remember that, "vanity may strut in rags and humility be arrayed in purple and fine linen."

2. To this question we say yes, Sisters have just as much right to say yes or no in the selection of men who are to rule over them in the intimate Spiritual relations of the Christian church, as they have in selecting their husbands. The Scriptures do not specifically prohibit it, and the general rule is that, "In Christ there is neither male nor female." Gal. 3:28.

3. The question concerning the use of instrumental music in the public worship of the Christian church is not one to be settled by Scriptural authority. It is a question to be determined by general principles and the light of experience. If it could be clearly shown that an organ tends to promote the spirit of devotion and heighten the ardor of praise and worship in the congregation as a whole, then it would follow that organs should be employed. If, on the other hand, they silence the melody of the heart in the greater number, and destroy or sensualize the Spiritual praises of the Lord's people, then away with them! Now either of these results may follow the use of an organ in the conduct of the church music, according to the musical cultivation and taste of the congregation, and the choice might be made accordingly. This is, of course, but our humble opinion. We claim not the right to answer any one who may not think with us and would condemn both our self and him, could either of us make it a matter of strife or division in the church of the living God. Let all things be done in love, and with a general respect to the feelings, tastes and even prejudices of one another, and this will be sweeter praise to him who sits amidst the symphonies of angels and seraphim, than the swelling harmonies of the best trained organ—aided by choirs of a most semi-sensuous music.

4. Certainly, the church must judge whether the apostate,

who confesses, is penitent or not. Suppose he were drunk at the time of his confession, or made it in mockery or irony, should the church stultify themselves by receiving him? But this judgment must not be extended to constructive hypocrisy. It must be exercised in that charity which hopeth all things, which suffereth long and is kind. In the spirit of meekness, let us restore the erring and wandering to the right ways and help them to do better. If they are hypocritical the sin is on their own heads, and God, to whom vengeance belongs, will, in due time, make it manifest.

5. What constitutes the soul of man! Why, the soul is the man himself. Take away the soul and we have a body—it may be a living or a dead body, but we have no longer a man. If you ask me what it is made of, what proportion of carbon, or oxygen or alumina there may be in it, I tell you I don't know:—

whatever it may be to you, to me this is an untaught question. I rather think it is not a chemical question at all; at any rate the Scriptures do not so teach us.—But if it is not material, it is responsible; if it is not of palpable shape, it is rationally informed; and if it cannot be analyzed, it can be definitely identified, and shall stand in the final judgment, knowing and being known, to be judged of God according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or evil.

We must pause here for the present. The rest we will notice in our next number. In answering queries which are not specifically met by the letter of the Scripture, we wish our readers to remember that we present our reasonings and judgment for what they are worth, and leave the matter to their own minds

and consciences, with the constant prayer that God will still further open our eyes to see the wondrous things in his life—giving word. W.K.P.

Q. Is it required of the Christian Preacher, that he should while presenting the gospel to sinners, present also his theory of the modus operandi of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the sinner in the work of conversion?

A. The gospel of Christ is fully and fairly presented when its facts are fully and fairly exhibited in the light of their evidence. And when such a presentation is made, followed by

suitable exhortations deduced from the divine love therein exhibited, the Christian Preacher has honored his office and ministry and has presented that grand system of divine truth which the Apostle emphatically styles "the wisdom of God and the Power of God," for the salvation of a ruined world.

A theory he may have logically, as he conceives, deduced from the premises of man's fall and redemption, which harmonizes in his view, all the divine perfections in this wonderful procedure of grace towards a world of rebels. But as he knows his theory to have been the result of much after-thought and to have been in no way connected with his own salvation, he would not surely preach it to save others. Nor would he be guilty of adding it to the gospel of Christ, to give it, as it were, greater effect, lie could not, methinks, so far forget himself, as thus to dishonor his office and the ministry with which he has been entrusted.

A.W.C.

Q. Elder A. Campbell:—Dear Sir; At a recitation here recently, the Rev. J. W. Bailey, (a minister of the new School Presbyterian Church, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in this College,) said that "the Campbellites say, that if a man is dipped under water he may be saved, no matter what else he believes."

I have examined the "Christian System," and also your debate with Mr. Rice, and have been unable to find anything which could ever be construed to mean anything of the kind. Now what I wish to know is, have you ever said anything like that, either in debate, sermon or writing? If so, please inform me where I will be able to find it?

And if you have never said thus, do you know of any minister in the Christian Church, who could be quoted as representing the views of the Church, who has said anything which could be construed by an evil-minded person to mean the above? Please answer the above in the way which you think proper. Very truly, your Brother in Christ. Hiram S. Roberts.

A. Brother Roberts :—My Dear Sir.—I cheerfully respond to your inquiry. This is but one of the many misrepresentations, not to say deliberate falsehoods, originated and circulated by

certain opponents of the cause we plead. This is one of the means by which some of our too religious contemporaries seek to glorify their peculiar orthodoxy.

Paul once alludes to a similar case. He asks the Romans, Chapter 3, 7, the following question;—"If the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory, why yet am I judged" (or condemned) as a sinner; and not rather as we be slanderously reported, (and as some affirm that we say) Let us do evil that good may come, whose damnation is just." Lying to advance the cause of truth, is even in our day and somewhat popular, even at the risk of Divine condemnation.

Your New School professor seems to sympathize with some of Paul's contemporaries, and zealously affiliates with them, glorifying his orthodoxy by making me say what I never said or ever wrote. We never uttered nor wrote such a sentiment, nor heard any of our brotherhood so express himself, in public or in private. Let him refer to any such sentence, or confess his mistake or misstatement, and make the amend honorable. This is due to himself as an honest and honorable man. Yours truly, A  
Campbell.

Questions about giving: "I hid thy talent in the earth." (Matt. 25:25.)

We read of a Syrian King sending a vaunting message to one of the Kings of Israel—"Thy silver and gold are mine; thy wives also and thy children are mine"; and the reply of the cowardly and hypocritical Ahab was, "My Lord, O King, according to thy saying, I am thine, and all that I have." But when the king of Syria sent to bring away a portion of what was thus in words declared to be his, the Monarch of Israel showed that he had no idea of its being more than an acknowledgment of inferiority, and dared the consequences of a war with Syria, rather than lose any of his property.-How like many professing Christians of this generation! They read in the Word of God that their gold and silver are the Lord's, and they answer, "true, O King." They hear their obligation to use it for the advancement of his cause, and their consciences assent to the claim. They sit down at the table, and virtually say, "We are not our own, but are bought with a

price; we are the Lord's, and all that we have." But where is the evidence of their sincerity?

"With their mouth they show much love," (Ezek. 33, 31.), "but their heart goeth after their covetousness."

1. Let us ask—Is your admission, that all that you have is the Lord's, like Ahab's, unsupported by what you give to his claim?—I Kings 20:2, 9.

2. Are you not sometimes glad, when you can offer to the Lord that which costs you nothing? unlike David, 2 Sam. 24,24.

3. Do you ever grudge comforts to yourself, when the Lord's cause wants means? 2 Sam. 7, 2.

4. Or can you enjoy your comforts without a thought of what might be given up to Zion? Hag. 1:4.

5. Do you believe the Lord will be able to repay what you sacrifice at his call? II Chron. 25:6.

6. When you meet with a worldly loss, do you ever reflect the Lord may be showing you your sin in your punishment? (Ha. 1:6, 9, 11.)

7. Have you ever proved the Lord, whether you might not become richer by giving than withholding? (Mal. 3:10; Prov. 3:9, 10; 9:24.)

8. Do you give your best to the Lord, or what you can best spare? (Mal. 1:7, 8, 13, 14.)

9. Do you think most about what you can get for your dying body, or what you can give the kingdom of Christ? (Matt. 10:21.)

10. Does Christ know that you so love him, as that you would follow him, were he to require you to sell all that you have? (Matt. 10:21.)

11. How many evidences of discipleship will you have on the Judgment day, in what you have given to Christ? (Matt. 25:35, 36.)

12. How often have you made yourself a "friend" of this world's wealth, so that it shall witness for, and not against you at that day? (Luke 16:9.)

13. If you think you have the excuse of straightened circumstances, are you as anxious to give like a gentleman or lady, as to dress like one? (I Tim. 2:9, 10.)

—From the British Millennial Harbinger.

The following queries are taken from *The Evangelist*, published by Walter Scott, in 1832:

Q. It is asked by a highly respectable brother in Virginia, "Whether the Church of Christ is authorized to issue resolutions of disapprobation against a teacher of Christianity for asserting that the New Testament authorizes no one to say that God gives his Holy Spirit to unbelievers."

The query is put on account of the following resolution issued by one of the Churches at S ..... etc., etc.

Resolved, that this Church disapproves of certain views or sentiments advanced by Elder H., as contrary to the spirit of the gospel, particularly that sentiment which considers a sinner repenting and believing in Christ with a saving faith, before he receives any influence from the Holy Spirit: and this resolution with their Christian love to Br. H. be made known to him. By order of the Church,

S\_\_\_\_\_ C\_\_\_\_\_, Clerk.

A. There is no instance in the Scripture of a church disapproving one of her members for asserting what is certainly fact, that "God does not give his Holy Spirit to unbelievers"; but there are instances of the disciples, (e. g. at Jerusalem and Ephesus) sitting in judgment upon matters and persons when they are conceived to affect the peace and welfare of the church.

The above note of disapprobation is couched in very brotherly and respectful terms, and ought not, in my judgment, to be considered by the querist, as exceedingly offensive. Several points in the question now pending between the advocates of the ancient gospel and all other professors of Christianity, appear to them as novel and extraordinary as if they were not to be found in the New Testament. Moreover other professors, as we, deem these points, of vital importance and the discussion of them therefore may well be supposed occasionally to origi-



nate transient disapprobation and disquietude. "Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

We are persuaded that as our brother has the wisdom to perceive all this, so he will have the goodness to bear with all longsuffering the disapprobation of his brethren which is no doubt, as he firmly believes, occasioned rather by the novelty than by the unsoundness of his own sentiments.

Q. Why is the gospel styled the faith?

A. Because its blessings of pardon and the Holy Spirit, can be received only on the principle of faith.

Q. Why is it called Spirit?

A. Because the worshippers receive the Spirit.

Q. Why is it called the grace of God?

A. Because these blessings are communicated by grace or favor.

Q. Was it revealed to the Jews, that Messiah when he came should abrogate the law?

A. (Note: This was apparently inadvertently left off.— O.J.S.)

Q. Bro Scott, was Adam created holy?

A. It is not said he was: the word holy is of origin posterior to the fall; and the adjectives used in reference to Adam, are these—'natural, living, earthy, upright;' 'God made man upright.' Adam was an animal, earthy, upright, living man.

Q. Would the life giving tree have sustained him in life after the fall, as certainly as it did before it, if God had permitted him to eat thereof?

A. First, it was not a life-giving tree, but a life-sustaining tree. Secondly, it would appear from scripture, that the Tree of Life would have kept him alive after the fall as well as before it; for the Lord said, 'now lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever; so he drove out the man.'

Q. What is your idea of the state or condition in which men are as connected with fallen Adam?

A. I think of them, to speak analogically, pretty much as I would of children born in prison, and subject to all its suffering and debasing effects, but not personally to blame for being there.

Q. Why then are we blamed?

A. We are not blamed: we are pitied: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life : " and we are condemned not because we are in the prison, for that is condemnation, but because we will not come out of it, when Christ has opened the fetters and opened the prison doors. 'He that believeth on me,' says Christ, 'has passed from death unto life.'

Q. What do you think the word image, in Genesis, imports?

A. If the word relates to the body, then the lineaments of the human form are the lineaments of the Divinity; when it is said, 'Let us make man in our image,' the words import, 'Let us make him in our form;' and this interpretation has the advantage over all others, in that it is the literal one.

But if the word is used in relation, not to the exterior of man, but in relation to his mind; then the word image is here used figuratively, and becomes more difficult of apprehension in regard to the Heavenly Father, because we are not accustomed to think of mind,' or of the attributes of mind, only as they are in union with forms,—animated forms.

But, thirdly. If we suppose the word relates to the entire man, viz: that he was made in person and spirit like his Creator, then the interpretation is sustained by the subsequent accounts of the Father of Mercies, furnished by the scriptures: e.g. It is written, 'And they (Adam and Eve) heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the Garden; and the Lord God called unto Adam and said: Where art thou, It is said of God at the flood; that he saw that 'The wickedness of man was great, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his

heart was only evil continually: and it repented the Lord that he made man on the earth—and it grieved him at his heart.'

The idea that the human form is the divine, is communicated in the following scripture: The next appearance of the Divinity was to Abraham. 'Now the Lord said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee.'

But the Lord sent his word or message to his servants of old, sometimes in vision, without appearing in his proper person; so it is said, Gen. 15th chapt., 'After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision, saying, fear not Abraham, I am thy shield—thy exceeding great reward.' But when Abraham was 99 years old, the Lord appeared unto him and said, 'I am the Almighty God; walk thou before me and be thou perfect.' And chap. 18, it is written, 'The Lord appeared (in person) unto him in the plains of Mature: And he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day. And he lifted up his eyes, and looked: and 10! three men stood by him: when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground, and said, My Lord,' etc.

It is also said that the Lord appeared to Isaac twice, perhaps the first time in person, and the last in vision.

Of Jacob, on his way from Beersheba to Haran, it is said, 'He dreamed, and behold a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending upon it; and behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father.'

Again. On his return he was left alone, and there wrestled with him a man until the breaking of day. 'And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, for, said he, I have seen God face to face and my life is preserved.' And he appeared to him again a third time; and fourthly, as he came out of Padanaram, where God renewed all his promises to him, and finally 'went up from him in the place where he talked with him.'

The last appearance of the Divine Father to Jacob, was antecedently to his departure for Egypt; but this, we are informed, was in 'The visions of the night.'

He appeared to Moses in the burning bush; and at the rock, where he beheld his hinder parts; and to the nobles of Israel in the mount, with a brilliant pavement under his feet; and to Josiah, as the captain of the Lord's host. He spoke with Samuel, also, while he was yet a child, and his glory and beauty were beheld of David and of the High Priests who entered once a year into the Holiest of all. 'One thing,' says the sweet psalmist of Israel, 'have I desired of the Lord; that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord and to enquire in his temple.'

Isaiah says, 'In the year that king Uzziah died I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the train of his mantle filled the temple. Above it, (the throne,) stood \*.he seraphim: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, with twain he covered his feet, and with twain did he fly; and one cried unto the other said, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory; and the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the temple was filled with smoke! Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell among a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts!'

Of Jeremiah it is said, 'The word of the Lord came unto him,' and afterwards, that 'The Lord put .forth his hand and touched his mouth.'

Ezekiel, in describing his glorious vision by the river Chebar, says, 'And above the firmament that was over the living creatures' heads, was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone; and upon the likeness of the throne was a likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it: and I saw as the color of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within; from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward,' etc. 'And he said unto the Son of man,' etc.

Daniel delivers himself thus: 'I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and The Ancient of days did sit, whose garments were white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool;

His throne was as the fiery flame and its wheels as burning fire : a fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; a thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him,' etc.

The accounts which the Christian books give of the person of the Father resemble the above, which are taken from the Jewish scriptures. John says, Rev. 6th chap., 'Behold a throne was set in heaven, and one sat upon the throne, and he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and sardine stone; and there was a rainbow round about the throne in appearance like unto an emerald, etc. And of the Beings that bear his throne, it is said, 'They rest not day and night, saying Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty; which was and is and is to come!' etc.

In answer to the question, then, whether the word image includes the outward appearance, I say; all these scriptures represent the Father as wearing the human form, which is more susceptible of the attributes of beauty, grandeur, sublimity, dignity, grace, gracefulness, veneration, etc., than any other shape with which we are acquainted. In the forms of animals, and in their faces in particular, where the brow, eyebrow, chin, and pons nasi are wanting, no such variety is found; and it may be safely averred, that real beauty is not to be expressed without these elements, the absence of which constitutes so essential a difference between the countenance of man and those of the inferior tribes.—So much for the person of the Father.

As for the person of the Son, he is said to be the image of the Invisible God—an impress of his person or existence, and his form is, on all hands, declared now to be human, though glorified. He appeared to Cephas, to Mary, to James, to the twelve, to 500 brethren at once, to Paul in glory and in vision, to John, who says,

'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto

Laodicea. And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And, being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth went forth a two-edged sword; and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death. Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter. The mystery of the seven stars, which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches.'

Again he says,

'And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written that no man knew but himself: and he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called the Word of God. The armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings, AND LORD OF LORDS.'

In all these appearances of our blessed Lord he wore the human form, so that this is the form of both the Father and

the Son. The Holy Spirit being in the church wears also the human form, in the person of his Saints; but the Father and the Son only are, of course, visible. The Father wears originally the Divine form, The Son has assumed it and made it his own. The Holy Spirit bears it in the persons of the Saints, and thus the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, with the whole kingly household, have a family likeness, both internally and externally, for ever and ever.

**Practical Thoughts and Reflections on****Peter's Sermons**

BY A. CAMPBELL

We have now heard that Peter, to whom the Lord in person gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, prepared to open it to the Jews. This is the opening speech of the Reign of Grace. It announces the most transcendent facts ever announced on earth. It reveals the mysteries of the Messiah's life, death, burial, and resurrection. It discloses secrets hid from ages and generations. The universe is now made to stand in a new attitude before us.

A child born of an humble virgin, in Bethlehem of Judea—a person of great obscurity, though of a noble and a royal ancestry—brought up by Joseph, a carpenter, in the town of Nazareth—after a life of perfect purity, holy, harmless, and undefiled—distinguished by the noblest deeds of piety and humanity, as numerous and as various as the days of his life; after being opposed, insulted, reprobated, times and ways without number, is finally condemned and crucified; but after an ignominious death and an humble sepulture, suddenly rises from the grave—identifies himself to his few true and faithful, though disconsolate friends; and, after numerous interviews for instruction and consolation, bids them an affectionate adieu—ascends to the heavens—is carried through the portals of the skies amidst the greetings and acclamations of adoring saints and wondering angels, and ushered into the presence of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible. No sooner does he appear before the awful sublime and glorious throne of the universe, than the everlasting God and his Father arises from his throne, and, saluting him in the words reported by the sweet Psalmist of Israel in his divine lyrics, says, "Sit thou at my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool." "I have sworn by myself, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck." Thus being made Lord and Christ, he receives



the rod of universal empire, is crowned "Lord of all," and the angels of God are commanded to worship him.

A new King now presides over the universe—a new Lawgiver and Judge, all in the person of him who was reprobated by the Jews and crucified by the Romans. He has the entire dispensation of the Holy Spirit, for he has received that promised honor from his Father and his God. How truly and circumstantially did Isaiah speak of him—"Unto us a child is born—a son is given, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Founder of an everlasting age, 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, even forever."

Nothing could have been more suitable to the occasion than the point to which the Apostle brought the subject. He desired to prove, in the most convincing manner, that God had constituted that same Jesus, whom they, as a nation, had most wickedly condemned and crucified, both Lord and Christ. This he did by a proper Selection and application of the testimony of the national Prophets, whose authority with his audience was paramount and supreme; also, by reasoning in a very clear, concise, and pointed manner on the testimony adduced; and then by a solemn declaration of his own personal knowledge and that of the eleven witnesses standing beside him, of the indutiable certainty of his resurrection from the dead and ascension to heaven. In all this he was sustained not only by the assent of his fellow Apostles, but by the glowing tongues of fire radiating from their persons, while their hallowed lips, touched with a live coal from God's own altar, in dialects not their own, but especially vouchsafed for the occasion, confirmed the message which he delivered. Never did words fall with more irresistible weight on human ears than did these—"Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made that name Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ." This information pierced them to the heart. It was accompanied with the demonstration of the Holy Spirit .and with power displayed before their eyes.

This is a model-sermon. It was scripture, argument, and

proof. No idle declamation—no pomp of speech no effort to soften the heart by melting tones, gentle cadences, or an impassioned mannerism. There was sincerity, and there was gravity. A conciseness, characterized every word and action. Such, at least, are the indications to my mind from all that is written, and from the question propounded to the Apostles by the audience. The question propounded by the auditors, the answer to it, and the results, are next to be considered.

A.C.

PRACTICAL THOUGHTS AND REFLECTIONS ON  
ACTS—VERSES 37 THROUGH 47.

In this short section of the narrative we have the first, and, indeed, the only, apostolic development of the commencement of the Christian community. In the section preceding we had the ascension, coronation, and glorification of the Messiah, and the great revolution in heaven consequent upon his investiture with the mitre and the crown of the universe. He was then, indeed, constituted "Imperator et Pontifex Maximus," not of Rome, nor of earth, but of the Universe. King and High Priest of the Universe He is. "Angels, authorities, principalities, and powers" are now subjected to him. He is "Head over all things" for the sake of His church "the fullness of him that filleth all in all." He is now the dispensator of the Holy Spirit. And how sublime the commencement of his kingdom in Jerusalem! Under the Jewish theocracy, and the regimen of the law by mediator Moses, on the day of the descent of Moses with the law, three thousand Israelites were slain by the sword. But now, under Christian theocracy and the reign of grace by Mediator and King Messiah, on the day of the descent of the Christian Advocate with the gospel in his hand, three thousand souls that were slain by the sword of the Spirit are made alive to God.

Hence, then we have the glorious beginning of the gospel kingdom—THE REIGN OF GRACE. The gospel facts, promulgated and proved that day, were :—that Jesus died for our sins, an atoning sacrifice; that he was buried, that he rose

again from the dead, that he ascended into heaven—was crowned Lord of all; and that he sent down the Holy Spirit to be the Guest of his church and the Advocate of his cause.

These facts the HOLY TWELVE affirmed. They proved by quotations from the Prophets that they had been promised. They most solemnly deposed that he rose from the dead—that they were witnesses of that fact—and so was the Holy Spirit that sat visibly upon their persons. They then exhorted the audience to save themselves from the impending vengeance by coming to him.—Such was the preaching of that day.

The conversion of the audience was consummated as follows :—They heard, they saw, they were convicted of sin, of justification, and of future judgment: of their own sin, because they had disbelieved and crucified the Messiah: of his righteousness, because of his reception into heaven: of judgment, because the powers that opposed him were defeated and ultimately to be vanquished.

Their introduction into his kingdom was not by hearing and seeing only—not by believing and repenting only; but also by their obeying the precept concerning their putting on Christ by baptism. They heard, they saw, they believed, they repented —they gladly obeyed and were baptized. Such was the process of their conversion. They were thus added to the saved.

Now would Peter have not told the whole human race to have done the same things, had they been present that day? And if so, are not all who hear the word commanded to do as they did? This certainly is not ancient, but primitive, original Christianity. The stream is always purest as it gushes from the fountain. Let all who have not yet obeyed the gospel do as they did, and the same gracious results will follow. They also will participate in all the promised illumination, peace, and joy of the Holy Spirit.

And what do we learn of the employment of the first church? They not only declared their faith in the Messiah, and their repentance; they not only made a public confession of this faith and repentance; they were not only baptized into Christ—into the name of the godhead—into the mysterious,

sublime, and awful relations of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; but they also continued steadfast amidst all the trials and temptations of their new associations. They held fast the Apostles' teaching, and were obedient to the faith. They continued in the Apostles' doctrine, in social intercommunications of all brotherly kindness, distributing to the necessities of the saints, and communing not merely in social repasts, but in breaking the mystic loaf—in prayers, praising God—in songs of adoration and gratitude; and in enjoying the admiration and favor of the more sedate and reflecting citizens of Jerusalem, with the special tokens and demonstrations of the divine presence and protection.

What a delightful community was this mother church! Who would not desire to have been a member of it! Who can imagine a more convincing proof of the divine authority, evidence, and excellency of the Christian religion! The selfish feelings of the human heart were so entirely overcome, that they went beyond the requisitions of the gospel. They sold their surplus possessions and laid the price of them at the Apostles' feet, that distribution might be made to all according to their need, and that they might have one great sabbatical year, a glorious jubilee, a daily spiritual feast in the temple of Solomon, and then meet in social parties all around the city, breaking the social and festive loaf from house to house, eating their food with gladness and singleness of heart. A revolution so sudden, so radical, so sublime, so contrary to all the usual springs and fountains of human action, never before happened on earth, and constitutes an irresistible argument in proof of the Christian religion, of the divine mission and call of the Apostles. The church in Jerusalem was a glorious monument erected in proof of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and more than a thousand lectures carries conviction to every observant mind that our faith, and hope, and religion, are not of man, but of God. We thank High Heaven that not Rome, but Jerusalem, is the mother church—the mother of all true churches. Oh! that all Christians were inspired with her spirit, would receive her doctrines, imitate her example, and enjoy her high honors and rich reward!

A.C.

**Letters and Articles Various**

Jacksonville, Ind., August 18, 1835.

YOU do not like long letters; nor do I, unless very interesting. Every thing flourishes here but religion—this is very sickly, and almost sick unto death. "Like people, like priest." The preachers have almost left the field and only preach when it suits their convenience. I can say with Paul, though old, I labor more abundantly than all. I have baptized and received for baptism about 10 in eight or ten days, not in Jacksonville. In this place I hardly ever speak. What think you of the plan now proposed of the general union of Christians? The paper is published in Marysville, Tenn., by Episcopalians and Presbyterians. I should be glad to know your thoughts on the subject.

B. W. Stone

FROM THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE  
1835  
CONQUESTS OF THE GOSPEL.

A TEN days' meeting at Versailles has just closed. It commenced on Saturday, the 12th of September. Jacob Creath, Sen., presided, J. T. Johnson and Jacob Creath, Jun., did the preaching until Wednesday the following; during which time about sixty persons confessed the Lord Jesus, and were immersed for remission. Messengers were dispatched for brethren J. Challen and B. F. Hall, who arrived on Wednesday. Brethren Fleming and Lancaster joined us on Thursday evening. On Saturday, the 19th, some of the brethren left to attend a two day's meeting at Mount Vernon and the Stamping Ground. The others continued until Monday evening, the 21st. During the meeting about one hundred and thirty-five persons were immersed for the remission of their sins.

There was nothing of the excitement peculiar to revivals, so called. Nothing was preached to excite the animal feelings. It

was the gospel of truth that did the work. Several Presbyterians and Methodists were immersed among the number who bowed submission to the Prince Messiah.

We have no room for comment, more than that Versailles is the first place in Kentucky where the ancient gospel was received. And while our enemies are publishing far and wide that Campbellism, as they slanderously denominate the gospel of Christ, is dying in Kentucky, and particularly in those places where it was first embraced—we wish to be recollected that there is in Versailles, a congregation consisting of more than 250 members, and several others in the neighborhood and county.

Brother P. S. Fall immersed two at Bethel, near Frankfort, on Lord's day, 23d of August.

F. R. Palmer and B. F. Hall were at Providence, near Lexington, the 5th Lord's day in August—three were immersed, and one joined from the Baptists.

Brother W. Scott writes, August 21st, "That he had just returned from a three day's meeting in Brown County, Ohio—ten persons were immersed. There are said to be about fifteen hundred brethren within ten miles square, in that district."

Brother J. Coons, of Calloway county, Mo., writes, August 8—"That the good cause is prospering in that region. A church constituted about two years ago, with nine members, now numbers upwards of seventy. Brother M. P. Wills has immersed fourteen lately.

Brother J. Mavity writes us, Harmony Landing, September 14 "That he has recently immersed eight or ten persons."

Brother J. M'Vey writes us, September 12—"That he immersed 25 a few days before, at a protracted meeting, and several since."

Brother David S. Burnet; of Cincinnati, Ohio, writes, September 16—"That he is just from Washington, and that 12 persons obeyed the gospel there."

Brother J. C. Anderson writes us from Murfreesborough, Tenn., September 3d—"That the day before, ten were immersed; and a few days before that, four others; and that at nearly every meeting he and Brother T. C. Griffin have some make the good confession." May the Lord continue to bless the labors of these evangelists.

(The following most acceptable intelligence is from one of my youthful playmates. He often accompanied me in my fowling expeditions when I was first entrusted with a gun. I met with him in Philadelphia, and, after an interval of twenty-six years, would not have recognised him but from his making himself known unto me. This proved the happy occasion of what is recorded below; for which I most cordially thank our heavenly Father. May the good spirit of our God fill his heart with heavenly peace! and, trusting in the blood of the Lord Jesus, the great and good Shepherd of the sheep, may he always rejoice with the "joy unspeakable and full of glory!" His father was a ruling elder over the congregation over which my father presided, some thirty years ago. He has a brother, a Minister of the good old Secession Presbyterians of Ulster.) Ed.

Philadelphia, October 19, 1835.

Dear Brother Campbell: May the favor of God, which has been so abundantly shed on you, be multiplied to you, your family, and all who love our Lord Jesus Christ.

I have long promised myself the pleasure of penning a few lines to you, but the various causes have induced me to postpone it to the present time.

Beloved, I can look back to the evening when I first heard you preach the gospel as preached by Peter and the other Apostles of our Lord with surprise—surprise at my own stupidity—so far different was the plain simple announcement of the gospel to what I had been accustomed to hear for the gospel, that I came home with the impression that much learning had had an unfavorable effect on your senses; and yet I could find nothing in all you said, which you did not clearly prove to be according to the law and the testimony. I heard you

again and again with deep satisfaction, and soon became satisfied that you spoke the words of truth and soberness. I read the Harbinger with pleasure, and I believe with profit—attended the meetings of the brethren in Bank street; but, alas I I long remained only a convert of the Gate; and it was not until the last visit of brother Elley, of Lexington, Ky., in August last, that I confessed Jesus Christ, and was immersed into his name for the remission of sins. I regret much that I did not obey Jesus Christ when I first heard you announce the glad tidings. How much spiritual pleasure I have lost by not doing so! But "O, to grace how great a debtor!" How great the longsuffering of God has been to spare me, and permit me to again and again hear the offer of mercy. Surely, "If our death were his delight, He would not thus to life invite."

May I be enabled to spend the remainder of my days in his service; and as much has been forgiven, may I love much. To you, dear brother Campbell, I am much indebted, and to our good brother Elley I am also deeply indebted. I can only say to you both, Go on in the service of our blessed Master, and he will abundantly reward you; for "they who turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever."

It would give me great pleasure to behold your face in the flesh once more, which I hope I may be permitted to do; but to see your venerable father would fill me with joy. I dare say he does not remember me, for I was but a child when I saw him; nevertheless, his appearance and manners made an impression on my mind which has never been erased. Please present my Christian love to him. Tell him I am the youngest son of his very sincere friend, the late Philip Morrison.

Thomas Morrison

Cincinnati, October 2, 1835

There have been many accessions to some of the churches near here within a month or six weeks—8 or 10 here—13 at Wilmington 26 at Dayton—8 at Carthage—25 at New Albany —11 at Lawrenceburg, Ky.—140 at Versailles, etc., etc.—making about 260 or 70 in that time.

David Burnet.



Georgetown, Ky., Feb. 8, 1838 We have just closed a most interesting meeting of 13 days at this place. Brother Gano was the speaker, while the brethren with one accord held up his hands. We had 39 added to the congregation—amongst the number were my son and daughter. All those of my family who are old enough are in the kingdom. It was a most blessed time. The additions here including Christians, amount to about 55—nine of them are students. The additions at Paris recently are 117, and at Millersburg 34. Praised be the name of the Lord. (Amen!—A.. C.)

Jamestown, Ohio, 5th, May, 1838

On last Monday we closed a four days' meeting in this village. Brethren Walter Scott and John Rogers were the laborers. Eleven were added by immersion and three by letter.

M. Winans

(Of all the sins in the long list of omissions and commissions, the foulest and blackest is ingratitude. Now the question is, How much of this sin will be found in those who neglect the Christian assemblies and forget the death of their Redeemer. while they profess to expect eternal life through his death.)

Ed. M. H. 1836

North Middletown, September 27th, 1839.

You desire to know the number of churches in Bourbon county, their names, number, etc., etc. There are eight churches located in the county, and two others immediately on the lines of Fayette and Harrison. About one half of each of the latter congregations live in our county, to wit:

Leesburg, Harrison county, total 253, half	126
Elders, Coppage and Wasson; Evangelist, John A. Gano.	
Union, Fayette county, total 150, half	75
No officers. John A. Gano their preacher.	
Bourbon County	
1. Cooper's Run, members	40
No officers. John A. Gano their preacher.	

2. Paris, members .....	214
Elders, Riggs and Bledsoe. A. Raines, preacher.	
3. Mount Carmel, members .....	120
No officers. Joshua Irvine, preacher.	
4. Cane Ridge, members .....	220
Elders, John Irvine and William P. Payne. Deacons, Hamilton Wilson and H. Rogers. Thomas Bledsoe and John Rogers, preachers.	
5. Flat Run, members .....	80
Elders, Parker and Morrow.	
6. Millersburgh, members .....	160
Elders, Joseph Irvine and Deacons, Bills and Taylor. A. Raines, preacher.	
7. Clintonville, members .....	80
Deacons, H. Curtwright and J. Crose. John Rogers, preacher.	
8. North Middletown, members .....	320
Elders, John Rash, William Mason, and N. L. Lindsay. Deacons, E. Darnall, James Ford and Devall Payne. A. Raines, preacher.	
Total number of members .....	1423
in eight churches situated in the county, and including the half of two others located on the line—namely : Leesburg and Union, as above described. Seven of these congregations own the houses at which they meet. The other three own but half a house, to wit: Leesburg, Union, and Millersburg.	

Enclosed I send ten dollars, which credit as follows :—John Campbell, Sen., James Houston, John Thomas, Elias Darnell, Devall Payne.

N. L. LINDSAY

Russellville, Ala., March 8, 1842

By last mail I informed you that 62 had been added to this place; but since that time I have immersed 12 more. Amongst

the last are seven young men, and some of them possess the first order of talents.

It is strange to see Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and the world uniting upon the Bible to keep the holy ordinances, and all rejoicing in the one hope.

A happier congregation you have never seen than this at present, and the members pledge themselves to meet weekly to observe the institutions of the Lord's house.

Owing to bad health I shall be compelled to leave soon.

T. FANNING.

Louisiana, Missouri, July 14, 1842

WITHIN the last few days we have received thirty-six of the principal citizens of this county; and since my return from St. Louis fifty persons have been translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of favor and peace. The harvest is truly plenteous here, but very few laborers.

J. CREATH, JR.

#### TRUE BAPTISM

Brother, are you a husband and the head of a family? Do you daily and constantly read the scriptures and pray in your family? Do you bring up your children in the correction, and admonition of the Lord? Are you spiritually-minded, and rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God? Do you often meditate, and carefully examine yourself? Have you your good behaviour without covetousness, and are you intent on making your calling and election sure? If so baptism verily profiteth you: if not, it is no better than baby sprinkling.

A. C. 1840

"Millions of money for an inch of time!" cried Elizabeth—the gifted, but vain and ambitious Queen of England, upon her dying bed. Unhappy woman! reclining upon a royal couch—with ten thousand dresses in her wardrobe—a kingdom upon which the "sun never sets," at her feet—now all are valueless;

and shrieks in anguish, and shrieks in vain, for "a single inch of time." She had enjoyed three score and ten years. Like too many among us, she had so devoted them to wealth, to pleasure, to pride and ambition; that her whole preparation for eternity was crowded into her final moments; and hence she, who had wasted more than half a century, would barter millions for "an inch of time."

M. H. 1843

#### APHORISMS.

Every man should have a calling to follow, and follow his calling.

That friendship will not endure to the end, which is begun for an end.

They will buy the world at too dear a rate, that pay but one sin for it.

It is a sad thing for a man to be taken out of the world by death, before he is taken out of the world by grace.

Inordinate affection brings extraordinary affliction.

M. H. 1843

Versailles, Ky., September 1, 1844 Brother Brown and myself, together with father Creath and brother Raines, spent a few days in Winchester, including last Lord's day. Eight persons were added.

B. F. HALL

#### MONEY

It is astonishing how much the Bible says of money! The characters of men are more thoroughly developed by money than by any other means. It is the hottest crucible in which man's soul can be placed. See how the Bible speaks of it. Man is a steward. Nothing that he possesses is his own. The fee simple of not a foot of land lies in him. It lies in the throne of God, and the occupier is nothing but a tenant—a mere tenant at will bound to use every penny of his estate for God's glory,

and to render a strict account at last. What a light does Christ's own conduct throw upon this doctrine! Men pride themselves in their wealth. Did Christ? Where was he born, and how did he live? And when upon his cross, how did he act towards his mother, the being of all others of the race whom he loved best? Did he say to Joseph of Arimathea, "Behold thy mother"? No, no! It was to John, the poor, penniless disciple, to whom he commended her. He who could have commanded the mountains to pour forth their riches for her use, bequeathed his dearest relative to the care of a portionless son: thus throwing a signal rebuke upon those who will not trust God, parting with their substance at his command. Let this elementary work be thoroughly done. Let the great doctrine of stewardship be preached. Let men know the tenure by which they hold their property. Then if the Master calls for a given sum, whether by agents, circulars, or any other cry, the means will be forthcoming; and a man will withhold it on the peril of his soul.

Rev. Dr. Patton—M. H. 1845

#### BEAUTIFUL EXTRACT

I saw a mourner standing at eventide over the grave of one dearest to him on earth. The memory of joys past came crowding on his soul.—"And is this," said he, "all that remains of one so loved and lovely? I call, but hear no answer. O, my beloved one will not hear. O, Death! inexorable Death! what hast thou done! Let me lie down and forget my sorrow in the slumbers of the grave!"

When he thought this in agony, the form of Christianity came by. He heard the song and transport of the great throng, which no man can number, around the throne. There were the spirits of the just made perfect—there was the spirit of her he mourned! Their happiness and hers was pure, permanent, and perfect.

The mourner then wiped away his tears, thanked God and took courage. "All the days of my appointed time," said he, "will I wait, till my change cometh." He returned to life's duties no longer sorrowing as those who have no hope.

M. H. 1847

"Out of Zion shall go forth the law,  
And the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem,  
And he shall judge among many people,  
And decide among strong nations afar off;  
And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,  
And their spears into pruning-hooks;  
Neither shall they any longer learn war:  
But they shall sit every man under his vine  
And under his fig-tree, and none shall make him afraid;  
For the mouth of Jehovah of hosts hath spoken it."

Isaiah 2:3-4

**Death of Alexander Campbell**

BY MOSES E. LARD

On the night of the 4th of March, the night of the Lord's day, at a quarter before midnight, this eminent man fell asleep in Christ. He died at home, beneath his own roof, in the bosom of his family, surrounded and watched by his friends. For this event the country was not wholly unprepared. For several years past a rapid decay was known to be going on in his intellectual powers; and recently his body gave obvious proofs of his approaching dissolution. Yet now that his death is announced, it fills us with deepest grief. It may not be dutiful to wish that he could have stayed with us longer; still how utterly do our hearts refuse not to mourn now that he is gone.

Mr. Campbell was born in Ireland, in the county of Antrim, in June, 1786. This is the date of his birth as given by Professor Pendleton. I confess I question its correctness. Dr. Campbell himself told me, unless my memory is at fault, that there was the difference of a year, as to his age, between the count of his father and that of his mother, and that he himself followed the count of his mother, as being of the two the more likely to be correct. Prof. Pendleton follows the count of his father. This difference in count arose from the fact that the family record was lost by shipwreck on the passage of the family to America, and that the date of the birth of Alexander had to be made out from memory. Whether the count of his mother made him a year older or a year younger than that of his father, I do not now recollect. It is probable, then, that at his death he was either seventy-nine or eighty-one years old, and not eighty, according to the above date.

From the foregoing facts it will be seen that Mr. Campbell was an Irishman, and not a Scotchman, as is so generally supposed in this country. On his father's side his ancestors were Scotch; on his mother's, French. And in his modes of thought and personal appearance, especially the conformation and ex-

pression of his face, he exhibited strong traits of his Scottish descent. His nose and other features of his face were strikingly Scotch; his eye, strikingly Irish. Again, the ring of his voice was decidedly Scotch; while his rapid articulation was clearly Irish.

His early education was received in Ireland, and was superintended with scrupulous care by his godly father, whose powerful mind (perhaps not excelled in native strength even by that of his gifted son), deeply pious heart, and accurate learning, eminently fitted him to be the curator of his richly talented boy. His riper education was received at the ancient University of Glasgow, Scotland, of which, through life, Mr. Campbell ever cherished the fondest recollections. It seems to have been at the latter place, more than anywhere else, that those aspirations awoke in his bosom, and that wonderful impetus was given to his powerful intellect, which formed guarantees of his future success. His stay at the University was not long, but highly important. Here he came in contact with a few very eminent men, who aided him in forming those habits of promptness and intense thought, which so much distinguished him in after-life.

He immigrated to the United States in 1809, landing in New York in October of the same year. Consequently, if born in 1786, he was twenty-three years old at the time of his landing. From New York he went at once to Washington, Pa., where his father lived, who had preceded the family two years before. Here he lived, and continued to study with his father till his marriage. In May, 1810, in the twenty-fourth year of his age, and about seven months after landing in this country, he preached his first sermon at a meeting-house called Bush Run, about eight miles southwest from Washington, Pa.

He was married in March, 1811, to Margaret Brown, by whom he had eight children. Beside this lovely and intellectual woman and her eight children he now sleeps, on a little slope, near the home in which he died. By him and his dead, wrapped in the same consecrated dust, sleeps also his venerated father. Seldom has so much greatness and pious worth hallowed the same spot on earth.

On the 2d of June, 1812, he and wife, also his father, mother,



and one sister were all immersed, to use his own language, "into the Christian Faith." They were immersed by Elder Matthias Luse. This event at once identified him with the great family, of the immersed on earth, with whom he stood connected, and for whom he worked with a fidelity and an energy never surpassed, for fifty-four years of his life.

In 1823 he commenced the publication of *The Christian Baptist*. This work is the masterpiece of his life. In polish and completeness of thought, it cannot be pronounced equal to some volumes of his *Harbinger*; but in originality and utility he has written nothing to excel it. But to comment in detail on these works is the business of his biographer. We shall not here further anticipate it.

To few men has nature been more kind than to Mr. Campbell. No word but lavish will express her gifts to him; and this must be accepted as true, whether it have reference to the inner or outer man. Physically, not one man in a thousand was so well endowed as was he. Nature was in a fertile mood when she molded that large sinewy body. Material was abundant and was bestowed with no grudging hand. In height, in the day of his prime, he stood, I should say, full six feet, perhaps a little the rise of that. And from the first foot to the sixth, counting upward, was not one defective bone or muscle. Not a pound of flesh too much, not a pound too little. His body was a noble one. To say that it was formed to manifest the true conception of the symmetrical or the beautiful would be going too far. It was not. Toughness and power were palpably the two finest traits in it. Grace and beauty are ideas it did not suggest. Not that it was ungainly, for it was not. It was not rude; only it was not exquisite. The lightness and polish of the model Greek it lacked; the force and strength of his own sorrowing Erin were its boast. Nor was a body ever more largely endowed with the true activities of life than his. Even when he slept I should think his muscles often twitched with life. With this his whole frame seemed ever replete. Every motion and emotion of the man evinced its bounding presence. His walk, his talk, his look, and laugh were fervent with it. This, through life, kept him from acquiring the courtly studied manner too often and always unwisely assumed by the great. A slow measured bow was some-

thing he could not make. Life rushed on too fast. It left him not the time. He shook your hand in passing you; looked back and made his hasty remark, and then darted on as if some grand and inexorable current bore him away. This never-sleeping energy of his nature often exhibited his body at a disadvantage. He had no time to study gestures. His act was as inartificial as that of the untutored child who does not know that the world has criticism to make, and heeds not the world's criticism when it is made. When he walked he was apt to walk too fast, as if the leading idea were on the wing and he was pressed in the pursuit. When he rode he rocked on his horse, as if to aid his speed; and even in his speech he often articulated one word too hurriedly in hastening to the next. To the eye this gave him a rather rugged, irregular appearance, but at the same time it served to show him in the sublime, original light in which nature delights to exhibit her finest samples of handiwork. With a body formed as his was, any one at all acquainted with human nature would have predicted for him a life of not less than eighty years; and he fell only a little short of that. With less exhausting mental labor than he performed, he might well have reached ninety; to which add a degree of physical repose to which it may truly be said he knew nothing, and a hundred years might have fallen his lot. But for his sake we shall not lament that a merciful Providence spared him the burden of the additional twenty.

But Mr. Campbell's chief greatness lay in his intellect. In resources of mind no word but opulent will describe him. Here he was great, pre-eminently great in the true sense of that fine simple word. No one could gaze on that grand head, or look on that bold unique face, without feeling impressed with this fact. His head was large, very large; his forehead high, with all the breadth necessary to amplitude; while the distance from the point of the ear to the center of the frontal bone revealed the capacious home which God had built for his thought. His head I think the finest I ever saw. It was simply faultless. After the first look, you never criticized it; you only admired it. You dwelt on it only to wonder how munificently nature sometimes works. His head never disappointed you. No matter with reference to what you studied it, it always complimented your highest

expectations. Was it the abode of a mind of extraordinary strength? Every confirmation of it answered yes. Was it filled with a soul of profound devotion? The answer was the same. Did it betoken that its occupant was marred by any dangerous or unlovely eccentricities? Not one. Every point, angle, and curve on it revealed that nice adjustment of faculty to faculty which renders greatness safe, and assigns to it its true position in the lead of earth's great beneficent change. On once looking on that fine largely turned head, you never feared to trust it more. On the contrary you thence confided in it as the babe does in the mother. You felt sure it would do right. Mr. Campbell's eye was too small, and set too far back in his high head. This, I grant, gave to it the appearance of sharpness and penetration; but at the same time it lent to it a look of fierceness from which you a little shrank. Had his eye been larger and a little more prominent, with a milder expression, it would have comported better with his half Roman face, and relieved it of a look which the word hard, if mildly used, somewhat accurately expresses. But this is said only in the spirit of the critic, and not in that filial affection in which alone I would now recall the lineaments of that noble face. My object is not to dissent from what is so excellent, but to be just to what so well deserved it.

So eminently was Mr. Campbell's mind fitted for most of the great pursuits, that it is difficult to say which one it was best fitted for. Had the law been his calling, that he would have stood the peer of the great masters, as Webster and Marshall, none who knew him, I believe, will deny. Indeed, I doubt not whether he would have excelled them all. He always struck me as possessing peculiar qualifications for the law. His large inborn love of right, his naturalness, especially his capacious and wonderfully well-balanced mind, would certainly have assigned him the first rank in settling those complex and difficult questions of law and equity which are constantly arising in the higher courts. Then at times he evinced a wiry mode of address and magnetism in speech, which would have enabled him to sway benches and juries as few men have ever swayed them. Still, though we have every confidence that he would have made the first and most brilliant of lawyers, yet how thankful

we feel that he was not a lawyer. In that case he might have left us a fine work on Evidence, or a masterpiece on Equity, but, then, we should never have had his magnificent eulogies on the "great Messiah," his pleadings for the Bible alone, or his manful, heartwarm defenses of the one only true way of salvation to the sinner. What his loss to the world would have been, had he gone to the law, we can only know by comprehending the whole magnitude of his vast achievements under Christ in behalf of primitive Christianity. I repeat, that I am thankful that the hand that made him kept him from the law.

In medicine, I think, he would always have stood low. Here he would have been a theorist, and would hence have failed. For a doctor, I think, he had few qualifications. Medicine requires not certainly a greater mind than he possessed, but a finer one. It requires a mind which delights in details, in ultimate atoms and particles. In the discussion of primal cells Mr. Campbell would have taken no pleasure. His active, discursive nature would have disqualified him for it. The comprehensive generalization, the universal affirmative, the far-fetching induction—these were his delight. Mountains, not atoms, were his study; ages, not minutes. To have bent over a magnifying glass of immense power for half a day, for the purpose of defining the shape of a particle of blood, is something he could never have done. Had he studied medicine he would have abandoned it, and gone to astronomy.

As a statesman and politician, Mr. Campbell would have been transcendent. I believe he would have stood even higher here than in religion. His breadth of intellect, his power of generalization, his ability to cut straight through a huge mass of facts to the one necessary and all-determining one, his genial nature, his brilliant ready talk with the common people—these would have left him without a rival. Indeed he never was a clergyman. Nature had not made him one, and he could never assume the character. It is but just to add that he never tried. His religion was a matter of principle, of conviction. In it was nothing conventional. Hence he never impressed the world as trying to seem clerical. He had neither clerical airs nor clerical gaits. He neither walked like one nor talked like one. And

as he never seemed to be one, few people, not knowing him, ever suspected him for one. He had about him an active, sprightly business air; an impatience of confinement, and a love of out-door life, which, combined with his other fine traits, would have made him the gayest and most fascinating politician. His large and varied knowledge, his love of all mankind, his inimitable powers of conversation, ever sporting and playing in the most easy and graceful way with subjects from the most abstruse to the simplest—these would have endeared him to the great commonalty, and perpetually have secured him their enthusiastic support. Thus his elevation to the highest place in the gift of the people would have been certain. And once high in power, the masterly way in which he would have handled the great questions of state would have made him the idol of his own people and the admiration of all civilized nations. I do not think he could ever have had a superior here.

As a historian, Mr. Campbell would have excelled only in some respects. In collecting facts, in combining propositions remotely connected, and in drawing inferences, he would have been unsurpassed; that is, he would have been a master in the mere logic of history. In other respects he would have failed. That he could have written as splendidly as Gibbon, and as faithfully as McIntosh, I do not hesitate to assert. But he could never have equaled the luminous and dramatic Macaulay. Mr. Campbell stated facts well; but he never vivified them, and made them sparkle with the bright light of genius as they left his hand. He arranged them with skill; but his arrangement had more the stiffness of rule than grace of life. His combinations lacked ease and ornament. He did not festoon his facts with drapery which left them gleaming like golden sands in the silvery current of the mountain spring. Hence he would have failed in the finest feature of history. Again: Mr. Campbell lacked the rare power of sketching to the life personal character. Without this no man can succeed in history. Here men must live and act as in real life. They must be reproduced with that vividness which makes you see and hear, after ages gone, the very intonations of voice in which each spoke.

This power of reproduction Mr. Campbell did not possess.

He would have made you understand his characters, not see them. Thus his histories would have abounded in personal sketches; they would all have been sketches of bloodless and pulseless bodies. He would have shown you men's faces; but they would have been the expressionless faces of men as seen beneath the coffin lid. But precisely the intellectual powers which would have placed Mr. Campbell among the first of men in the great departments of literature to which we have alluded, made him the first of uninspired men in the department of religion. For while we intend scrupulously to refrain from pronouncing mere hollow eulogies upon the great dead, we yet do not hesitate to affirm that since the last inspired man bowed his head in death a greater than our lamented brother has not risen. This, of course, we do not expect bigots, and others who did not know him, to admit. We expect this verdict only from his friends who knew him, and who have the magnanimity of soul to grudge him neither his powers nor his rank.

But though we award Mr. Campbell the possession of the highest and rarest gifts of intellect, yet no one who ever studied him could have failed to observe how completely he was deficient in certain respects. As to the powers necessary in a great metaphysician, he had positively none. He showed not even a trace of them. Hamilton would have smiled at any pretensions he might have made to a knowledge of metaphysics as at the harmless pretensions of a schoolboy. Of course, we do not mean that Mr. Campbell had not read metaphysics, nor that he could not understand metaphysics—this is not what we mean. We mean, simply, that he had no taste for metaphysics, and that hence hardly a trace of them can be found in his writings. Had he been left to produce works on metaphysics for a living, we believe he would have died as poor as Goldsmith, and perhaps the subject of as much ridicule.

Again; no one who knew him can have failed to notice how completely he was lacking in those powers of the imagination which insure the success of the poet and the novelist. To say that he was destitute of even the semblance of these would perhaps be extravagant, and yet it is doubtful whether this strong language would do him injustice. Mr. Campbell abounded in

the use of adjectives and epithets, which, to the unpracticed ear, often seemed to invest his efforts, whether written or spoken, with the appearance of the poetic and imaginative. But he has left us hardly a genuine trace of either upon record. To compare him in these respects with Milton or Sir Walter Scott would positively be to offer insult to the good taste of the world. Of poetry he had in his nature just none; of imagination just next thing to none. But when we thus speak we are not to be understood as saying that Mr. Campbell never rose up to the full height of the sublime. Very far from it. This he did, often did. But his sublimity was the sublimity which springs from grandeur of thought, and not from the gorgeous creations of the imagination or the gildings of a poetic fancy. His mind was great, his thoughts great; and what men felt to be great they concluded must be the product of a teeming imagination or the outcrop of a rich poetic vein. But in this the world was wrong. Again : Mr. Campbell's thoughts were replete with a wonderful life and vigor. They bore you on like the fathomless currents of the sea. Beneath every one you felt the throb of a soul which amazed you by its marvelous strength. This abounding life and vigor also men easily mistook for the evidence of imagination and the presence of high poetic inspiration. But what men felt was simple inornate greatness, and neither imagination nor poetic genius.

But now in what light shall we view these deficiencies as affecting Mr. Campbell? Must we regard them in the light of mere deficiencies and as subtracting so much from the power and worth of a great man? if not, in what light shall we view them? I answer, we should view them in the light of special providential appointments, designed pre-eminently to fit Mr. Campbell for the very work which God called him to do. Had he been a metaphysician, we should have today been strangers to the glorious work he has bequeathed to us. He would have woven into the fabric of the gospel the subtleties of his intellect and recast Christianity into recondite scientific moulds and left us a creed, instead of, as he has, the word and light of the divine Master, evoked from the tomb of human folly and human rubbish, put as in the day when the Spirit gave to this word and its light its completing touch. We feel profoundly

thankful that Mr. Campbell was not a metaphysician. In that case he would have struck out some new track of abstruse speculative thought parallel to, or it might have been divergent from, Calvinism, or some other ism equally remote from the primitive truth. This he would have embodied into some book of Institutes, and then have passed away, leaving the world only the darker for having been in it.

If, in addition to this, he had been a man of highly imaginative or poetic powers, he would have compounded the dreams of Plato, and the teachings of Christ, and thus have given us some new Gnosticism. Or he would have blended the shadowy lights of the Mosaic day with the splendid intellectualism of Greece, and a new system of philosophy, devoid of even one thought from Christ, would have been the result. Side by side with the sturdy facts of the gospel would have stood the nebulous myths of the past; while the traditions of the saints and martyrs would have disputed the pre-eminence with the sayings of Paul and James. The frost of antiquity would have gleamed in spicules on every page of his writings, with scarcely the semblance of truth to sober the delusive picture. Tradition would have occupied the place of divine authority; psychology that of inspiration; and the commandments of Jesus would have fallen into desuetude, as being unsuited to the exemption from law of pure idealism.

While, then, we rejoice in the greatness of Mr. Campbell, we rejoice still more in this, that he was not great in the respects just named, he was pre-eminently a man for naked truth, naked fact and naked divine authority. He neither wanted these illumined by the coruscations of the imagination, nor improved by the refinings of the metaphysician. He stood for the simplicity which is in Christ, and delighted only in the ultimate elements of the gospel. In these he refused to allow accretion or diminution. He was a warrior in an instant, with a broad, keen blade, ready to strike the moment the truth of Christ was to be marred even in the minutest item. "This," he said, "is perfect, and I fall a martyr ere the profane fingers of mortal shall smut it or change it." All honor to this great sentinel for his heroism and intrepidity here.



Of Mr. Campbell's scholarship I will not be expected to say much. The proof of what it was and all it was is fully before the world. Perhaps it would better become me to pass it in silence. But I am so anxious that he shall stand forth in the exact character in which God intended him to work, and which alone he could have done the work he did, that I am willing, if need be, by speaking of him, to subject myself to the inconsiderate censure of those who can never know how wholly incapable I am of doing him even the semblance of injustice, if thereby I can succeed in setting him forth in that character. Mr. Campbell was a great man. I place him among the very first of the greatest. He was a fine scholar, not a profound one. He was great in thought, commanding in learning; but not transcendent. Will my brethren forgive me this boldness? Do I mean herein and hereby to detract from the good name of departed greatness? The very reverse. Hear me then. Mr. Campbell was no graduate of any institution of learning. Still we have just ground for saying that when he left the University of Glasgow for the United States, he was the full equal of any young man of his age who had been in that institution no longer than he had been. He was all that he could be up to the time of his leaving. After settling in this country, it is well known that he became soon involved in business, which left him little leisure for more than the mere revision of what he had acquired before quitting his native land and Glasgow. He understood something of Hebrew; was thoroughly conversant with Greek and Latin, and read French well. This was about the extent of his lingual information. Of the sciences, his knowledge was what is termed in the old country liberal. His reading was certainly varied and extensive. More than this we, perhaps, would not be warranted in saying.

But how again shall this circumstance be viewed as bearing on the great work of his life? Favorably, very favorably. Mr. Campbell had all the learning necessary to enable him to discover the whole will of Christ. To the discovery and the defense of this will he devoted both his learning and his life. For this purpose he certainly had none too much time. Had he spent more of his time in rendering his scholarship profounder than it was, or had he devoted more of his years to purely

literary pursuits, then clearly must he have left incomplete the very work he did not leave incomplete. Again: it is at least questionable whether a more thorough, especially a more minute scholarship than he possessed, might not have had the bad effect to unfit him for those original natural modes of thought which so peculiarly adapted him to his Master's work. A deeper devotion to human learning might have weakened his perfect confidence in the divine. Most likely, at least, it would have left him less natural, which would certainly have rendered his success less sure.

But the peculiar greatness of Mr. Campbell lay not in his broad intellect, his capacious thought, or his learning. Neither did it lie in the vigor of his soul, or the reach of his view. Nor yet in the activity of his nature, his powerful speech or mastery over the wills of men. It lay in none of these. Mr. Campbell's greatness lay in his power to perceive intuitively the truth. This power will make a common man great; it makes a great one transcendent; and such was our fallen brother. We say his greatness lay in his power to perceive intuitively the truth. Let us be understood. Mr. Campbell never discovered the truth by induction. Yet he was fond of induction, spoke of it often, and used it well. Still he discovered nothing by it. He admired the great Bacon; but induction was for one purpose in Bacon's hands, for a different one in his. Mr. Campbell saw the truth at once and directly; he only defended it by induction. Bacon both discovered and defended it. Again: Bacon discovered only physical truth by induction; Mr. Campbell, divine truth without it. The difference between them was great.

Hence Mr. Campbell was never able to account satisfactorily for his discoveries of the truth amid the darkness which enveloped the early days of his life. The plain truth is, he himself did not know how he had discovered the truth, or why. As proof of this, whenever asked how he happened on this or that, or how such and such points had been suggested to his mind, he uniformly seemed confused and unable to answer. In reply, of course, he always said something; but then you felt that what he said did not fully meet the case. And this was really so. Indeed the truth had flashed upon his mind from time

to time by simple intuition; hence he could never give an account of it. Had he discovered it by induction, then could he have retraced the steps by which he reached it, and explained the whole process. But this he had not done, hence his inability to explain.

But when we say that Mr. Campbell discovered the truth by intuition, we may be misconceived. Let me then explain. He made no original discoveries. Far from it. The truth which he discovered had already been revealed, and lay imbedded in the sacred page. This and this only is the truth which he discovered, and this is the only discovery we claim for him. But this truth we say he discovered immediately; that is, by intuition, and not by induction.

But we shall be told that in thus speaking we give to Mr. Campbell no very high merit. We beg to dissent, and say that we award him a merit which we award no other man since the gospel first became corrupted. The truth lay on the sacred page as much for others as for him. Why, then, did others not discover it? Is it no small merit to say that he alone did what none others before him had done, and this to the glory of Christ and happiness of men?

It is proper to note the relation of other striking traits of Mr. Campbell to what we deem his great master power—the power of intuition. We notice these traits not to show how they aided this power, for intuition is never aided by other powers, but to show how they never interfered with it.

1. His faith.—No trait of this eminent man shone more conspicuously through his long and eventful life than did his never-flagging faith. It was the noblest mark in his noble life. But in some respects it was peculiar. So strong and simple was it, that at times it assumed the form of the most pliant credulity; indeed to some it would have seemed to have reached even the point of superstition. At such times it appeared a positive weakness. No matter what the tale was, if consistently and innocently told, it found an auditor in him. This occasionally rendered him the victim of unprincipled cunning. No man ever detested knavery more; yet no man was ever more liable to be practiced upon by knaves. But this was owing solely to the

perfect simplicity of his faith. As it was wholly free from every trace of skepticism, so it was ready to credit anything. Consequently, when directed to the word of God, it accepted without question, or one wish to modify, everything it found therein. Hence, what Mr. Campbell saw therein by intuition, he instantly embraced in the identical form in which he there saw it, and ever afterward held it with marvelous firmness. Thus his great chief power and his pure faith wrought together to perfect him for this grand work.

2. His naturalness.—If of any full-grown man it could ever truly be said, he was perfectly a child of nature, surely it could be said of Mr. Campbell. Of the artificial he had not one vestige in him. He had it neither in his look nor in his talk, in his writing, nor in anything else. Never was man freer from the influence of mere conventionalities. He thought as no other man ever thought, spoke as no other man ever spoke, wrote as no other man ever wrote. He was himself simply, original, natural, true, just as the Father made him. Not a crooked line in him had ever been straightened by art, nor a straight one crooked. In harmony with this, rather as a piece of it, he had no imitation. None but a divine example could move him, and this from no inclination to follow others, but from principle, or as a matter of duty. He could have never succeeded in any of the fine arts. Had he gone to statuary, painting, or music, his name would never have been heard of. And had he gone to the stage he would certainly have died in an almshouse. I should think that any effort he might have made in any imitative form must have ended in a failure, nothing short of ludicrous.

Now no one can fail to see the direct bearing which these traits had upon the work of his life. His perfect naturalness restrained him from attempting any embellishment of what he discovered in the word of God. Precisely as he there found things, he there left things. They were just to his taste in their original form. If rude, they were natural, and it was right; if smooth, they were natural and it was right; if grand, they were natural, and it was right—in a word, whatever form they assumed was natural, and therefore with right. Again : he imitated nothing, followed no one. Hence ancient precedents and illus-

trious examples, unless divinely approved, were neither precedents nor examples for him. He set at naught the decrees of councils, and tossed aside the prescriptions of the great, where they stood against the word of God, with as little compunction as he parted the thread the spider had spun across his path. But this would not have been the case had he been differently organized. Hence I set clown not only his natural endowments, but even his natural deficiencies, as being designed in the providence of God to be a peculiar aid to him in completing his work.

Besides, we cannot but think that the very location he chose for his home was specially designed for him in the providence of God, and that it had no small influence on the great work he did. He sat down among the hills of West Virginia, on the little stream of Buffalo, amid a hardy, simple population, who had no more power to appreciate him than they had to compute the distance from their respective doors to the most distant star. Here he lived in comparative seclusion to the day of his death, dwelling in the same house in which he had married his first wife, and in which his children were born. True, in the course of time, he collected around him a few highly cultivated and gifted friends, as professors in his beloved college. These accomplished brethren were his life-long friends, and helped him much. Still must it be said that for the most part he dwelt alone, far away from the great marts of trade and centers of literature and fashion. Whether these could ever have had any influence on him or not, we, of course, are not able to say; but of this we feel glad, that he dwelt remotely from them. The pride of his life was thus passed in the lap of his own romantic hills. Here on the Lord's day, for many a year, in a rude, untidy little meeting house, he wasted the splendors of his great mind. His dozy congregation numbered often not more than fifty. They had wound down their hill-side paths to hear him preach. Many of them passed the time as unconsciously as did the bodies of the dead, which slept in the yard close by. Others lent him a drowsy ear, as incapable of appreciating his masterly inductions as were the kine that browsed on his pastures. The week he would pass in his study, amid his choice books, illumining and spicing the pages of his

immortal Christian Baptist, or enriching with his riper and more sober thought his great Harbinger. Many a piece of a day he spent wandering besides his winding Buffalo, or clambering over its neighboring woody slopes. Here, often seated on a log, or perched like the wild mountain bird on some lone rock, he would pass unconscious hours deep wrapped in thought, or searching the meaning in some dark text in his Greek Testament. If he passed a teamster stuck in the mud, he clapped his burly shoulder to the wheel, and shouted to the team, as if he had been bred to fit the cart and its toils. If he passed a ragged orphan boy, he stopped him, asked for his mother, gave him his secret penny, and then wept over him tenderly as did the Saviour with the stricken Martha and Mary. Such were the scenes amid which he ripened and mellowed for the work to which God in his mercy called him. If the flocks of Midian were the most fitting school in which to train Moses for his immortal mission, were not the oak covered hills and the deep shadowy vales of Bethany the very spot in which to nurse this great restorer of the gospel to the age in which we live? We cannot but think that one greater than he had much to do in fixing even his home where it stood. Being here alone he was left free to prosecute his studies and pursue his thought in his own original way, with no interference from those great local and religious forces which are constantly at work in large cities. He thus studied Christianity in the light of nature, because in the light of his own unperverted mind. Never could he have succeeded otherwise.

Of Mr. Campbell's religious life it is not necessary that I should speak at length. This was lovely indeed. Nothing human can be pronounced more perfect. His religion, like himself, was as inartificial as the blood on which it was founded. It was a matter of profound conviction and duty. Hence it was sedate, unimpassioned, and uniform; it was neither showy nor fitful, but tranquil, cheerful, and fluent.

At nightfall he collected his family in his homely parlor, and arranged them in order around the room. Each then read a verse, he reading with the rest. In this reading, every soul in the house was expected to take part, from the Indian boy of

the wild prairies of the West to the elegant guest of his hospitable home. The chapter for the evening being read, a song was usually sung, when all bowed in the presence of God. His prayers were usually long, inimitably reverential, and chaste. At times they were broad and grand. All this was repeated in the morning. In the intervals, in the social circle, Christ and the gospel were the never-ending themes of his conversation. On these he never flagged himself, nor wearied his delighted hearer. These conversations were often relieved by bursts of eloquence, which even his finest flights in the pulpit never surpassed. Yet his manner was as easy and natural as that of a child. Of his greatness he seemed never for a moment conscious; of his religion, never for a moment unconscious. Not an object in nature did he see, from the orb which illumines day to the insect which lay beneath his glass, that did not suggest to him something of the wisdom, power, or goodness of God. Every accident of life, whether prosperous or adverse, was the text for some appropriate comment replete with hope or consolation. Being an ardent believer in the special providence of God, he looked on nothing as happening without his notice or interference. Consequently, no matter what occurred, he bowed to it either in a spirit of reverential submission, or in one of cheerfulness and joy. Hence, if he held his hand on the noble brow of his father as he breathed his last, he would calmly say: "It is all right"; if he wept by her grave as men buried his lovely daughter, he would sigh: "It is all right." Thus in the stroke that broke his heart, as well as in that which lifted up his soul, he read the presence of the ever-merciful hand. In the anguish of his spirit he sometimes groaned, but never complained. Truly was his religious life a poem, replete with loveliness and beauty. Among the many things which honored him personally and made him great, we give to this the very highest place.

Of the labors of Mr. Campbell's life I cannot consent to speak at length. This must be the work of his biographer. Nor am I willing to speak of them in vague general terms. This could be interesting to none. I must hence, in alluding to them, be brief.

The first thing which seems to have struck his mind with peculiar force, and to have aroused in it that train of thought which resulted so fruitfully, was the existing divisions at the time among the professed followers of Christ. As a fact these divisions were palpable. This needed no proof. Hence the first question he raised was: Are these divisions right? This question he promptly decided in the negative. With this decision we are not surprised; with a different one we should have been. For no candid man with the New Testament in his hand can pronounce it right that the children of God should be divided. With a view to remedying these divisions, he seems next to have inquired into their cause. This was natural. For if the cause be detected and removed, certainly we should expect the effect to cease. Mr. Campbell seems to have concluded that creeds and confessions of faith are the chief cause in effecting and fostering divisions. Hence to oppose them was with him, not only a life-long work, but a work of conscience. For a few of these preliminary views Mr. Campbell was indebted to his excellent father, who aided him much in his early labors. But his own active and powerful mind once fully aroused kept ahead of all others in the labor which crowned his life. The rebound from the insufficiency of creeds to the all-sufficiency of the word of God was the next step. No step could have been more natural; certainly none more productive of good. Here Mr. Campbell stood for life. Indeed the all-sufficiency of the word of God is the true comprehensive generalization of his labors. To this every thought must be referred; from this every act sprang. This determined the man; this determined his work.

As soon as he had accepted the postulate (for postulate it is) that the Bible alone teaches the religion of God, his positive work began. His first great object was to make himself profoundly acquainted with this book. How well he succeeded I must not trust myself to say, for I rank no uninspired man with him here. As his own conceptions of this blessed book began to assume accuracy and definiteness, he began to mold and shape the thoughts of others. Immense crowds now flocked to his appointments to hear him. They were delighted with his



noble plea for the Bible and the Bible alone. As he taught men how to read it (for at that time, let it astound none, men did not know), their appreciation of it arose; and as their appreciation of the Bible arose, their appreciation of human creeds sank, and their appreciation of creeds once on the wane could never be stopped. Thus the first great blow which Mr. Campbell's position enabled him to strike was his fatal blow at human creeds. From this blow they have never recovered. May heaven grant they never may!

His next most important work was his attack on the traditions and superstitions which had accumulated in the popular religious mind. In order to render this attack successful, he took the position, then bold, always just, that every thought and deed must be subjected to the Bible; and that whatever cannot abide the application of this test must be rejected. His masterly defense of this position, and destructive use of it, amazed and alarmed the sects of the day, but delighted the pure in heart, who loved the truth, and had long groaned under the burden of these traditions. The sects grew furious and belligerent; the children of God held up their drooping heads and blessed the Lord for the good day which had fallen to their lot. With the former Mr. Campbell grew daily less popular; with the latter daily more so. The people resolutely stood for the man who resolutely stood for them; and never did man stand for the people in truer fashion than did Mr. Campbell. He told them God had spoken to them; and made them see what God had said. He vindicated, as had never been done before, their ability to understand for themselves the Scriptures of truth, and their right to obey the things contained therein. Thus the work went grandly on. The power of tradition was daily weakened—the voice of superstition was daily enfeebled. Ghosts deserted the land: voices were hushed; while "the called and sent" mourned the degeneracy of the times, and vowed that experimental religion was fast becoming extinct.

Among the injurious superstitions of the day, Mr. Campbell none more successfully opposed than he did the silly pretensions of the clergy, that they were especially called and sent. His onset on these men was positively sublime. They were fine

marks for his caustic wit and racy tongue; and never did wit or tongue fall short of its mark. They literally raved; I will not say they swore. The great dialection of Bethany kept cool, while God helped him to skin and denude these hollow pretenders. The clergy pouted, the people laughed, while pretense after pretense glided growlingly away.

Thus Mr. Campbell's great negative work is summed up in his opposition to human creeds, his opposition to the superstitions which were traditionally held to accompany what is phrased, "getting religion," and his opposition to the pretensions of the clergy.

But Mr. Campbell's work was far from being negative. It did not consist in simple opposition to this or that, however much such opposition was needed. It had in it something still higher, still better. The whole force of his mind was now directed to the word of God. This he was studying with intense thought. Its meaning was gradually opening to him. Among the first things which struck him was the great and imperious necessity for pure speech. By this is meant the expression of revealed thought in the identical words of the Bible. To him it seemed clear that purity of speech was a necessary condition of purity of thought, and purity of thought a necessary antecedent of union. On it, therefore, he insisted with great warmth, Time has only served to demonstrate his wisdom in the item.

Mr. Campbell had now reached the point from which to unfold the true plan of salvation. To elaborate from the New Testament this plan, and present it in its completeness, is the supreme honor of his life. This was his great and peculiar mission. Had he done no more than execute this faithfully, he would still be entitled to the profound gratitude of the world. In unfolding this plan, then so complete an enigma to those who sought the way of the Lord, his first act was to call attention to the Saviour. Christ was to be conceived only in the light of the New Testament, and to be spoken of only in its terms. All speculation respecting him was to be dismissed. This work Mr. Campbell continued through life. For truly it can be said that the Messiah was his perpetual theme and his high-

est delight. To him all eyes were turned as the only source of salvation.

Next faith in Christ was discussed. Its true nature, value, and place were all determined. Mountains of rubbish were here dissipated. For while other subjects were involved in quite as much confusion as that of faith, none was involved in more. That faith is the simple belief of the truth, that it is induced simply by hearing the word of God, that on it all must at once and without delay submit to the Saviour—these were strange things in the early part of Mr. Campbell's labors.

Repentance was also defined; and its true nature unfolded and illustrated. It was shown to be an act, and not an impartation to the soul or a feeling excited in it by some occult inscrutable influence of the Holy Spirit. Not only so, it was shown to be an act entirely under the control of the will of the party repenting, and not an effect wrought in him in which he is merely passive. To that age these were most heretical positions. With them the common people were delighted; against them the preachers poured out the bitterness of their souls. For the first time in long dreary centuries men began to feel that Christianity was perfectly adapted to them in their present state; and that hence all its blessings are available things. They now began to feel that salvation is for all; and that all may at once, and without the toils of the anxious seat, attain it. Men grew wild with joy. They vowed the millennium was at hand, and that the new doctrine would take the world. Such were the feelings with which Mr. Campbell and the simple truth as it is in Christ were everywhere received.

Also the true nature of baptism, especially its true design, was unfolded with irresistible force of argument, and all its peculiarities treated with the utmost minuteness of detail. Indeed it is not going too far to say that the whole ordinance, except the simple act itself, was literally exhumed from the rubbish beneath which the criminal folly of man had buried it. We are amazed at the achievements of Mr. Campbell here. It is but just to add that in all this good work he was greatly and signally aided and abetted by many excellent and Godly men,

most of whom now rest with him. I should delight to honor them by name, but can not here.

Still further, the true office and precise work of the Holy Spirit in the matter of conversion and sanctification were fully set forth in the light of the gospel, and at once became the joy of an age which had lived in painful darkness on this point. This work of Mr. Campbell, and no other deserves higher praise, provoked heavy opposition. He was denounced off all hands as an innovator and a heretic; but he heeded it not. Being bold and scrupulously honest, and feeling profoundly sure that he was right, he pushed the cause of his Master grandly on. The spectacle of his controversies and triumphs now became sublime. We should delight to dwell on them, but must not.

Mr. Campbell held during his life three great decisive debates, which deserve a passing notice. In his debate with the bold, defiant Owen, he stood the champion of Christianity in America. In this debate Mr. Campbell proved himself a consummate master in the arts of logic. Indeed this has been termed his great debate, and his eight-hour speech in this debate, his great speech. It gave him immense popularity and influence with the people. It marked an epoch in his history.

In his debate with Bishop Purcell he attacked the arrogant and hollow pretensions of Roman Catholicism. In his debate with Mr. Rice the traditions and other baseless tenets of Protestantism were put to test. These two, we think, are his great debates; and the last of them his greatest. These debates opened for him a broad field of usefulness. Today we are reaping their fruits. But we can not dwell on them longer.

Mr. Campbell was an editor from 1823 to 1863, a period of forty years. During this time, including his debates which he merely assisted in bringing out, the two editions of the Hymn Book, he issued from the press fifty-two volumes. In addition to this, must be added, as a part of his work traveling unknown thousands of miles, and preaching countless numbers of sermons. Such is only a very meagre sketch of the labors of this wonderful man.

Nothing peculiar seems to have marked his dying moments. He was at himself only at intervals. In these he evinced the same unwavering faith and boundless hope which had borne him up through his long life. His last words were an emphatic expression of profound confidence that Christ would hold the candle for him as he stooped beneath the cold shadows of death. And now his work is gloriously done, and he sleeps till the trump of God shall wake him. Grand old man, and tenderly beloved brother! it will nigh break my heart to tell thee good-by. Yet, since it must be so, fare thee well, thou friend of God, thou friend of Christ, thou friend of the Bible, thou friend of man—fare thee well!

**Elder Walter Scott's Demise**

BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

I have not yet seen any published notice of the death of our much beloved and esteemed Elder Walter Scott. I have just now learned by a letter of April 25, from brother L. P. Streator, that he was seized, one week before he wrote me, with a severe attack of Typhoid Pneumonia, at his own house, which, in seven days, terminated his pilgrimage on this earth. With the exception of his son Samuel, absent from home, he was followed to the grave by all his children. No death in my horizon, out of my own family, came more unexpectedly or more ungrateful to my ears than this of our much beloved and highly appreciated brother Walter Scott; and none awoke more tender sympathies and regrets. Next to my father, he was my most cordial and indefatigable fellow laborer in the origin and progress of the present reformation. We often took counsel together in our efforts to plead and advocate the paramount claims of original and apostolic Christianity. His whole heart was in the work. He was, indeed, truly eloquent in the whole import of that word in pleading the claims of the Author and Founder of the Christian faith and hope; and in disabusing the inquiring mind of all its prejudices, misapprehensions and errors. He was, too, most successful in winning souls to the allegiance of the Divine Author and Founder of the Christian Institution, and in putting to silence the cavilings and objections of the modern Pharisees and Sadducees of Sectariandom.

He, indeed, possessed, upon the whole view of his character, a happy temperament. It is true, though not a verb, he had his moods and tenses as men of genius generally have. He was both logical and rhetorical in his conceptions and utterances. He could and did simultaneously address and interest the understanding, the conscience, and the heart of his hearers; and in his happiest seasons constrain their attention and their acquiescence.

He was, in his palmiest days, a powerful and a successful advocate of the claims of the Lord Messiah on the heart and life of every one who had recognized his person and mission; and especially upon those who had, in their baptism, vowed eternal allegiance to His adorable name. lie, without any partiality or enmity in his heart to any human being, manfully and magnanimously proclaimed the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so far as he understood it, regardless of human applause or of human condemnation. He had a strong faith in the person and mission, and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. He had a rich hope of the life everlasting, and of the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading.

I knew him well. I knew him long. I loved him much. We might not, indeed, agree in every opinion nor in every point of expediency. But we never loved each other less, because we did not acquiesce in every opinion, and in every measure. By the eye of faith and the eye of hope, me thinks I see him in  
Abraham's bosom.

A.C.

**Letters, Etc., From Walter Scott's Works**

## EXTRACT OF A LETTER

Nicholasville, (Ky.) January 17, 1832

Dear Brother Scott:—Permit me to inform you of a mighty conquest which truth and the love of it, have lately obtained in Lexington, Ky., at a three days' meeting held in the above place, by Brethren John Smith, John T. Johnson, B. W. Stone, Rogers T. Smith, J. Creath, sen. and others in the Christian Brethren Meeting-House; when all seemed to be inspired with a wish to promote the good cause of Gospel truth: Brothers John Smith and Barton W. Stone, the first a Calvinistic Baptist, the other, one of those denominated a Christian, arose on Saturday to address the people, when they both declared to the congregation that they had no doubt speculated much for the last ten or twenty years in relation to Gospel truth, as well upon the subject of the trinity, as upon other subjects, that they were not conscious of having effected any good by it, but some evil. That for the future, they now both determined to cease from all speculation upon the oracles of God; stop where they stopped; and go when they commanded; and in a word, to oppose everything else as the standard of Divine truth. It was then proposed that all who felt willing to unite upon these principles (faith and pardon) as the only infallible ones, in order to Christian fellowship, should do so by the mutual giving of the hand; when many brethren and sisters, both of the Christian and reforming order, joyfully did so; and, on the Lord's day, broke the loaf together in commemoration of our Lord with much joy. When we see, Bro. Scott, old men who have been the leaders of a sect for years, cast their crown at the feet of Jesus and submit alone to him, we are bound to believe that it proceeds from the love of the truth, and not the aggrandizement of a party. Old Brother Stone is a man of talent and much reputation for piety, and I rejoice at the prospect of seeing before very long the mighty army which will be marshaled in the field upon these glorious principles. It is



proposed to employ Brothers John Smith and Rogers, to labour the next twelve months amongst the churches in order to promote this wished for union, and to convert the aliens.

Geo. W. Elley

It is now thirteen years nearly (1819) since I and a few others, perhaps ten or twelve, sat down in the ancient order of the Church, as explained in the writings of the brethren; at that time we knew of no other church of like faith and order? I had been a Presbyterian, but my mind now became wholly revolutionized and sunk down like lead, upon the first principles of the Gospel, as may be seen in a few essays which I had the pleasure of writing for the periodical of our distinguished Bro. Alexander Campbell about 10 years ago, these essays were upon the one fact developed in the 4 Gospels: viz. that 'Jesus is the Christ' entitled on 'Teaching Christianity,' and over the signature of 'Philip.'

I projected the scheme of a New Testament like that which has since been successfully Edited by Bro. A. Campbell, went to the Printer, Mr. Butler of Pittsburgh with the prospectus, but discovered that my means were wholly too limited, and I abandoned the attempt.

I then published the prospectus of a periodical to be entitled the "Millennial Herald," got a goodly number of subscribers, and intended to discuss the two subjects of the ancient Gospel, and the Millennium. My views on both these subjects have since been printed. I had vacated my school for the purpose of having the first of these Numbers printed, when an interview with Bro. Campbell carried me to the Western Reserve, August 1827, when by a singular turn, though personally unknown to the whole association I was appointed a Preacher or Evangelist. I never made one objection to the nomination, nor to the appointment, but saw in it a providence, I believed no mortal then understood but myself. I immediately cut all other connections, abandoned my projected Editorship, dissolved my academy; left my Church, left my family, dropt the bitterest tear over my infant household that ever escaped from my eyes,

and set out under the simple conduct of Jesus Christ, to make an experiment of what is now styled the Ancient Gospel.

I had consulted no mortal on the topic of the Ancient Gospel, the very phrase was unknown, except in a single piece, which was dropt from my own pen two or three months before. I was prompted to it by no man nor set of men, nor did I get it from men, but from the book of God, and that too by a course of reading, meditation and prayer to God, which he alone knows, and to him alone the praise is due. My essays on the one fact required to be carried out and the matter of them reduced to practice.

In my very first tour, I left the association ground, went to the one side and made an unsuccessful experiment of the Ancient Gospel: the people fled, but I renewed the experiment with success shortly afterwards, in another place, and actually immersed the converts for the remission of sins, and for the Holy Spirit spoken by Peter, Acts 2nd. Nothing however as yet had been published on the subject of the Ancient Gospel.

All was at present experiment, had no model but the Apostles; had seen no mortal immerse for the remission of sins, no man accept the candidate, on the simple confession of the "one fact," no person propose that believers should be baptized, that they might receive the Holy Spirit.

I proceeded in this matter without example, without council, and without reference to any mode or practice which I ever saw or ever heard of. I followed Christ and his Apostles alone, and the experiment was crowned with complete success. Of this experiment Bro. Campbell took the following notice:

"Walter Scott, who is now doing the work of an Evangelist in the Mahoning Baptist association informs me per letter of the 4th ultimo, that he had made an experiment in preaching the Ancient Gospel, for ten days preceding the date of this letter. He states the effects as having been immediate and astonishing, no less than thirty have been immersed in that time, etc."

The letter is dated in Jan. 4th. Of course the experiment above referred to occurred in Dec. 1827, from which moment

the whole country around, preachers and people were aroused, and all illuminated; all was bustle and confusion and conversion. When 1828, Jan. 7, Bro. C. issued his first piece on the topic, and the matter was carried to the utmost bounds of the union.

Never was partyism so baffled as it has been by that order of elements styled the Ancient Gospel, and the reader is referred to the "Sacred Colloquy," for the manner in which the editor handled these things in 1827 for further eclclairissement if necessary.

#### CIRCULAR LETTER

Beloved Brethren—

The restoration of the ancient gospel, forms a new era in the history of reformation. To immerse for the remission of sins, that the believers might receive the promised Spirit, had wholly vanished from among the manners and customs of Christians. Antecedently to eighteen-hundred and twenty-seven, no party (although it was found in the theories of almost all) seems to have possessed the least practical knowledge of this matter, the influence, therefore, which such an administration of the gospel was intended to give the church over the world, became extinct; and the Unity which its operation in the church was intended to secure ceased to exist; the church, therefore, during three centuries has been dividing and subdividing without end; until Christianity is full of partyism, contradictories and rival interests. And we, I mean all the Protestants, have failed, entirely failed—notwithstanding all our good intentions, to accomplish the illustrious design of our Lord, when he established the church on the earth, viz: the conversion of the world.

Brethren, the ancient mode of administering the gospel, and the bond of union in the church, have been restored, through the mercy of God and of Jesus Christ, our Lord. An immediate and personal acquital from sins, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, is now brought to every man's door; a prompt salvation from the power of guilt and sin, is now held out to all penitents, and the willing converts taken down into the pure

water, and immersed for remission of sins by the high authority of the word of God, are filled with joy and the Holy Spirit.

The restoration of the ancient gospel, has shed a rich light over a thousand subjects connected with the present and past fortunes of Christianity. It forms a point, at which, religious truth and error are brought into strong contrast. On the side of the disciples, all now is light on the great matters of Remission and the Holy Spirit; perplexity has vanished and there is scarce shade of difference in the sentiments of the disciples, on these points.

Brethren, I have as you are aware, been engaged in the late endeavors to restore ancient Christianity, from the beginning; know much of all that has been doing; have witnessed the blessed affects of administering the gospel according to the apostolic plan, and have watched over its progress through the land, with intense interest. The cause is still advancing and I am persuaded that nothing but more zeal in our laborers, more zeal and devotedness in all the disciples, are necessary to make it triumph among men.

I now reside in Cincinnati, laboring in word and doctrine with the Brethren who meet in Sycamore street; and being anxious to disseminate the principles and advance the science of eternal life, I have resolved, with the help of the Lord, to avail myself of the advantages afforded by the press.

The Evangelist is to fall or stand by its merits; the first number will not warrant a final judgment on all that are to follow, and yet we give it as a kind of a specimen of what may be expected. The objects of this paper are now before the public in my prospectus. If you please to obtain for it patronage at home or abroad, you will oblige your brother in the faith. The Evangelist—1827. Walter Scott.

### **MILLENNIUM**

The hilia eta of St. John stands, as most interpreters believe, for the next thousand years of this world, which, being the seventh, and the period, during which unusual freedom and peace are to be granted to the whole creation, and to the church in particular, has been styled the thousand, or by way of eminence, the Millennium. From The Evangelist—1832.

**The Reformation**

BY WALTER SCOTT

The history of Christianity, from Christ to the Millennium, may be divided into three parts, Primitive Christianity, the Apostasy and the Reformation. We hope to be able, as often as the pages of the Evangelist admit, to furnish our readers with some of the best readings on these interesting portions of Christian history; at present, we shall say a few things of the period of the reformation. Reformation, as used by Christians stands properly for that portion of time, during which, the God of heaven has been raising up a succession of illustrious men, to proclaim repentance to the ungodly nations, before Messiah punishes them, and to warn them of the certain and speedy outpouring of those vials of interminable wrath, which are, to overwhelm the nations of the earth, for their neglect and unlimited abuse of Christianity. It possibly comprehends the whole period of the seven Apocalyptic vials the last of which introduces the Millennium.

Beginning of the Reformation.—The earliest dawn of reformation is considered to take its rise in the fourteenth century, when Wickliffe, Huss, etc., with their innumerable followers, set themselves in opposition to the reigning corruptions of the age in which they lived, and the life and death, the labors and learning, of these distinguished men, form the basis of that glorious pillar, which the successive efforts of Luther and other reformers during five centuries, have been contributing to rear.

Wickliffe was born in Yorkshire in 1324, he attacked the jurisdiction of the Pope and the Bishops; wrote many books, and is called the "first reformer." He died in thirteen hundred and eighty-four, aged sixty, and in forty-six years after, the Pope ordered his bones to be taken up and burned.

Huss took up the doctrines of Wickliffe, and was distinguished for his eloquence, and noble enthusiasm in the cause

of Christ; betrayed into the hands of his enemies, he was cast into prison and condemned in 1415, to be burnt as a heretic; he refused to plead guilty, and smiled at the chain. Though the faggots were piled up to his very chin, he called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and from among the flaming and crackling combustibles, sung a song so loud and cheerfully, that his voice was heard above the bruit of the tumultuous throng of his persecutors.

In the 16th century appeared Luther and Calvin, and Knox; in the eighteenth, John Wesley and others, who, diffused their doctrines all over the United States, England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, etc., etc.

At present, a very numerous and rapidly increasing party, plead for, not a reformation only but an entire and unqualified restoration of everything warranted in the holy scriptures, comprehended under the two titles of ancient gospel and ancient order; the first of these matters having been intended to include everything in the doctrine of Christ necessary to make disciples, and the last everything necessary to keep them disciples. The scheme has in a few years spread itself far and wide, and by means of religious periodicals, issued by individual brethren, has been carried into every state of the union and even into England, Wales and Ireland; this is the part of the professing world, to which, the editor is not ashamed to say, he has belonged.

Evangelist 1832

**The Laver of Regeneration**

BY WALTER SCOTT

The words used by the Administrator at the restoration of Baptism for the remission of sins, were "For the remission of your sins by the precious blood of Christ, and for the gift of the Holy Spirit; I immerse you into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen."

The reason why he used the words "precious blood of Christ," was, that the spectators, many of whom would not attend preaching, might understand, that although Baptism was the time, place and ordinance in which God was pleased to impart forgiveness to the truly penitent, yet the blood of Christ was, in reality, the procuring cause of remission.

The phrase—"and for the gift of the Holy Spirit," was, however, used by him from a different consideration; with feelings of the deepest regret he had for many years perceived that the sentiments on this subject embraced in our Protestant systems, were wholly erroneous; that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's being necessary to faith, was without foundation in the Holy Scripture, and merited, therefore, a decided reprobation. As a part, then, of that arrangement of first principles to which at that time was given the name of Ancient Gospel, and for the sorting up of the public mind on the Gospel of our salvation; also, in order to put the lovers of truth in the possession of a certain and short method of confuting errors on this point, did he venture, under our Lord Jesus Christ, to use the words in question, viz: "For the gift of the Holy Spirit," etc.

Both these phrases, however, were soon laid aside, both by himself and by others who embraced the Ancient Gospel, and the words "for the remission of your sins" I baptize you, etc. only, were retained; it is not to be denied, however, that our abandonment of these forms of speech took place, not because we had concluded on a different doctrine, but only because expediency rendered the use of them any longer unnecessary.

But it may be asked, why do you still retain the words "for the remission of your sins" etc? Answer. The Scriptures say- "*Be Baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins,*" etc., and therefore it is strictly evangelical, and consequently proper to say, as we all now do, "for the remission of your sins," etc.

Nothing could exceed the panic that seized the public mind when it was first proposed to the audience to be "Baptized for the remission of sins that they might receive the Holy Spirit." The indignation of most, and the astonishment of all was excited to the highest degree, and while hundreds yielded to the divine authority and goodness, thousands were so inflamed as to render the proclamation of the Gospel in many instances exceedingly perilous. Success, however, accompanied the preaching everywhere, and at the third annual meeting held in one of the northern counties it was believed that no fewer than two thousand disciples were present, who chiefly had obeyed the gospel within the short period of two years.

The Apostle styles Baptism the *Loutron paliggenesias*, I. e. the regenerating bath, or Laver. Now, whether we contemplate the re-elevation of this Christian Laver to its original rank and significance in relation to the conversion of the world, the consolation of the people of God and the unity of the church; whether we look at it in relation to systematic divinity—the dissipation of partyism, or the many beautiful definitions of Scripture terms and Scripture doctrine in which it abounds, or in relation to the strong contentions which it has already and which it is still likely to occasion, it must, I conceive, be interpreted, by posterity at least, as a fact in the history of reforming principles singularly important and interesting. There is not any ordinance in the whole circle of false or corrupted religion to be compared to the Christian laver in which the regeneration of the convert, on the principles of faith obtains. And there is no doubt on my mind, that it would greatly contribute to the convenience and comfort of our assemblies, to have in our meeting houses, or near to them, *lautrons*, fonts, lavers, or baths, constructed in a manner suited to the simplicity, modesty, and divine nature of our holy religion, according



to the customs of the most ancient Christians. This, doubtless will be the case, as soon as the Protestant ministry turn their attention to the remission of sins as administered by the Lord and his Apostles. O! how beautiful will be the scene, when all the watchmen shall lift up their voices together—speak the same things—administer the same remission on the same faith and by the same authority! May the Lord enlighten, speedily enlighten the eyes of all on this prime matter!

How near to us God has brought the blood of Christ by the Christian Laver; nay, he has by this bath put us into the blood of Christ; hence the immersed are represented in the holy Scriptures as saying, "To him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

Surely, the Gospel, when administered, is, to the poor, and blind, and broken hearted, as the visitations of the day-spring from on high—as the light of the bright and morning star—as the rising of the sun of righteousness, with healing in his wings.

The new convert cometh forth from the Laver, washed in the blood of the Lamb, and with dripping garments, looks as if the Son of God had come down upon him like rain upon the mown grass, and as showers that water the earth. He now becomes of quick discernment in the things of good and evil, and the voice of the congregation is to him as the songs of the morning, the melodies of heaven, awaking every feeling of love, of joy, or devotion; every tender string is touched; hope bursts her prison house and spreads her wings for heaven; the fellowship of the saints fills his social nature with the bread of heaven, the hidden manna, the fruit of the tree of the paradise of God, and he drinks of the sanctification of the spirit of God without measure.

**The Inheritance**

BY WALTER SCOTT

"Besides not through a righteousness of law, the promise was to Abraham and to his seed, that he should be the heir of a world, but through a righteousness of faith," Rom. 4th chap. On the supposition that this splendid promise means what it says;—what a pity but the faithful would separate themselves from the present evil and antiquated order of things, and show their fellow men how much society and the world would be improved if managed and constituted on a plan devised by that wisdom and goodness which arises from faith in God [Suppose Infidels, Deists, Theists, Sceptics and Atheists, had now died out, and "that the world, the great globe itself, were given to us the men of *faith*,"—*what* would we do with it? Would we parcel it out into plantations, villages, cities and states, as has been done by the men of no faith? and should our villages, towns, cities, and states be regulated by the laws, governments, and religion which are found in old society? then I think we ought not to receive it, better let the men of flesh possess it forever.

Society, as managed by wicked men, on the principle of law, is not productive of the righteousness which is well pleasing to God: it is full of unnatural poverty, and unnatural riches; it is full of rival interests and of the ambitions of personal, family, and professional distinctions, so that "if any man is a friend of the world, he is, says St. James, an enemy of God."

It is truly affecting to see how little good irreligious men have done for the world during the 6,000 years they have been permitted to rule and possess it! Christians ought to bid adieu to the old world and to all its ways, civil, political, and literary, and begin a new order of things—an order of things which would meet the approval of that righteous disposition which grows out of their own faith in God—an order of things which would work no ill to its neighbor. It is by faith, that Christians

in their Baptism, are constituted righteous, and it is by a righteousness growing out of their faith, they are finally to heir the world :—How magnificent to behold the Almighty distributing worlds to those who love him! Kings bestow empty titles and hollow offices on their favorites, but to Abraham, and men of like principles, he has promised the world!

Evangelist 1832

**Articles, Etc.: by Walter Scott**

BY WALTER SCOTT

Those alone, who have labored in the ancient Gospel, know how many objections, difficulties, and excuses, are to be removed, overcome, and rebuked in those with whom they have to do: Some conceive it too inconsiderable a matter merely to believe that Jesus is the Christ—object to its novelty, and say all the world believe it! some cavil at the ordinance, despise immersion, and ask whether there is any thing in the water: others think that the preacher does not sufficiently reverence the sacrifice of the blessed Redeemer; and most are willing by any excuse to avoid obedience: This one says "I have no faith," that one "I have no feeling"; one is afraid, another ashamed, a third careless, and a fourth profane; while those who have made a profession of religion in some party form, have a series of objections to be removed, of a nature wholly sui generis—they hope every thing—they hope they have faith, hope they have repentance, hope they have remission of sins, hope they have the Holy Spirit, nay they even hope they have been baptized—nothing at all being with them a matter of certainty—having no confidence that they are the possessors and heirs of any positive or immediate blessings.

Now, here is the field for the man of God, who labors publicly and from house to house in the Ancient Gospel; and in order to clear away the rubbish, his mind must be richly furnished with the history of the men of faith from Abel downward. If the objection is I have no feeling, then separate faith from feeling and ply the sinner with the case of Abraham sacrificing his son Isaac by faith, without regard even to the finest of all human feeling, viz, the parental feeling: if he asks whether there is anything in the water, answer his question by asking another; ask whether there was any thing in the rod of Moses, or the mantle of Elijah, with which he smote asunder the swellings of Jordan, or the ram's horn that blew down the

walls of Jericho, or in the red thread that saved Rachab, or in the sprinkling of the blood that saved the first born on that night when the destroying angel cut off all the first-born of Egypt.

The restoration of the Ancient Gospel gave birth to the most singular phenomena: If the reader ever practiced fishing at night, if he ever lifted the light over the pool, or has seen any other person do it; if he has watched subsequent appearances and looked at the crowd of fishes which approached the flambeau, swimming carelessly and lazily under the light, some, however, active and suspicious, some nearer to hand and some further off, and all confused; then he has seen a matter which may give him a kind of image of the scenes which occurred when according to the Ancient Gospel we began to compel men by revealed truth and argument to accept of an immediate acquittal or pardon of their sins in baptism. Truth and error, and their effects on the mind are clearly seen by the presentation of the Gospel as administered by the Apostles.

#### UNION OF THE DISCIPLES AND CHRISTIANS

John Smith, who, as our readers have seen, was sent out in company with John Rogers, by the brethren in Lexington, has published a piece in the "Christian Messenger," the reason whereof he assigns to be as follows:

"We do not publish the Address with the hope of satisfying or silencing our opposers; but hearing that some of our warm hearted, pious, reforming brethren, having heard many reports, and not being correctly informed on the subject, have become uneasy, fearing lest the good cause of Reformation may be injured by the course which we have taken in relation to the Christian brethren, we therefore feel it a duty which we owe to our brethren and to the cause which we profess, to lay before them and the public, candidly and plainly the principles from which we have acted relative to this matter."

(Bro. Smith then proceeds to relate his intercourse with the Christian teachers, and says)—

"In a word, I believe that the Christian teachers with whom I have had intercourse, teach as plainly and as purely what the primitive teachers taught, and require as precisely what they required, in order to the admission of members into the congregation of Christ, as any people with whom I am acquainted."

He says—"It may be asked if the people called Christians, who have ceased to speculate upon the character of Christ, have given up their Unitarian opinions? And, may it not as well be asked: have they who *speculated* upon the character of Christ before they became Reformers, given up their Trinitarian opinions?" and adds, "To both questions I would answer, I do not know, neither do I care."

Bro. Smith goes on—"They (the brethren) cannot think that we wish to amalgamate the immersed and unimmersed in the congregation of Christ: we do not find such amalgamation in the ancient congregation, therefore while contending for the ancient order, we cannot contend for this; we are pleased with the name Christian," etc.

"Avoiding all speculation, on the other hand, we are determined, by the favor of God, to the utmost of our ability, to teach what the primitive disciples taught, and in admitting persons into the congregations of Christ, we will require what they required and nothing more." Among those who labor for the same object (he adds) are the brethren about Lexington, Georgetown, Paris, Millersburg, and Carlisle."

Bro. Smith ends by saying—"As we do desire above all things to know the whole truth and to practice it; and as we think that the best of us either as individuals or as congregations, not fully reformed but reforming, we hope that the editors of reforming periodicals, Bro's Campbell, Scott., etc., if they see this in the 'Messenger' will notice it in their journals with such remarks of commendation or correction as they may think proper;—we make this request because circumstances we think, actually require it."

Signed,

John Smith

If the beloved brother who is the author of the Address, reflects upon the relation that the editors sustain to the case in question, which I understand to be the whole business of the late union, he will readily perceive that it is one of so specific and local a nature as to render it impossible for those who plead the cause generally to pronounce upon its propriety, or impropriety.

A few years ago the great desideratum with Reformers was  
The bond entire of Christian Union.

This was contained in the holy Scriptures, but to know it, to understand what it was, to lay hold of it, to take it thence, to assign it its particular parts their proper places, and to present the whole in actual practice for the inspection, adoption and benefit of men, was the consummation to be wished.

This has been done; the entire First-Principle scheme was, a few years since, put into operation, and then for the first time, disciples were let upon the divine institution on the plan of the Ancient Gospel and Ancient Order combined, that upon the principles and customs contained in this double form of things, all the godly might put on the new character, or new man, which after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.

At that time the ardent wishes of those who had for many years struggled together to ascertain the truth, and bring forth a view of things which should reconcile all parties, and ultimately absorb all rival interests, we realized to a wonderful extent; God, who had seen their tears, and witnessed their sincerity and agony of soul, had answered their prayers and crowned their long and sore enquiries with complete success; he had rewarded their pains and exhaustion of mind with discoveries most interesting, discoveries which must continue to affect the world while it lasts and is inhabited by men who seek remission, and desire to inherit life eternal, through the keeping of the commandments of Jesus Christ.

We would not expect, then, that any compromise to the amount of a single letter, will be made by these individuals. It is their particular duty, I apprehend, to give the public gen-

erally, in writing or otherwise, as has been done and is now doing, the particulars of the faith and manners of the original institution, without comment; adding and subtracting nothing; without increase, without diminution.

But to the Evangelists and the brethren with them on the field exclusively, belongs the right to say what courtesy, what condescension, what *deflection* from a straight course is due to present times, pieces, persons, and circumstances, for the furtherance of the truth as it is in Christ. Editors have no superior rights, and their absence from the particular point of action, entitles their opinion to but little weight in the case.

With great deference, then, for the standing, character, and judgment of Bro. Smith, and all the beloved of God, who are with him on the field, and with all respect for his very sensible Address, and his holy, and brotherly, and godlike intentions of uniting the people of the Most High, and with the most brotherly feeling for all parties concerned, I shall beg leave to commend them all to God and to the word of His grace in whom they have believed.

The following Letter from Bro. Rogers, to the editor of the Christian Messenger, will show whether the name Christian has any tendency to retard men's progress in wisdom, knowledge, holiness, and elevation of mind:

Carlisle, March 27, 1832

Dear Brethren—I have just received the 3rd number of the Messenger, and am much pleased with its contents, generally; and especially the letter from Bro. Smith. I was anxious to hear from him, and do rejoice at the important intelligence he has laid before the public, as I do think it cannot fail to promote the best of all causes—the cause of peace on earth, and good will among brethren.

The simplicity, the candor, the charity, the piety, the dignity, and noble independence, which this communication exhibits, are characteristic of the man who wrote it, and (what is better) of the religion he professes. And I am much mistaken if it does not contain a fair and clear statement (as far as it goes), of the



principles and practices of the Christian brethren in these regions; and not only here; but generally in the West. I do therefore confidently hope that it will be greatly useful, in promoting the good work of the union and cooperation among those who have acknowledged and submitted to the one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all, who is over all, and with all, and in you all. That it may produce those happy results, is, and shall be my fervent prayer. "For how good and pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in Unity!"

I returned a few days since from a tour in Fleming and Mason counties. I addressed the people upon the subject of Christianity at the following places, viz: Poplar Run, Elizaville, Bethel, Flemingsburg, Union, Wilson's Run, Beach Woods, and Mayslick; and I am happy to say that a desire to know, and do their Master's will, seems to predominate in those churches. I immersed two happy individuals at Wilson's Run, who had previously made the good profession. One professed faith at the Beach Woods.

In my public addresses to the churches, as well as in my private interview. I dwelt much on the importance and necessity of personal reformation—a reformation, not consisting merely in a return to the primitive order of worship in the congregations, but in a return to primitive holiness of heart and life; to that purity and peaceableness, and gentleness, and goodness, and patience, and forbearance, and longsuffering—to those longings after immortality; those breathings of the soul after the mind that was in Christ; to that spirit of humble, fervent, constant prayer to him whose eyes are over the righteous and whose ears are open to their prayers; and that spirit of deep concern for the conversion of the world—the conversion of our neighbors and our children, which characterized the first Christians. All, this is the reformation we want. And I state with pleasure that I found the churches alive to this subject. By some of the leading brethren in the reformation, I was addressed, on this subject to this effect: "We profess to be Reformers; but it is much to be regretted, that thus far, our reformation has consisted more in theory than practice, more in talking than acting. We have many and powerful

enemies. The Sects indulge towards us, feelings of implacable hatred, because we have waged against them a war of extermination. They therefore watch us with an eagle eye of jealousy, and will with pleasure, dwell upon, and magnify every impropriety they see among us; hold us up to public odium, and thus endeavor to shut the public ear against us. Thousands of those who are not members of the sectarian churches, are nevertheless, from their training, under sectarian influences; so that this Reformation, because of the "vicious" circumstances that surround us, "an uphill business"—a rowing against the wind and tide. Unless, therefore, we can exhibit among ourselves, more unity, and harmony, and holiness, honesty, truth, fair dealing, brotherly kindness, and charity, than exist among the sects, we cannot hope to succeed to any great extent. Yes, we must act out our principles, and show their superiority to all sectarian principles, in promoting all that is true and honest, and of good report—all that is pleasing to God and dignifying to man; all that gives glory to God in the highest and that promotes peace on earth, and good will amongst men, if we hope to see the good cause triumphant. "Shall we not, then, put our shoulders to the wheels of reformation, and call on Him for help,

"Who hears, and sees, and from on high,  
Will make our cause his care?"

Yours, in all Christian love and good feeling.

John Rogers.

Agreeable to appointment, a four days' meeting was held at Mayslick, on the 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st ult. It was supposed that on Lord's day, fifteen hundred persons were present: five brethren engaged actively in the business of the meeting and ten or eleven individuals were immersed.

We would just notice that the economy to be observed at such a meeting ought to be maturely considered, for very frequently our best wishes and most zealous efforts are rendered abortive for want of a proper plan, and a few moments' deliberation.

The fact of commencing operations at the spur of the moment without any preconceived plan, frequently proves injurious to our cause.

I very well recollect of three of us, a while before the actual restoration of the Ancient Gospel, standing up and in succession, with only a few minutes intermission between the last two, delivering three set of speeches of from two to three hours in length each, and then sitting down without ever affording the audience a single opportunity to obey the Son of God. Things, however, are very much changed since that time, and now we meet to preach the gospel that it may be obeyed by those who hear us.

How then ought the ministering brethren, who are present on such occasions, to proceed, in order to produce the greatest possible effect?

Experience suggests the following to me as the best plan to be pursued. The laboring brethren who are to be engaged should have the sole direction of this matter, and then should pitch upon one brother who is capable of handling a distinct topic. When he has enlightened the audience, and has stated, defined, and illustrated his subject, let him give an invitation to the people and be succeeded by his fellows in the characters of exhorters.

Exhorters, it ought to be observed, should never introduce new topics, but only new and striking ideas on the same topic.

Exhortations should consist of such things as have a tendency to move the affections of those who have believed but not obeyed; they should be elevated, violent, or tender according to the state of the case; bold and lively, striking and animating, containing great and beautiful images, calculated to move the soul and win the world to God.

The person engaged in delivering the leading discourse should not, I think, be called on to immerse; it is on some occasions too much. The-man-at-the-fountain should be one of the other brethren.

**CRITICISM**

In the 7th no. 3rd vol. M. H. 202 p, Professor Stuart has these words, "a person may be baptized into a thing" (doctrine) —so in Matt. 3:11. "I baptize you with water into (eis) repentance," I. e. into the profession and belief of the reality and necessity of repentance, involving the idea that themselves professed to be the subjects of it.

In Acts, xix 3, we have, "into (eis) one body" all in the like sense, viz. By baptism the public acknowledgment is expressed of believing in and belonging to a doctrine, or one body; also in Acts 2:38 baptized on account of Jesus Christ into (eis) the remission of sins, that is, into the belief and reception of this doctrine; in other words, "by baptism and profession, an acknowledgment of this doctrine, on account of Jesus, was made."

With all deference to the erudition and biblical knowledge of professor Stuart, this exegesis appears to me to be exceedingly lame, for the following reasons: and 1st. the assumption is made, that under John's teaching, the Jews were called upon to baptize into a thing, by which he would have us to understand a doctrine !! Now permit me to say, that it was not intention of John to call the attention of the multitudes to a mere doctrine to be received as true and proper, but to that which the doctrine implied and enforced; not to a belief in a tenet, but the actual performance of a thing; not to acquiesce in the necessity of obeying a call, but to obey it!! or in other words, not a reception in the mind of the duty of reformation, but a call to an actual change of mind and of life. They were, indeed, baptized into a thing which was something to be done; not a doctrine of reformation, but reformation itself; immersed into reformation, or in order that they might reform. The same remarks will apply equally as forcibly to the teaching of the Apostles, in regard to the remission. They commanded the people not to be baptized into a belief of the value or importance of remission, or the belief of the doctrine, but into an actual and bona fide remission, which remission, they were, out of—,before they reformed, and were immersed in order to obtain it.

It would be a strange thing for an Alien to be naturalized into a belief of the excellence and glory of the republican institutions of our country, instead of an adoption into the number of our free citizens, and an actual enjoyment of the rights of citizenship.

Evangelist 1832

Crispus

#### FIGURES

Tell me, said Paul to the Galatians, ye that desire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman; but he of the free woman was born by promise; which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage which is Agar; for this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is and is in bondage with her children.

The reader will perceive from the above scripture, that the Jewish church is set forth under the figure of a Mother, viz. Hagar.

But Jerusalem which is above, or rather superior Jerusalem, is the free woman, who is the mother of us Gentiles. For it is written; rejoice, O barren woman, who didst not bring forth; break out and cry thou that travailest not in birth; for more are the children of the deserted than of her who had the husband of the deserted! We, therefore, brethren, after the manner of Isaac, are children by promise.

Here the Christian covenant is prefigured a Mother, viz: Sarah.

Again—"And there came one of the seven angels—so he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns; and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and Abominations of the Earth."

The Jerusalem Jewish church, then, the Jerusalem Christian church, and the Apostate Roman church, are set forth in scripture as Mothers. The slave-mother, like Hagar, producing bondmen by the Law: The free-mother, like Sarah, bearing freemen by the Gospel; and the harlot-mother, like Jezebel, generating idolaters.

The Apostle thus describes the morals of these children:

Of the Jewish children, he says, As it is written: There is none (of the Jews) righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth: there is none that seeketh after God: they are all gone out of the way: they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one: their throat is an open sepulcher, with their tongue they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now, says he, we know that whatever the law sayeth, it says to those who are under the law.

The manners of the harlot mother's children, is thus noticed by John in the Revelations: They—"Repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk; neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornications, nor of their thefts.

The manners of the Christian mother's children are said to be "love, joy, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance," against which there is no law.

#### EXHORTATION

Let us, dear brethren, recollect that we profess to be children of the free woman, and, as such, are bound to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit of Christ in all love.

Let us recollect that, as the children of the slave mother have been scattered abroad and made a hissing, a by-word, and a

curse for their righteousness, that neither will God spare us if we continue not in righteousness.

Let us look to Europe, where God, in war, pestilence, and famine, is pouring out his wrath upon the children of the harlot-mother, and let us reform, and reform, and reform, until we become what God would have us be. Blessed be the name of the Lord! Let us, brethren, approve ourselves to be of God, and of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory.

### CONFESSION

"I acknowledge my sins unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid; I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."—David.

"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them, shall have mercy."—Solomon.

All the works of God are beautiful in their place, and all his ways are distinguished by wisdom. He has given place for the sun to shine in the greatness of his strength; he has marked the course for the earth to travel in; he has given us day and night, winter and summer, seed time and harvest: a pleasing vicissitude characterizes all the works of the Most High. He governs the worlds he has made by laws as unalterable as his throne. The beasts of the field, the birds of the air, the finny tribes of the deep, man, and the highest order of intelligence are governed by laws. God is said to have "given his laws to the seas, that they should not pass his commandment."

It is a law of nature that water flows downwards, that it seeks its level; that all bodies tend toward the earth; the flame rises toward the sky. It is a lawful nature, that he who swallows poison, even by mistake, endangers life; that he who puts his hand in the fire will be burned. These laws are independent and universal; obedience to them is invariably attended with good, disobedience with evil. Health, energy of mind and body, result from obeying the laws of nature in regard to the constitution of man, while disease, mental and bodily imbecility, result from disobedience. In the moral as well as in the natural

worlds, the laws of God are invariable in their operation, and as the eye is admirably adapted to the laws of sight, the ear to the law of sound, the muscles to the laws of gravitation, so the mind of man is admirably adapted to the moral requisitions of God. In the scenery of nature, the Benevolent Creator has not informed us of the laws by which the world is governed, because we are able to discover them by the lights of science; and it seems to be his uniform procedure to afford us direct knowledge, alone in respect to those things, which lie out of the dominion of our senses, and which appertain alone to the empire of faith. What man can do for himself he is determined he shall do. The angel of the Most High knocked off the chains from Peter, unbolted in silence, the doors of the prison in which he was confined, led him through the streets of the city to its massive gate, and having opened it, bade him good night. Peter could proceed the remainder of the way alone, a striking illustration of the manner in which aid is afforded to man by the Supreme Governor of all.

In the economy of grace, in which the mind of man is principally concerned, God has most wisely and benevolently revealed his laws, some of which are special and others general; but both are in accordance with the constitution of man, as a moral creature. Obedience to these laws is always attended with good, disobedience with evil, and we may learn from the excellency of these laws, not only from experience, but from the promises annexed to them, and we may learn the evil, resulting from disobedience, from experience, as also, by penalties threatened. It is a law in the economy of grace, "That it is eternal life to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent."

It is a law, invariable in its operation, that "He that believes (the glad tidings) and is immersed shall be saved."

And to those under the reign of favor, or to Christians,

It is a law, that "if we sin we have an advocate with the Father, and if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

Upon this principle God has always acted over the empire of mind; in nature, law, and favor, obedience to his commands,



is rewarded by the fulfillment of promise, "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."

A striking example of the efficacy of confession, is given in the history of David, "who had killed Uriah, with the sword of the children of Ammon, and had taken his wife to be his wife." "Thus saith the Lord, Behold I will raise up children against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbor."—"And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, the Lord also hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die."

The sin of David was very great, his conviction of its enormity was deep and genuine; his confession was frank and ingenuous, and his forgiveness was prompt and cheerful. I have sinned,—the Lord hath put away thy sin. The procedure of the Most High in the case of his servant David, is to the same effect under the reign of favor. At the time of our espousals to his Son, when we assumed his name, we were sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water and with the Word, or by the laver of Regeneration and washing of the Holy Spirit, all our infirmities were removed, all our moral defilements were washed away, the very garments tainted by the flesh were put off, and the new man—the garments of the new man now put on—we were most gloriously arrayed in the garments of praise and the robe of salvation, not a spot or blemish was seen upon us, as well becomes a Bride, in the day of her marriage festivity: arrayed in the beauties of holiness, she was presented as a chaste virgin to Christ, her reproach was taken away, her former life is not to be brought into remembrance. Again, she has been honored by the name and is shielded by the reputation of her husband, and so long as her husband lives, it is unlawful for her to be married to another, and as he shall live forever, the marriage must be a perpetual obligation; she can therefore be married to the Lord but once—and, consequently, she can be washed, and sanctified, and justified but once; so that all the sins attached to her life of virginity, are now removed. But should she act unworthy of her relation she sustains to

her Lord, should she become self-willed, perverse, or disobedient; should she forget the day of her espousals, and no longer feel the sacred influence of her first love, what is to be done? should she become an adulteress? What then?—either restoration to the love, and confidence, and protection of her Lord, or a total separation and abandonment. If she is restored, it is not necessary that she should again be married; the solemnities of this institution can be observed but once by the same parties. She must amend her life and confess her iniquities, in order to make reconciliation, and again be restored to the embraces of her glorious, and dignified, and condescending Lord. It would not comport by any means, with the dignity of the marriage institution, that the parties concerned, should, in case of any breach, be required to solemnize it. The author of the Christian institution, has made provision, not only for uniting the parties together but for conforming the union, and for healing any breaches that might be made. Thus all subsequent sins from the time of our immersion into Christ, unto the day of our death, are to be forgiven, alone, upon the consideration of forsaking and confessing them.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (The Evangelist 1832).

James Challen.

Reasons for embracing the Ancient Gospel, contained in a  
Narrative of the conversion of an opponent.

When I arrived at New York from England, I was introduced to a respectable Baptist minister of that city. Having informed him of my intention to travel west, he observed, "Well, Sir, you will find the people of the Western country intelligent, kind, hospitable, and attentive to strangers; but it is a fact much to be lamented, that society there, is very much infected with reformation; it is a heresy that strikes at the very root of all vital religions, and is making sad havoc among the churches."

I never heard of Mr. Campbell in my own country, except in

connection with his able defense of Christianity, against the attacks of Robert Owen and hence—I supposed that instead of his principles being dangerous, they were such as ought to meet with the encouragement and support of the Christian world. My surprise, therefore, was not a little excited, when I was so carefully warned against their evil tendency. My views of sects and parties did not permit me to seek further information on the subject, as I made up my mind to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ and him crucified. I thought I saw so much evil resulting from the division and splitting of professors into separate and adverse communities, each contending that it alone was the truly orthodox, and had the influence of the Holy Spirit, that I determined to belong to none of them, but simply to take the word of God as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the only authority in matters of religion; to follow the Truth wherever it led; to shape my course through life according to the precepts of the Gospel; and to trust for eternal salvation to the blood of Christ which was shed on Calvary for the remission of sins. I had strong objections against being called after the name of any man, whether he be Calvin, Arminius, Luther, Wesley, or Campbell; for in the word of God I find no such names written, though I doubt not they may be found in the Lamb's Book of Life:—I desired only to be a Christian in name and deed. With these views I arrived in Cincinnati. Here I was thrown into the society of friends whose opinions differed. I resided with a Wesleyan, received many kind attentions from Calvinistic Baptists and cultivated the friendship of those, who have been invidiously called by the name of Dr. Campbell. Discussions naturally arose upon different topics of a religious character, and among other things mooted, was the necessity of baptism for the remission of sins. Hitherto I had viewed baptism as non essential, and a mere question of party; and I had said I would never be immersed, since I considered the act as a mere initiation or admission within the pale of a particular sect. The Millennial Harbinger, and the Evangelist were lent to me, but I read them not; and subsequently a sermon on the Holy Spirit was put into my hands. It was composed by Mr. Walter Scott; I perused it, and upon reflection, saw no propo-

sition to which I could not yield assent. I still felt no inclination to pursue the subject, being quite unconcerned about Baptism, Operation of the Spirit, or any other similar topics, all of which I classed under the heads of non-essentials.

But the anxiety of some of my friends, who considered me in an unenlightened condition, would not allow me to let them alone. When I visited them, no other subject of conversation seemed to interest them, than those to which I have already referred. I began to perceive that there was nothing non-essential in matters of religion, which is commanded by the word of God;—that our Heavenly Father requires nothing of us which we are not able to perform; that he never works without means, and that these are always adapted to some specific ends; that, as in the ordinary affairs of life, so also in our spiritual concerns, we are required to exercise the faculties God has given us, we cannot expect the promised blessings; for "the hand of the diligent maketh rich," and by believing, by repenting, and by being baptized, we receive the remission of our sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. I saw, instead of waiting until I experienced some special primary influence of the Spirit to induce me to saving faith, and to assure me of pardon and that the word of truth was nigh me, even in my mouth, and that I was quite as competent to embrace the Gospel, as I am to receive or reject any testimony whatever. I felt I was a sinner, not by any miraculous impartation, but because the word of God told me so;—"that I was born in sin," that therefore I was "exceedingly sinful," and that my only escape from "the wrath to come," was by "laying hold of the hope set before me in the Gospel." Till now, I thought I had done this; but I found that my belief in Christ was without obedience to his commands, and that I was in the predicament of one who knew his Lord's will but did not fulfill it, and that I might expect to be beaten with many stripes, if I persisted in refusing to yield to my convictions of the truth.

I began now to perceive the cloud of darkness in which my mind was involved. I had heard Christians date their conversion from some sudden, arresting, and supernatural influence, independent of the testimony of the Scripture, which corn-

pelled them to faith in Christ. I had been subject of no such operation. I therefore attributed the morality of my life, and my faith, to educational causes; and, though I had examined the evidences of Christianity, had devoted much time to the study of prophecy, and had watched the progress of events in the history of human affairs, as corroborative of the Book of God, all of which left me no doubt of the infallibility of the scriptures, and their supremacy in all matters of conscience, faith, and practice; still, although my convictions had often drawn tears in secret, I was told I was in the gall of bitterness and in bondage. I felt now that I was in bondage; not in the bondage of Satan so much as in the bondage of orthodox opinions as they were called. When I was crossing the Atlantic, I acted in the capacity of both chaplain and physician; not because I felt myself competent to the cure of spiritual diseases, but I thought in the absence of more efficient aid, I might warn my companion voyagers to flee from the wrath to come. I felt great difficulty in doing this, because I could not see the use in exhorting them to believe and repent, if it were true that no one had the power of doing so unless compelled by supernatural influences. They seemed to be in the situation of the man, who was told to do a thing and with the same breath assured he could not possibly do it, and yet if he did not do it, he should be punished. Impressed with the idea that this was the decree of God, and to have harbored such a sentiment I confess was the result of superficial, or rather no examination of the question at all, my mind has long been the subject of doubts, and fears, and misgivings, which are generally referred to as conflicts with Satan, instead of the error in doctrine, which to me appears so flagrant, of the Holy Spirit compelling us to do that, which we are quite capable of effecting by the exercise of those faculties God has graciously bestowed upon us. The conversation adverted to led me to see that the blood of Christ was indeed shed for the remission of our sins, but that we could not expect to receive the blessings of the Holy Spirit, which are joy and peace in believing, unless we complied with the command of our Saviour to be baptized. "Those who believe and are baptized shall be saved," and again, "except ye repent we shall likewise perish," are the w6fds of

Christ; and the declaration of Peter on the day of Pentecost, in reply to the inquiry of the convicted multitude, "men and brethren what shall we do?" exhibits the plain and simple way, the natural order in which we shall obtain the forgiveness of our past sins, and "a right and title to eternal life." "Repent," says he, "and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." I learned from the Record that their consciences were smitten with the conviction that they had indeed crucified the Messiah of God; for it declares "they were pricked in their heart." They saw their fearful condition, and determined to accept any terms that the Apostle should offer, by which they could be pardoned for the wickedness they had done;—They repented of their evil deeds (as we may all do if we will) and resolved that instead of persecuting his disciples, they would themselves become his followers and obey his commands, being assured that in doing so they would be freely pardoned, and that their past sins would never be quoted against them. They were baptized; this was a test of their sincerity; for by acting thus they became identified with the people under the proscription of the Law, and exposed to all the vindictiveness of its administration. They were baptized for the remission of their sins; the sins which they had committed, I apprehend were remitted or pardoned, not on account of the meritoriousness of the act, but in obeying the command by which the purifying efficacy of the blood of Christ was applied to their souls; for baptism I consider as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual regeneration, and unless the ordinance has been complied with, the sinner has not accepted the terms of pardon proposed, and has certainly no right to expect the blessing consequent on his compliance, which is the gift of the Holy Ghost. By "searching the scriptures," which we are commanded to do, "for in them we think we have eternal life," I perceived that there was no warranty for the opinion that the Holy Ghost was given men, prior to faith, to induce them to believe, though I found instances it was bestowed anterior to baptism. But these cases are exceptions to the ordinary rule of the Spirit's operation, and therefore they establish the proposition that the gift of the Spirit is consequent and not

anterior to faith and baptism, that it never precedes belief, and that the order of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost is never inverted, except when miraculous and special results are designed. Thus we find that its descent upon the Apostles, on the day of Pentecost, was attended with signs and extraordinary appearances, which resulted in the miraculous faculty of speaking with "other tongues"; again we are informed that Peter and John were sent to Samaria, that they might pray for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For we are told in the 16th verse in the 8th of Acts, "as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only (or notwithstanding) they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost." In this case an act was performed, the Apostles laid hands upon them, and the effects were so astonishing that Simon wished to purchase the power they possessed for gold. This was not an ordinary gift of the Holy Ghost, and so far from its being anterior to faith, so as to make them believe, they had even been baptized, and had not then received it until Peter and John conferred it upon them by virtue of power received from God. Shall we say then that Christians of our own day, who simply believe and have not yet been baptized for the remission of their sins, have received the gift of the Holy Spirit? Is the position they maintain founded upon and supported by the word of God? They may appeal to their feelings and experiences, but I humbly conceive the scriptures do not give birth to this article of their creed.

Again, in the case of Paul;—his conversion was miraculous, and it is a remarkable fact that even he did not receive the Holy Ghost till after he had believed. "Three days" elapsed between his conversion and receiving his sight, and during this time, though he had believed in him whom he had persecuted, the Holy Ghost had not been bestowed upon him; for the Scriptures tell us that Ananias "put his hands on him" and he declared to Paul that the Lord, even Jesus, had commanded him to do so, that he might not only receive his sight, but "be filled with the Holy Ghost." And if there were any case in which baptism might be considered as non-essential it was Paul's; but

we are told that even he was baptized. All the circumstances of this case were miraculous and special; not ordinary and general.

Again, the case of Cornelius and his household is analagous to that of the Apostle's, for as the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them was a demonstration that salvation had come to the Jews, so its descent upon the Centurion and his household, became a Pentecost to the Gentiles, on whom in like manner "also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." The results were similar, for they spoke "with tongues." And again, Paul found at Ephesus certain disciples, and he inquired of them "have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" But they declared they did not even know there was such a thing as the Holy Ghost; which very much surprised Paul, for he seemed astonished that men who had been baptized should not have received the Holy Ghost. "Unto what, then," said he, "were you baptized?" But they explained the mystery by saying, "*we* were baptized unto the baptism of John," and when they heard the declaration that John baptized with the baptism of re-penance, teaching that they should believe on him, who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus, they were baptized again "*in* the name of the Lord Jesus." Here they had believed in John's testimony and in Paul's, yet they had not the Holy Ghost until God conferred it upon them through Paul, who is recorded to have "laid his hands upon them," after which the Holy Ghost came upon them, and as the communication thereof had been special and extraordinary, the results were miraculous; for "they spake with tongues and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve."—Hence we see that where special purposes were designed, visible means were employed, showing that God works by means, whether it be to heal the sick, give sight to the blind, impart the faculty of speaking with tongues and performing miracles, or to induce a belief in the divinity of his Son. In respect of the latter, I believe a man may have faith, if he will only exercise those faculties which God has given him, and that it is as much in his power to give ear to the things which belong to his everlasting peace, as it is to those which relate to his interest and happiness in common life. Hence, all are left without excuse, and it can no more be urged



that we are irresponsible for our unbelief, on the plea that we cannot have faith unless it is imparted to us by the Spirit.

These topics are some of those which formed the burden of the conversations I had with Major D. Gano and Mr. Walter Scott. The light of the Gospel did not burst suddenly upon my mind, but one truth after another seemed to develop themselves in succession. I had endeavored to comprehend the doctrines of the Gospel by an effort of my understanding, but I could not; I had not been told that religion consisted not in head knowledge, but in the experience of the heart; but I now see that God expects us to believe nothing in relation to salvation we cannot comprehend. I saw that the command to be baptized was imperative. "Why then did I hesitate to obey," was the question put to me by Mr. Scott. I felt I could give no valid reason, still I did not like what I supposed would be ostentatious display and desired to defer compliance. I was assured there would be none, and perceived that an immediate unceremonious performance of the ordinance was scriptural and therefore justifiable. I complied, and in the presence of a few friends, I was baptized in the Miami Canal, on Sunday evening, Oct. 14, at 10:30 o'clock.

It has been put to me since this occurred, whether I had received the Holy Spirit, and if I had, how I knew it? In answer to this I can only say that, whereas before I was blind, now I think I can see, and that the doctrines of scripture, instead of being unintelligible, now appear to be entirely comprehensible and clear; and, as we are elsewhere informed, so plain and simple, that a wayfaring man, though unlearned, cannot err therein. One thing only I regret, that my immersion was not more public, as it might have operated as an example and inducement to others. This I can say, that all fear of death is removed, and I feel firmly assured that the doctrines I have embraced are the pure doctrines of the Gospel, and abundantly efficacious in the practice they enjoin to procure me safe and certain introduction to Everlasting Life.

(Evangelist 1832)

John Thomas

**FOR THE EVANGELIST—1832**

It must be evident to all who study the scriptures, that our Divine Father has made a gradual development of his character and intentions to the human family. And that he has adapted his communications to the age and capacity of the world for their perception. In the patriarchal age, when the manners of the people were simple, and their experience and knowledge limited, he revealed a few plain and almost self-evident truths for their instruction and obedience. Every father acted in the capacities of Ruler, Priest and Teacher of his family, and their duties were all social and paternal: happy it would be, were there more patriarchal religion amongst us. But this state of things, although adapted to society in its infancy, would not answer the great, and benign purposes of God, towards our race, in a more advanced state; and therefore an institution of law, was set up, according to promise in the family and offspring of Abraham, the most distinguished of the patriarchs. "In thee (Abraham) and in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"; two promises are here made, the first embracing the posterity of Abraham according to the flesh, and the second, the Messiah, as Paul in his letter to the Galatians teaches, in whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed. In due season God fulfilled to the letter what he had promised to Abraham, for after he slept with his fathers, and his posterity, had emigrated to Egypt where they continued in bondage for the space of 430 years, he sent them a deliverer, raised them up from their state of degradation, and constituted them into a distinct nation. And it is the design of the author of this piece to draw out before you, some striking analogies, between the things under the old, and those under the new covenant, in order to prepare your minds for the contemplation of such matters, in which we all feel deeply interested. But to proceed intelligibly, it will be necessary to explain, and define some of the terms that we will use. And 1st, we will show you what we understand by a type, and in what we are to proceed in the interpretation of typical allusions.

A type, primarily signifies a rough draught, copy, image or pattern of a thing. It is a shadow, of which that represented

by it is the substance, and as persons and things under the old covenant are denominated types, those under the new are called antitypes.

To constitute any thing a type under the old covenant, it must adumbrate something under the new, not in all its accidents and adjuncts, but in some grand leading features of resemblance—the sacrifices of the law, were typical of the sacrifice of Christ; not however in any resemblance of the victims slain, or the altar on which they were offered, but in the life of one being given for expiatory purposes, as was the life of the other: by the one the Jews obtained remission which was however imperfect, as it did not purify their conscience, but by the other, the worshippers being cleansed have no further consciousness of sins.

Melchisedec, Priest of the Most High, was a type of Christ. His priesthood was typical of the priesthood of Jesus, his birth and death not being known, and being without genealogy, and having no limited time for the commencement and expiration of his office, as the Levitical priest had, Num. 4:3,23,35,43, he was a *Sacerdos perpetuus*, a priest without limitation of office. In consequence of which the inspired writers have spoken of him as possessing a shadowy eternity, and it is in this respect that his priesthood was typical of the perpetual priesthood of Christ.

Another characteristic of a type, is, that it should be originally designed by the Almighty, to represent its antitype. This rule for the interpretation of the typical language of Scripture, will be found to be indispensable, it will enable us to draw the evident distinction between a type and a similitude. In the figurative language of Scripture, Judah is called a lion's whelp, but this animal was not constituted a type of Judah. Herod is called a fox, but this animal was not designed to be a type of Herod. The life of man is compared to smoke, but smoke was not made as a typical representation of the life of man; these and many other similar expressions in Holy writ, must be interpreted as metaphors, not as types.

The objects represented by a type must invariably be in the

future. I Cor. 10:1-11; Heb. 10:1; Heb. 9:11,12,13. They are consequently called "patterns of things in the heavens," or in the Church, "good things to come"; and Paul assures us that those things done in the tabernacle, by the command of God, prefigured, the good things done in the tabernacle that God pitched and not man. Indeed the whole constitution, ritual, and nation of Israel, were typical of the constitution, ritual, and people appertaining to the church of Christ. The Levitical priesthood and sacrifices, were typical of Christ. The Pentecost, which commemorated the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, was typical of the giving of the new covenant on Pentecost in Mount Sion, through the agency of the Holy Spirit. The adoption of Israel into the family of God, typical of our adoption into the rank and dignity of the children of God. The glory of God residing in the tabernacle, typical of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the church, which is the body of Christ. In short the baptism of Israel into Moses, was a type of our baptism into Christ. The congregation of Israel, a type of the congregation of Christ. And their Canaan, a type of our future rest.

Amongst the most remarkable persons and things mentioned in the Old Scriptures, we may specify the following: Abel, Noah, Melchisedec, Isaac, Joseph, the ram sacrificed by Abraham, the pillar of fire, the manna, the rock in the desert from which the water flowed, the scape goat, the brazen serpent, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Sampson, Samuel, David, Solomon, Jonah, and Zerubbabel. It would not comport with the design of this paper to point the coincidences between all these persons and things, and the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ; we merely name them, that the intelligent reader may call them to his remembrance, and to induce all to examine for themselves.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we will now proceed to offer a grand proposition, which we will endeavor to define, illustrate and prove, viz.

That the congregation of Israel from the giving of the law, together with the tabernacle in the wilderness, and worship until the erection of Solomon's temple, represented the Church of Christ, from Pentecost to the Millennium.

And 1st. Just fifty days after the passover, when the angel

of God destroyed the firstborn of Egypt both man and beast, the law was given on Mount Sinai, and because it was given fifty days subsequent to the passover, it is called the Pentecost, or feast of weeks. In like manner, Christ, our passover, having been sacrificed for us. Just fifty days afterwards on Pentecost, when the disciples met together in one place, not around the base of Sinai, but on the hill of Sion, the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, was given to the congregation of Jesus Christ.

2ndly. Moses stood between God on the one hand, and the congregation on the other, and is therefore called the Mediator of the old covenant, and having received the law through ranks of angels, he handed it to the people. In like manner Jesus having ascended the Holy hill, and taking his seat at the right hand of the majesty of God, angels, and principalities being put into subjection to him, receiving the commandment from the Father, he sends the Holy Spirit as his agent to communicate to the church by the apostles the new covenant sealed by his own blood, and confirmed by the good spirit. Between the Father on the one hand, and the congregation on the other, he acted as Mediator.

3d. The constitution of the laws of the old covenant were given by Moses to the nation of Israel for their adoption, and government, and they unanimously agreed to receive and abide by them. In like manner the law of the Spirit was given to the church, and she with one voice and one heart accepted it, for we learn that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers—praising God, and having favour with all the people."

We will now call your attention more particularly to the Tabernacle, and worship, and things connected therewith, for the materials, size, and appendages, and form of the Tabernacle, Exod. 25 and 26 chap.

And 1st. We learn that the Tabernacle in the wilderness was set up on the first day of the month, answering to the 1st day of the week on which the church of Christ was set up.

2ndly. The offering of first fruits, were miraculously con-

sumed with fire from heaven, when they were first presented to the Lord, as a token of his approbation; is there not some coincidence between this and the fire enveloping the faces of the apostles, miraculously given as a token of the Divine favor, and presence, the only period in the history of the church in which such an extraordinary exhibition was made?

3d. Aaron was first consecrated to the Lord, and then he presented his offerings, which received the Divine approbation. So Jesus having died and rising from the dead ascended on high, and being "anointed with the oil of gladness," he was set apart and consecrated an High Priest forever, over the house of God, in the holiest of all: he then presented the twelve, in connection with the other disciples, together with their prayers, and praises, and other acts of obedience, as the first fruits unto the Lord, as a sacrifice, well pleasing unto the Divine Father.

4th. The fire of heaven was to be kept burning continually upon the altar, so in the church of Christ, the flame, the celestial flame, lit up in the heart by the good spirit, must be perennial.

5th. God resented with indignation the strange fire presented to him on the altar by Nadab and Abihu; so God has most fearfully resented the profanation of his holy institution, "by the strong delusions that have fallen upon the people, and the long oppressive reign of the man of sin, and the apostasy, the tremendous apostasy! which like a flood has poured forth its dark and murky waters, upon every green and living thing, the kingdoms of the earth have trembled, and are even now reeling to and fro as a drunken man. But the scarlet beast sitting upon many waters is doomed to a signal overthrow; the earth shall not merely open, but,

Like a stone, great city, shalt thou be,  
"Cast into the sea."

"Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down and shall be found no more at all."

But we cannot refer to all the circumstances or typical allusions in regard to the Tabernacle in the wilderness; suffice it to

say, that it was built by God. Ex. 25; Heb. 8:5. The glory of the Lord filled it. Ex. 40:34; I Cor. 3:16. It was sprinkled with blood. Num. 16:14-16; Heb. 9:19-22. No unholy person or thing should enter it. Lev. 16:1-4; John 3rd; I Cor. 6:9-11. It was replenished with all necessary furniture and provision. Heb. 9; I Cor. 10 and 11th chapters. Praise resounded in it. See Psalms of David; Col. 3:16; I Thess. 5:16. By referring to these several scriptures you will have the satisfaction of tracing out the coincidences, which will relieve me and profit you.

The Tabernacle was carried about during the long and tedious perigrations of Israel through the wilderness; "the clouded ark of God," had no permanent place of abode; wandering perpetually in tents, subjected to daily vicissitude, surrounded by the most deadly foes without, and deadlier foes within. Onward she moves, weary and sad, and desolated, her path a zig-zag and circuitous one, fed to be sure with bread from Heaven, and followed by cool and refreshing waters that gushed from the rock of Sinai, but always murmuring, never satisfied: "They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them": "and that rock was Christ." But with many of them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, or have become examples to us, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted, "and having informed us of their idolatry, uncleanness, their trying Christ, and murmurings, with the just punishment that was inflicted on them, the apostle adds: "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples (types) and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world, or ages have come," I Cor. 10. See to it, you who have a name to live, and are dead, and "this also know that in the latter days perilous times will come. For men will be self-lovers, money-lovers, boasters, proud, defamers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, without natural affection, bargain breakers, slanderers, incontinent, fierce, without any love to good men, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power of it."

I Tim. 3. Such is the fearful account that an apostle has given us of many who shall assume the Christian name in the last time: compare it with the character and conduct of Israel, and you will find an exact coincidence, but we must close this paper, and promise you another, as a continuation of the subject.

James Challen.

The following consists of letters and correspondence  
taken from the Evangelist for 1832

Murfreesboro, Tenn. 30th April, 1832

Dear Bro. Scott—In your letter to me, you wished me to give notice to you of any thing new or interesting here in relation to religion. I proceed to comply with that request. About the time I received your letter I heard Bro. Peyton Smith announce the glad tidings in the neighborhood of Readyville, twelve miles east from this place, and I saw its effects displayed to my delight. Four put on Christ by immersion on the confession of their belief that he was "the Messiah"; one of them was my old friend and companion in the study of our profession, Doer. Gowen, he had been a deist, made so, he says, by sectarian discord, but was, by the consistency, power and splendor of the gospel compelled to yield his assent to its truth, and his person a subject to its obedience. I saw him yesterday, he enjoys the translation to the kingdom of the Redeemer, and the prospect of a glorious resurrection to the life which is eternal.

In one week from the day I heard Bro. Smith (this was the first Sunday of this month) he visited a neighborhood twenty-five miles north east of this, and proclaimed to the belief and obedience of twenty-six more. Thus you learn, my dear Bro., that in two proclamations of the gospel of the glad news thirty were born of water and spirit, and consequently into the kingdom of our Lord; he has since then, together with Bro. Fannir and Carlee, been doing effectually the work of an Evangelist. These are all three willing and able proclaimers of the truth, and are almost constantly riding for that purpose. I seldom see



them or hear from them without hearing of the success of the gospel.

"Rejoice O earth! the Lord is king."

Difficulties, however, present themselves, and I will give you the fair and gloomy scenes in the order of their occurrence.

An old man (whose name shall not be perpetuated by an act of mine) who glories in his opposition, is stirring up some of the devout to schismatize. He is one of the called and sent, who he says was educated, or got his learning in Bush college, a spiritualizer of the first stamp; too selfish to follow, too ignorant to lead, and too old to learn. He has in some cases, by insinuations, inuendoes, and downright abuse deterred some from hearty adoption of the truth. Some again from a conscientious unwillingness to embark in that which seems new, (though in truth it is old) draw back.

We had a meeting here on yesterday and the day before. The Methodists here, in a spirit of liberality, worthy of republicans and of men, consented that I might publish in our paper, that the congregation would meet in their meeting house. I did so, but before the meeting days arrived, two of the defenders of the faith, who have grown grey in this world, and who are not here (living some miles in the country) more than a half dozen meetings in the year, decided that we are deists! etc., (though they have not heard us) and ordered the sexton of the church to shut the doors on us. In a paper I have sent you, you may see both communications and an explanation.

The sheriff of the county, Col. Crockett, kindly offered to us the spacious room of the court house. Seats were prepared and our meeting was numerously attended; we had with us many of the brethren who labor in word and doctrine, from neighboring counties; some from Bedford, some from Williamson county, and several from the Nashville church. A society was formed on the New Testament, of eleven members on Saturday, the first ever formed here on this basis. Yesterday Bro. Carlee and Craig spoke to the audience. Bro. Craig descended from the rostrum and invited all who would enter the kingdom to let themselves be known by advancing and giving

the hand. Two came up, a gentleman and a lady. He came without expecting to submit, and had no change of apparel; he was provided with it, and they both were immersed by Bro. Hall, into the name, etc.

Bro. Hall has been cautiously examining us for some time, but on yesterday gave us his hand in Christian love and cooperation. He will do much good in the kingdom—indeed he has been highly useful. After the immersion (the first time the waters here have been troubled on that account) we immediately returned to the court house, broke the loaf, partook of the product of the vine, sung a hymn and parted. Thus ended our meeting, to me the happiest one I ever witnessed, and happiness, joy and love sat in bold relief on the countenances and actions of all the brethren. It is thought that about sixty gave us the hand of Christian fellowship, and partook of the loaf. "Jesus thy blessings are not few."

If I was not fearful of becoming troublesome with my long letters, I would give you an occasional account of our progress. We send our Christian love to the disciples in Cincinnati. May the Lord bless you with increasing numbers, and faithful brethren.

Yours in the gospel,

Fred E. Becton, Jr.

(Bro. Becton, be not afraid of troubling me when you have such communications as the above, to make. I shall be happy to hear from you at all times.)  
Walter Scott.

From a highly respected brother near Nashville, Tenn., May 5.

Dear Brother Scott, I returned on last Monday from a two days' meeting at Murfreesboro. We were opposed by the Presbyterians with a sacramental occasion; the Methodists locked us out of their house after having first given us permission to occupy it. The liberality of a few of the more enterprising citizens furnished us, however, with the largest room in the court house, comfortably seated. We had ten public speakers from Bedford, Williamson, Rutherford, and Davidson coun-

ties; a large and attentive congregation, but introduced only three persons into the kingdom of our Lord. We are most wretchedly deficient. O for a fogleman, a fogleman! an earthly kingdom for a fogleman!

The fields are white unto the harvest, but we have no experienced labourer. Alas! our labourers have too much experience, but it is an experience of worse than Egyptian bondage. Too much skill, but a skill in that rascally science miscalled Christian prudence. The talents and respectability of the Baptists in middle Tennessee are decidedly in favour of the Reformation, the people are all attention. But how to set forth the truth, untrammelled by our conceits and notions, in that bold, decided and at the same time affectionate and winning manner, that should ever characterize the preachers of the gospel of life and salvation, is what we, who have been from our infancy, imbibing the hopes, the dreams, the doubts, the fears, of the mystery of iniquity, find not how to do.           Evangelist 1832

From Bro. Asa Runkon. "Dear Bro. Scott—On Tuesday morning after you left us, a young man of this vicinity came into our place, made the good confession and was immersed by Bro. Burnet. Yesterday Bro. John Smith had a meeting eight or nine miles south where three more confessed the Lord and were immersed. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me be stirred up to bless and magnify his holy name for all his precious benefits! Thus you see the good work progresses: may the good Lord prosper the work of Reformation here and all over the land! Yours in the glorious hope."

From Bro. Daniel, Todd county, O. "Dear Bro. Scott, We meet here every First day, when the weather admits;—if we hear no proclaimer we read the scriptures, sing, pray, and break bread. I lately attended a three days' meeting of the disciples. I think they amounted to eleven or twelve churches, as many laboring brethren, and perhaps about three hundred and ninety communicants. The conclusion of this meeting was truly an interesting season; every face seemed to speak what was

felt in the heart. Your numbers come in good time and in good order; much good would result I think from a careful reading of the writings of Bro. Campbell and yourself, but everybody apprehends danger. Any brethren from your part of the country are most affectionately invited to partake of my hospitality, seven miles west of Elkton: please invite all. I see in the last Harbinger some objections to your saying that Jesus baptized Peter. Please reconcile matters. Yours," etc.

(Dear Bro. Daniel, My words concerning the baptism of Peter are as follows: "The first person, then, baptized by Jesus, was the first stone laid on this well tried rock; now that first person was most probably Simon, son of Jonas, and for this called by Jesus, Peter or stone. But it is said that Jesus baptized not but his disciples; this I presume was the true state of the case, so that when John 3 chap, 26 v. it is said Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him,' —nothing more is meant than that baptism was then and there administered by Jesus' authority; this was all that I meant, and yet if it were asked me whether I thought Jesus ever baptized any disciple at all, I should answer that I think it very probable he did, but this we never can know, and it would be of little value if we could. Nothing is more certain than that all ought to be baptized.)

From Bro. Russell, New Orleans. "Dear Sir, Your paper is much needed in this place; I wish you could make us a visit; the harvest here is truly great, but the labourers are few. The Presbyterian church, of which Mr. Clapp was pastor, has split—a part of them has petitioned the Legislature to grant a Lottery, to raise 25,000 dollars to build a church! Query. Did they build churches in this way in the days of the Apostles?"

From Bro. G. W. Elley, Nicholasville, Ky., June 9, 1832. "Dear Bro. Scott—Your 6th number of the Evangelist is at hand and I am highly gratified to hear through its pages of the success of the ancient gospel in Tennessee and other places,

and willingly contribute my mite in giving you a short history of its progress in this region of the country. At a Four days' meeting held by the Brethren at Clear creek, three miles from Versailles, Ky., commencing the Friday before the first Lord's day in May, there being many of the preaching brethren present, both of the Reformers and Christian body; 15 or 16 made the good confession and were immersed in the name of Jesus: one week afterward five or seven more were added at Versailles. During the month of May, eight persons were immersed at this place and immediate neighborhood; in the neighborhood of South Elkhorn, near Lexington, eight more were immersed by Bro. J. Creath, Sen., and Bro. Smith; a Four days' meeting commenced at the Republican meeting house, eight miles from this place, where many of the Christians and Reforming brethren were present, and with one accord proclaim the word of the Lord to a very large and attentive audience, we had the pleasure of adding to the number of disciples twenty-one persons; the greatest love and harmony seemed to prevail, and with one accord the hearts of the disciples seemed to rejoice in the Lord. It was thought that there were near five hundred communicants who participated in the breaking of the loaf on Lord's day. I am also informed, that at the three or four days' meeting at Cambridge, near North Middletown, in Bourbon county, some two or three weeks since, some twenty or twenty-five persons were immersed, at the forks of Elkhorn, five miles from Frankfort, and at the Crossings, and Georgetown, Ky., some twenty persons or more have been immersed during the past month; hence you find, brother, that we have abundant reason to rejoice. Much good feeling seems to prevail between the Christian and Reforming brethren, and with one heart and one soul, being animated by the same spirit, they proclaim the word of the Lord with much effect. I pray not for these my apostles only, said Jesus, but for all those who believe on me through their word, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. O how long will brethren labour to keep the saints apart, by the creeds and systems of men? Let the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things, and call us what they please, we rejoice! yes, and will rejoice, at the conversion of sinners; and whilst our opponents are labouring

to convince that they are dead and to believe that they can't believe we will proclaim remission of sins in the name of the Lord. With all affection, your brother in the Lord."

Evangelist 1832

Abstract of a Letter to sister Gano, from her son-in-law David Burnet  
:

Dear Mother—I am happy to know you remember us always, especially at the gracious throne. I have lately attended three three-days' meetings; concerning that at Mayslick you have already heard; after Bro ..... left us, four more were immersed in the vicinity. Next week the Beasley creek meeting came on, but there we immersed only four; the meeting house was so filled with the saints that sinners could not hear; still we had a good meeting. Bro. Rains and myself were the labourers. Last Friday" the meeting commenced at Red Oak. After the first discourse six persons presented themselves, in the evening six more, and labouring from ten to four o'clock, we swelled the number to twenty-three joyful converts! Bless the Lord! most of them married persons, and one lady and one gentleman not less, I presume, than sixty years old each. This is my second visit to that place; the first time, two years ago, 17 were baptized. We have many enemies where we now labour. Most respectfully and affectionately,

Yours, ever.

From Bro. Hendrickson, N. York. Dear Bro. S:—The Reformation is prospering slowly among us, but I feel confident that notwithstanding the priesthood and their votaries, it will finally triumph. The friends and Christian brethren are in peace and unity, wishing you all like blessings. Since I wrote you last, my third daughter has confessed and been immersed for the remission of her past sins; my eldest was received about three years ago, my second daughter about two years ago; my companion has been a beloved sister for nearly thirty years: We have laid six infants in the silent grave, and wait patiently to rejoice with them in the morning of the resurrection from the

hand of Jesus our Redeemer. Three of our children, all sons, are still but born of the flesh, and it is my most ardent prayer that they may also be born into the kingdom of grace, in order that we may together have a right to the tree of life, and together live and praise him who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood! ever, etc.

From Bro. Hayden, Western Reserve. Dear Bro. Scott—Since I last wrote you, I have moved my family as contemplated. I have immersed eighteen lately, and have had information from New York state that in many places in that country the harvest is fully ripe. My heart aches with commiseration for the people. How few lay the state of things to heart as they ought. I must beseech you to do every thing that you can to stir up the spirits of those who proclaim, for they, as well as those who are taught, are liable to sinkings; all reason demands that the leading brethren be fervent in their spirits for if they lack energy, purity," or devotion, how can we expect these things in the church? I feel so much on this point that I am tempted to abandon this country for another, but then it would be like a woman running off from her husband and her own children. I am really in a strait. Ever, etc.

From the beloved Dr. Richardson—Extract. Bro. Hayden's visit to this country has been productive of much good; in three weeks he immersed twenty-seven, and you will be pleased to hear that the brethren dealt very honorably by him. We expect him to return in the fall or spring. In the meantime he is to be succeeded on this ground by Bro. Alton, whom he has persuaded to visit us. The disciples are at present very much alive, and see the great necessity of employing some one to proclaim the truth. I immersed one here last Lord's day.

Sister Osborn spent some time during the winter at Braddock's field, where once delivered a discourse. When Bro. James M'Elroy went up to bring her home, he found one or two who wished to be immersed. He and Bro. Young went up noon after and held a meeting at which nine came forward and

were baptized; they left an appointment for Bro. Hayden, who went up in a few days and immersed six more. They now meet together, and the disciples from Pittsburgh visit them. Yours in the Beloved.

(May grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father be with all the holy brethren through Jesus Christ.)—Ed.

From Bro. Becton.—Dear Bro. Scott —The month ending yesterday has been a glorious one with us. The influence of the truth has been astonishing indeed, when we remember the pains and trouble to which the mysticks have put themselves to prevent its spread.

Some three or four of the preaching brethren commenced on the first day of July a tour of preaching, and traveled through a part of four counties. All manner of opposition, allowed by law was offered them. It all happened for the furtherance of the truth. Near one hundred bowed to Immanuel's scepter before a meeting which has just ended in this county of four days' duration.

This meeting was held by the Christian body and reformers, about an equal number of teachers from each side were there. No council was held, no deputation was appointed, no committee spoken of to draught the rules of union, or propose conditions of fellowship. They all spake the same things, all acknowledged the validity and power of the same creed book, (The new covenant) and no choice of men, no human power could have bound their union. No discordant note was heard to sound in all that was said by stricter of the ten speakers, no feelings of jealousy were excited, no actions of selfishness were seen, but all laboured in teaching and immersing just as if they had been raised in the same family, dismay thank Heaven's King for the result.

They, (the audience) were brought to believe, to repent and be immersed for the express purpose of obtaining remission of sin. Seventy-one believed, repented and were immersed before the close of the meeting.



On Sunday last at the place where, in the greatest meeting of disciples ever held before, not more than fifty partook of the loaf, more than three times the number celebrated the death of our Redeemer. Some of the United Baptists joined us in the act, an act which Mr. Eagleston the teacher of Presbyterianism here, thinks is getting too common. His church here is on the eve of a split, about who shall sing, whether all the congregation or a choice of the best singers!

Thus you may learn Brother Scott, that here in Rutherford county, where unrelenting persecutions are the order of the day, and the kind clergy are denouncing us, while their priest-ridden congregation are barring us out of houses, with no other commander than Jesus, and no fugleman but his saints, the earthly kingdoms are girdling to the everlasting truths of the living word.

Our congregation here, which was commenced in April with eleven, has grown up to twenty one. We meet weekly, and always have some visiting brethren to join us in our celebrations. We regret that Bro. Campbell\* should say that he considered none a church of Christ but those that meet every first day. We have here the spirit and disposition to do so, but as many of the congregations are composed of members who have come out from among the elements of sectarianism and who were associated in the same house with those elements, they cannot meet every first day, because, the remaining party claim the house and extend to us as a matter of favor the privilege of meeting monthly at these houses and in some cases even this is refused. We however do celebrate the death of Jesus at every meeting we have, on the First day, and will so soon as houses can be made and overseers qualified, attend to our duty weekly.

I have just learned that after the congregation was dismissed yesterday morning, in conclusion to our first day meeting nine others came forward and were immersed (three of whom were Methodists), making in all 80 at that meeting.

(\*Beloved Bro. Campbell will no doubt satisfy you on this matter.)

From Bro. Gosney. "Dear Brother We have not had the ancient gospel proclaimed since Bro. Burnet left us, except by the brethren who have labored to do so, and were not in the habit of public speaking before. Our being destitute of regular preaching (or teaching) I think has been of some advantage. We meet on the first day of the week, break bread, sing, pray, exhort, etc.; and in attending to this course, many of the brethren have become useful; but we are weak and do not increase in numbers—(but I hope in the knowledge of the Lord.) We are surrounded by sectarians, who use almost every means to prostrate us; and such is the prejudice of the age, that none but the called and sent, or least professedly so, can bring out a congregation (except our preachers).

Bro. Rains will be here tonight, and spend some four or five days with us, and I hope his labor will not be in vain. Will you be good enough to give notice in your paper of our intended meeting, requesting the attendance of the ministering brethren?

From P. S. Fall, Frankfort, Ky., August 14, 1832. Dear Brother—I have just returned from Nashville, Tennessee, where I had the happiness of spending a week or ten days with the brethren. It gave me a degree of pleasure I can hardly describe, to find, that notwithstanding the most violent and sometimes unprincipled opposition the disciples there have held fast their begun confidence; and that, although they have not, since my removal, had any regular proclamation of the word, except from members of their own body, and the occasional visit of the visiting brethren; yet that their number has increased, and especially have they made great progress in the knowledge of the word. For the sake of the unconverted, they desire greatly to have some more efficient public speaker, than any one of them supposes himself to be: but I have no doubt that if they who are in the habit of speaking among them, would send a list of appointments a la mode, through Kentucky, they would be considered here, as equal to the most sensible speakers, and would return, armed cap a pie with all the panoply necessary to their being recognized as regular "heralds of the cross," by those whose prejudices in favor of an authorized

priesthood prevent them from seeing how ridiculous the idea, that three or four men, who say that they are vile sinners, and have hearts which are the seat of sin, and the sink of iniquity, and sometimes abuse themselves for "devils incarnate," by laying their hands upon the head of another sinner, such as themselves, make him holy. I had the pleasure of introducing four persons into the kingdom during my stay. I hope, in a few weeks, a congregation will be gathered in Frankfort, built upon the New Testament alone.

There are a number of disciples in this vicinity, who are extremely desirous to enjoy more fully the happiness conferred upon the citizens of the kingdom, in the observance of the significant institutions that belong to it. The desire of the public, moreover, is excited, to hear those things which have been so much decried, and against which, an opposition so violent, has been exhibited in this place.

From Bro. Stamps, Grand Gulph, Claiborn County, Miss. "Brother Scott, I am much pleased with your paper, particularly your colloquy: no sectarian can confute it, though different from his traditions. Hoping we may both live to see the time, when our Master will be the only Lawgiver in the Christian kingdom. I am yours, in hope of eternal life."

From Brother Scratton, Rochester, New York. Very Dear Brother, we have been receiving and reading in your publication, what we believe to be the pure theory of the Bible, the genuine doctrine of Christ and the Apostles.

The all sufficiency of the written word to produce faith—the faith which forms the Christian character, and immersion for remission of sin, were first proclaimed by myself, in these regions. After labouring for some time, I was successful. I have immersed about one hundred believers. Glory to the Divinity. I have now the satisfaction of teaching in three congregations, —established, I trust, on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.

1st.—The church at Gates, near Rochester, contains between fifty and sixty in number.

2nd—The Rochester church, recently organized, contains thirteen members.

3rd—Elba church, fifteen members.

I now immerse some, almost every Lord's day. Bless the Lord, O my soul. B.S.

The disciples in Covington, opposite Cincinnati, held a two days' meeting last month, when fifteen presented themselves for remission.

Brother Challen, Brother Andrews, Brother Ellis, and myself, were present, but father Stone was our chief speaker, and blessed be God, his labours were not in vain in the Lord! O how goodly a thing it is to be under the Messiah and God, and means of turning men to righteousness. "The law of truth was in his lips, and he did turn many to righteousness."

Malachi—Ed.

The following is from another great labourer in the gospel of the peace of God, who when he saw many of the Evangelists marrying and settling down in idleness, observed: "The women have slain all of the servants of the Lord, and I alone am escaped"; but also, it is said that, he also, is about to fall a prey to a common enemy of unmarried Evangelists! "Dear Walter: Since I saw you, which is a year and a few days, I have been engaged in a tour on the frontiers of Michigan, Indiana and Illinois; preaching once or twice per day, except in the wilderness where no inhabitants were, save the Indians. I immersed a number and formed them into Churches on the revealed plan.

I returned to Stark Co. in the spring and how many I immersed there, and in Crawford, Knox, and Licking counties I know not; but since the first of July, a little more than two months, I have immersed 121, mostly promising and intelligent

disciples. My companion in travail is of the name of Jones. The Methodists have been very busy circulating a small pamphlet styled the 'Gospel in Water'; but it has rather turned to the furtherance of the gospel.

"In places, where we have been teaching for four or five years past, the work still progresses. The churches have become numerous in several places. Sandusky church contains 80 members; a congregation in Wayne 150; one in Holmes about 50; one at Southeast about 50; one at 13ro. C. Rydon's about 150, and one in Harrison upwards of 100; there are besides them about thirty churches in the above counties, of from 20 to 50 members each. At a meeting held last Saturday in company with brothers Proter, Davis and Jones, 10 were immersed. I still claim you to be my brother in the Gospel of Christ.

J. Secret."

The following is news from the ground where the Ancient Gospel began to be republished:

"Western Reserve, Ohio.

"I have been at a great many large meetings which I thought could not be exceeded for love and affection, but such a one as this I never before witnessed; and, though none of the great spirits of the reformation were present, yet was the meeting as numerously attended as any that ever preceded it. It was supposed that 2500 were present, chiefly disciples; 35 were immersed, and on the last and great day of the feast, William Hayden stood in the water until he immersed 18. But all the parting! it was like that of Paul. We wept sore, but in the consoling idea that we should one day meet where separation should occur no more.

H.H."

Brother William Hayden informs us per letter, that upwards of 400 have been converted on the above ground during last year, and that several brothers volunteered their services for next year. He says, the question of modest apparel came up at the meeting and promises for retrenchment for sake of the good cause were made by many present.

Maysville, August 31st, 1932

Dear Brother Scott: Although three months have transpired since I saw you, such have been the frequent communications between our mutual friends, that it appears that neither of us has seen it necessary to write, if I except one letter written by myself. I am pleased to hear that your health has somewhat improved. Take care of yourself. When do you visit Mason again?

Since I saw you the gospel has had considerable success in my district. In my two last visits to Mayslick and vicinity, I immersed 19 persons, making in all 144, at our meetings in three months, besides many others by those cooperating with me occasionally. Our big meetings have contributed largely to this success. My mother-in-law is with us. Remember us kindly to your family. Yours, in the hope of our calling.

David S. Burnet.

#### MARRIAGE

Mr. Editor: You cannot conceive how much I have heard about my first essay on Marriage. One said, "It is a cunning piece"; "I don't believe in it," said another; and a third, "I think the editor is on our side by the questions which he asks. 'Whether the Old World was not destroyed in consequence of intermarriages between good and bad people?' " Again one would say, "Were not the Jews prohibited from marrying with the Gentiles?" and "Look at Solomon! .... See the whole nation at the return from Babylon! were they not, without exception, ordered to repudiate their heathen wives? and some who had originally wedded unbelieving women themselves, as they would now call them, thought it altogether insufferable to call marriage a political institution." But only one did I hear ask, "What is the law of Christ on the subject?" and none did I find willing to make the Jews their patterns in this point—viz. : putting away the unbelieving party.

Some would thrust the man, who would dare to marry an unbaptized woman, out of the church; but this did not the Jews. They had law on this matter, and acted accordingly, com-

manding the offender immediately to put away the infidel, These people would punish a man as much for bringing such a person into his own family as if he had brought her into their church, indiscriminately supposing that a family is as much a religious institution as the church of Christ is; but marriage makes a man and woman only one flesh. Alack-a-day! too seldom, one spirit!

No Jew would have been retained in the congregation for saying he repented of his unlawful marriage; nor would he have been taken in again for any reason short of putting his wife away. Let us be consistent, then, and if we are to follow the Jewish example without respect to the law of Christ, let us follow it closely. Let those who married unbelieving wives put them away, and then they themselves may be retained in the congregation.

The fact is, that before the flood the ancestors of the Messiah were called "the seed of the woman" and "the sons of God," while Cain's people were styled "the children of men." After the flood Messiah's family were styled "Jews," and those who had departed from the true God, "Gentiles." It seems to have been the intention of our Heavenly Father that his Son Jesus should have a godly ancestry from the beginning of the world, and to honor godliness by bringing forth his Son from among these families which practiced it from the beginning of time. This great purpose for which political separation was introduced, has now been attained. Messiah has come. "In the fulness of time God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," etc. "Faith being come, then, we have no more need of the schoolmaster."

Are we, then, to marry unbelievers? The Messiah has not said so. Many things are lawful which are not expedient. The brother who does so is to be pitied, perhaps; but not put out. The Apostle knew it to be lawful for him and every disciple to eat what meats pleased him; but on many occasions he found it inexpedient to exercise this liberty. This great man entertained the highest reverence for the consciences of his weak brethren : there was no putting out by him, unless for downright wickedness. What a pretty figure we should make if we should

excommunicate a brother for marrying the woman he loves now-a-days, and declare that we would not receive him again until he said, "I am sorry for what I have done!" thus putting him out for love, and taking him in for aversion to his own flesh! What could such a person mean when he said "I am sorry?"—That he now disliked his wife? He could not be sorry for breaking Christ's law, for we know that there is no law on the subject; and hence we cannot ask with propriety whether marriage with a believer or an unbeliever is lawful or unlawful, there being no law. We can only ask, Is it expedient or inexpedient? I should answer here, that it was sometimes expedient and sometimes inexpedient.

But one objects that a person who marries an unbeliever cannot attend to the manners and customs of our kingdom. "How," says such a one, "can I salute with a kiss the wife of a man who may have the strongest abhorrence for the custom?" It may be inexpedient, for as a person may unfit himself by things inexpedient for the Bishop's office, so a person may, by an expedient in marriage, be unfitted for some of the noblest customs in our kingdom. I have known the finest disposition for hospitality broken to pieces by the avarice of the unbelieving party. But, mark me, I have seen this in the believing party too.

Upon the whole, Christianity proposes to restore the holy ordinance of marriage to the footing on which it stood at the beginning, viz. that one man should have one wife. The Saviour observes to the Jews who practice polygamy, that it was not so from the beginning; and when the relation is formed, then we are instructed how to honor it; the husband is to love his wife, and the wife to obey the husband, and to behave herself that, if he is an unbeliever, he may be won without the word, by her chaste and comely behaviour.

To the Editor's two first questions I respectfully answer, Yes! that "marriage is that institution which makes the parties one and places them on such an equality as no other relation, natural, or political recognizes: and ought therefore be distinguished from other political relations in the human family, and does deserve, from its vast importance, to be noticed by the



Great Lawgiver, and excepted out of the rank of relations which only spring from it." But however distinguished above other political relations, and however much excepted out of them, we cannot, by any distinction or exception, change the nature of a thing, and make spiritual that which is natural. God alone can do this; and if he had said that disciples should marry among themselves only, then it would have been done.

"But, brother Parthenos," says one, "pray whom did you marry?" What is that to thee, brother? Follow thou the things that are lovely, and expedient, and excellent, and thou shalt have praise of the same. I married a daughter of our Heavenly Father, and God forbid that I should despise the Most High's family, and go from home seeking a wife among the families of the flesh. "Evil communications corrupt good manners," and it is the will of God that we should raise for him a goodly seed, bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

"Why, brother Parthenos, you practice just what I preach," says another. Yes, and you preach what you did not practice; but neither your preaching nor my practice is equal to the law of the Son of God, What say the Scriptures?

But I had almost forgotten the Editor's third question: "Does not Paul, in saying he had a right to lead about a sister wife, imply that he had no right to lead about a wife that was not a sister?" The passage reads thus, Cot. 9:2. "Have we not a right to eat and to drink? Have we not a right to lead about a sister wife as the other Apostles, and brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or have I only and Barnabas not a right to forbear working?" The matter in question here is his ministerial support; and if anything is implied at all, it is that he and his sister wife, if he had one, were entitled to support. Paul was an Apostle, and there was no law by Christ saying that he should work or that he should not work; he acted in this matter as expediency demanded. There was no law by Christ saying that he should eat or should not eat certain things; he acted in this expediently. There was no law by the Messiah commanding him to marry or to remain single; he acted expediently. And we may be assured that if the Apostle wished to marry, that in regard to the object of his choice, he would

have acted expediently, seeing there was no law on this point neither. When the Apostle said the bishop must be the husband of one wife, did he imply that other disciples might have two? Some might say that this was fairly implied, and I confess it looks like it; yet nothing is more certainly false. This only shows that it will always be dangerous to act upon implications as if they were verbal laws. But now to the Editor's last query:

"Are not widows commanded by the Apostle to marry whom they please, only in the Lord; and why should widows more than virgins be restricted in these matters?" The Apostle says, "Concerning virgins I have no commandment from the Lord." This is enough for the young or for such as has never been married, viz—that there is no special law in regard to them apart from the law which regarded the whole community, viz. that all were permitted to "marry rather than burn." Why the Apostle circumscribed the liberty of widows will be settled when we have agreed that he has really done so. But I think many take for granted here, that which they ought to prove, viz. that the phrase "only in the Lord," means only a man who is a Christian. The phrase "in the Lord" is of very frequent occurrence in the Scriptures: "Salute Persis who laboured much in the Lord." "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." "They abode speaking boldly in the Lord." Now do these not mean that the persons themselves laboured, died, and spoke, being in the faith of the Lord? And may "marrying only in the Lord" not mean that the person herself may marry, only in the faith of the Lord, i.e. not go out of him or become an idolater to get a husband. Again, it is said, "Let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord"; "nor the woman without the man in the Lord." Here the phrases are simply an acknowledgment of Christ's supremacy or headship. To "marry only in the Lord," may therefore mean to marry without giving up or abandoning the supremacy or headship of Christ as the only Mediator. Again, "Your labour is not vain in the Lord"; "be strong in the Lord"; "stand fast in the Lord," "both in the flesh and in the Lord"; "wives, submit to your own husbands in the Lord." Here the phrases mean Christianity—dear to you both in the flesh and in the Lord; that is, both as a natural religion and as

a Christian. To "marry only in the Lord," then, may mean that whether she married or not, or whomsoever she did marry, she herself must abide a Christian. But if the law of Christ to widows is, that they shall marry only a Christian, then I say there is no remedy for those who have acted differently, but immediately to leave their husbands, unless we can suppose that the law of the State is above the law of Christ. If Christ's law says that we shall not have a husband that is not a disciple, shall the law of man speak otherwise, and say she shall have and keep an unbelieving husband?

But the whole truth is that this chapter is not written about the persons to whom the Corinthians were to be married, but about marrying itself; and as the Apostle wished them to be without "anxious care," he told both the unmarried men and widows that it was good for them to be like him, unmarried; and therefore I rather conceive that the whole passage ought to read thus : If her husband be dead she is at liberty to be married to whom she pleases. Only in the Lord is she indeed happier if she so abides according to my opinion." This is my opinion expressed in the former part of the chapter, viz. that widows would be happier if they remained single like me.

I now appeal to the Editor whether this is not the literal reading of the Greek text, and whether our present translations are not most unnatural and forced readings of these Scriptures. To "marry only in the Lord," is therefore not a scriptural phrase. It is formed by putting the last words of one verse to the first words of another verse; or rather the phrase is hail our own; or rather it is all our own together. The Apostle did not wish the disciples to marry at all, but to remain single that they might enjoy their religion without family care; and to be wholly happy in the Lord was to remain single; for such had nothing to care for but the things of the Lord. To "rejoice in the Lord," to "boast in the Lord," "labour in the Lord," and so forth, are intelligible expressions; but "to marry in the Lord" is to me unmeaning. We may as well speak of children in the Lord, or of hiring a servant in the Lord, or of having a master in the Lord, instead of according to the flesh. But we have no masters in the Lord, no servants in the Lord, no

wives nor husbands in the Lord: therefore I object both to the phrase and to the present English version; and I beg that the Editor will do everything that he can to clear up this matter, that I may not be found wresting the Scriptures nor handling them deceitfully; for I fear the name of the Lord our God, to whom be glory. Amen! (The Editor: Bro. Campbell; Parthenos: Bro. Scott.)

### RESPONSIBILITY

Definition—Etymologically speaking the term responsibility signifies answerability. It means that we are morally accountable to God and to one another, and bound religiously and socially to honor those laws and wholesome restraints which God and society have imposed upon us for our own good and the public safety. In short, it signifies that if we are not law-abiding men, we shall be punished, or every departure from the maxims of rectitude shall recoil upon ourselves.

Antiquity—The doctrine of human responsibility is as old as creation. When woman appeared, creation reached its acme of loveliness, and ceased. In the language of sweet poesy—

"All heaven  
And happy constellations on that hour  
Shed their selectest influence; the earth  
Gave signs of gratulation, and each hill;—  
Joyous the birds, fresh gales and gentle airs  
Whispered it to the woods, and from their wings  
Flung rose, flung odors, from the spicy shrub  
Disparting, till the amorous bird of night  
Sung spousal, and bid haste the evening star,  
On his hilltop, to light the bridal lamp."

In the beginning of the world, the Creator gave to man the constitutional law of total abstinence on a particular point, and held him to responsibility. The Most High then entered into his rest, and man upon his work, which was to create the moral universe, families, nations, states, and mighty empires. Responsibility, or the recoil of evil, is, therefore, a doctrinal coeval in origin with creation itself, and is as sacred as the author-

ity of heaven and sanctions of life and death can make it. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Thus their departure from rectitude was to recoil upon themselves. Gen. 2.

An Instinct—But even anterior to revelation, responsibility is an instinct of nature. "An instinctive and instantaneous sympathy seems to carry us from consciousness of power and skill in our own souls to the recognition of corresponding attributes in Him whom Socrates styles 'the Soul of the Universe'."

A sense of right and wrong, of moral obligation and reactionary nature of good and evil is found in every man's breast, and therefore infuses itself into the very life of society everywhere; it enters into all man's organic relations, and is an admitted element in the political structure of every nation upon earth, for in what state or empire do not magistrates, teachers, guardians and parents hold both themselves and other men to responsibility? Anything to the contrary would transfigure society from the beautiful image of peace and happiness, honor and right, into the ferocious idol of brutal license, tyranny and anarchy. Responsibility associates itself, therefore, not only with the original and lofty adversities of humanity, but with the very conscience of man and the sentiments of universal society.

Reason—Some men dread responsibility; but they ought not, because it is the symbol of a superior nature. It is the very index of our natural excellence above the brutes that perish. Were we not endowed with the lofty faculties that assimilate us to God, we would not be held accountable. The giant ox, slumbering in the meadow, covers with his body a larger area than a man; he has a broader head and a bigger eye; he enjoys there the *otium cum dignitate* with a Roman greatness, and ruminates with a patrician nonchalance unequalled by that of his master, the Ohio farmer. Why then is he not held to responsibility to his maker and his master? The answer is, that in him all the conditions of amenability are wanting. Rational knowledge, a sense of duty, and the freedom and powers necessary to accountability are unknown to him. In regard to the excellent, glory, honor and eternal life, his soul, if he has one,

is a blank. Philosophy and art, religion and society—the systems of men, and the systems of God, lie high above the sphere of his instincts. These discriminations and generalizations come not within the circle of his conceptions. With all his bulk, weight and force, he is, therefore, generalized out of the sphere of God's more excellent works. He knows not and dreads not the recoil of moral evil, and is, therefore, held responsible neither by his maker nor by his master.

The learned ethnological and philological infidels—Morton, Agazzis, Usher, Patterson, Nott, and Gliddon have, after vast research, been enabled to rescue from the pyramids and paintings, the skill and sculpture of ancient Egypt, and to present, as an offset to the immortal literature of Scripture, the following verse in Egyptian rural poesy:

Hie on! oxen, tread out faster  
The straw for yourselves, the grain for your master.

Not begrudging these savants this choice morsal from Egypt—the land of darkness—seeing we are so rich in all sweet poesy from Canaan, the land of light, we only ask here, "Does this verse supply us with the last analysis between an ox and a man? Is it the grand differential between the two that the one eats the straw and the other the grain? If it were, then to hold men to responsibility would be not injustice but simple cruelty. The ox does, indeed, look at the sun with a bigger and brighter eye than man, but he cannot, like man, throw the measuring line over him. He cannot place the planets in scales; he can not, by refined analysis, determine their comparative bulk, weight, and periodical return in the heavens. He gazes on the expanse of nature, but can not, like man, spread forth in the form of farms and fruitful harvests his theses and thoughts of beauty, usefulness and wealth. He can not, like him, cause the orchard and the garden, the field and forest to smile with fruits and roots, and grains and golden flowers. He can not "make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before"; of his doings, therefore, God takes no account. The doctrine of moral accountability does not, as the index of a superior nature, point to the oxen but to man—man, made in the image of God and endowed by nature with a high sense of reactionary power

of evil. The grand differential between man and the ox, then, is not that the one eats the straw and the other the grain, but that one is endowed with a responsible nature and the other is not.

Measure of Responsibility—Seeing the doctrine of human accountability is of such ancient date, so universal and instinctive—seeing it is the symbol of a superior nature and the very signature of the Divinity himself to the lofty image which man wears and bears, we may very reasonably ask, "Is there a measure to it as there is a reason for it?" If there were not—if our amenability did not expand with our privileges, then all mankind would be on a dead level on this point; and the Caffre and the Hindoo, the Indian and the man of Kamtschatka would be equally accountable with ourselves, who enjoy all the aids and benefits of the true religion—the light and riches of a refined civilization. But this is not the law of responsibility. With relations come obligations; with privileges come duties. "To whom much is given," says our Lord, "of the same shall much be required." The Bible and the church—the standard of faith and morals—the knowledge of eternal life and the temporal blessings of a good government, and an almost boundless national domain—science and the useful arts are an armful of jewels that can not be purchased with gold—privileges of immense value—elements of national grandeur and national superiority that vastly enhance the responsibility of that people, whose fortune it is, like ours, to enjoy them. In the church and out of it, then, men are held to responsibility by God.

Before leaving this branch of my subject which allies itself intimately with national and individual improvement, I will briefly notice some adversaria or things in American society hostile to and destructive of responsibility, so that this essay may, if possible, claim kindred with the times and the men and things of the times.

1. Atheism—This denies the existence of the Deity, and by so doing annihilates at once, in its abettors, all sense of moral accountability. It is, therefore, exceedingly hazardous to the morals of the State, and should be frowned down by all who fear God and wish well to their country. It of course dreads

not the recoil of error and evil; and would substitute, as the cause of all things, a universal but invisible and non-intelligent principle.

2. Deism—This is also hazardous to the morals of the state; because by substituting its own reasonings and conjectures for the Bible, which is a fixed standard of faith and morals, it thereby places public and individual integrity on the uncertain and ever varying basis of natural conscience alone. As an error overlooking or disregarding the punishable and reactionary nature of sin, it ought, therefore, to be everywhere discountenanced; and the claims of the true religion and accountability met and honored.

3. Spiritualism—This would substitute for the Bible and responsibility a current revelation of familiar spirits; and transfer the idea of improvement and progress from the worshipper to the manifestation, from the person to the thing. Christianity would make us wiser to make us better, but Spiritualism inaugurates us into folly that too frequently terminates in insanity. It considers neither recoil, nor the retributive nature of evil; and, therefore, conflicts directly with the doctrine of a divine revelation and responsibility.

4. Universalism—Unable otherwise to reconcile human depravity with the principles of God's justice, Universalism affirms that faith and infidelity, reformation and depravity, obedience and disobedience, piety and impiety, good and evil, virtue and vice, saint and sinner, angel and demon are discriminations and differences of time, and will all disappear at the Judgment Seat in the presence of God, who, in heaven and eternity, will recognize no such temporary distinctions. As a reward for all sufferings here, therefore, faith, it affirms, shall at last kiss infidelity; piety, impiety; and virtue, vice; saints shall salute sinners; angels, demons; Christ, Satan; and hell, heaven. Such doctrine does not so directly inspire men with pride, as it fills society with dissoluteness of manners for it teaches, not only that God does not respect persons, but that he does not respect character. The eternal recoil of sin upon those who commit it is discountenanced and even denounced by Universalism as false and libelous.



But the inductions of Scripture in regard to good and evil, reward and punishment, from Adam downward, prove that Universalism can never successfully appeal to that book for support of the doctrine of irresponsibility.

5. Calvinism—"God did of his sovereign will and grace, without the least foresight either of faith or of good works, or any other condition whatever, choose, from all eternity in Christ, a certain number to be saved and inherit eternal glory; and did pass by and ordain to death and eternal damnation without any respect to good or evil on their part, all the rest of mankind, to the praise of his vindictive justice."

This doctrine is so perfectly subversive to every idea of human responsibility, that we can account for good behaviour on the part of those who teach it, only by saying that their faith in it is not practical; or it is so neutralized in their mind by the belief of milder and more evangelical doctrine that they are well behaved and saved in spite of it; for it can not be denied that very often it has inspired its patrons with desperation, or filled them with sentiments of unrelenting vengeance against their Creator. It begins where Universalism begins, but reasons to an opposite conclusion. While the one affirms that the recoil of evil is temporary and not to be dreaded; the other teaches that it is absolute and unavoidable.

6. Unbelief a Necessity—Those who hold to this, say to their uninquiring audiences, "You can not believe in Christianity of yourselves." This is sophism. Christianity invites no one to the belief of it of himself, but only on evidence. Such persons as use the above phrase affirm that a certain undefinable operation of the Holy Spirit is necessary to faith. In this way they not only negative all the great and precious evidences for the truth of our religion, but, at the same time, also weaken and unsettle the public conscience. They do, in fact, shift the point of responsibility from earth to heaven, from man to God they do indeed cut all men loose from accountability and the conscious sense of the recoil and retributive nature of evil; they render any revenue of duty in response to the claims and calls of religion an impossibility.

The Platform and the Pulpit are the working powers of the

state and the church—the outer and the inner government. The Press should report for both. The sheet that reports exclusively for one is one sided. It was proper to divorce the church from the State, but improper to divorce religion from politics.

7. Journalism—Our editors are in many instances the moral incendiaries of the nation. With vast stores of learning, with an exquisite taste for Journalism, with a mighty affluence of the English language, an ever-varying style, and a fixed temerity, ready to dash off in any direction, they array themselves on their respective sides of the political arena, and fight like Caesar. We know that their party hacks are not the offspring of the genuine and general virtue of the country, but in most instances the spawn of party; yet these editors seldom fail to persuade the press-ridden people that the candidates are indeed our veritable political saviours! With golden opportunity offered them by their position to tranquilize society, to feed our families with a pure and mature literature and the current news of the globe, this eminent class of men, with a perversity not to be estimated, too frequently substitute for all this, their own burning and bellicose party matter, frequently so inflammatory and denunciatory as to fill their readers with any thing but the solemn conviction of responsible existence, and the reactionary character of good and evil.

Great Britain has twice fought us on our own soil, and been twice defeated. It is probable, therefore, that she will never again voluntarily invade us again single-handed, but only in connection with France or Russia, or both. Now our editors, not satisfied with the political warfare which they enkindle and keep at home, seem to make a conscience of all they can to embroil us with Great Britain. It is not with France, or Russia, or even Austria, but with our mother country we must go to war! How natural! how decorous! how worthy is their argument of solemn reflection!

How does this marvelous malconception of all true policy and of nature occur? It comes, I believe, in this way—the editors imagine Great Britain insincere. How? She lies in the middle of Europe, between its northern and southern populations: and not being a military, but a manufacturing state,

it becomes evident that her existence as a nation must depend upon some law exterior to her natural resources. This law is her diplomacy. She has to ally herself with the north or the south of Europe alternately, or be swallowed up by them. Our editors see her doing this; they see her alternately with Russia and France, and they blame her for insincerity. But to do so is only her policy, and the very law of her continued existence as a nation. With liberal men who see this, how admirable it is to behold a small island thus by her diplomacy alternately, as necessity requires, commanding the services of the most powerful military nations that lie north and south of her—Russia at one time, and at another France. Russia and France combined might humble her; but this can only be when God has decreed it.

The Irish agitators and their servile imitators among our editors since the days of the arch-deceiver O'Connell, have never ceased to cry out about "British misrule" and "British insincerity." But they altogether miss their mark; it is "Catholic misrule," "Catholic insincerity," that has destroyed Ireland; and the bitter hatred which the priests of our own country put into the hearts and mouths of their partisans here, is only a duplicate of the false alarm by which, under O'Connell, they agitated their own country, in order to cover their own desperate designs against all government that is not thoroughly Catholic. People begin to see through this ruse de guerre on the part of the priests and their editors. Washington calls "party-ism .... a fire that can not be quenched." Partisans seldom fail to dare and defy Providence and the reaction of their own selfish designs and doings. Yet we sometimes see them overwhelmed.

8. Juryism—In cases involving intense public feeling, bribery and moral cowardice make it often difficult in our country to obtain a jury who do not prefer sympathy to responsibility, and money to law. These jurymen often strengthen the hands of evildoers, and in the same ratio, weaken those of the righteous. They patronize the doctrine of moral impunity. Witness the cases of Arrison, etc.

It were to be desired that the number of our jurymen be in-

creased from twelve to thirteen, and the case decided, as in arbitrament, by majority.

9. Philosophy—The absolute, the infinite, the eternal, time, space and the Deity have two phases which we shall call the finite-ward and the infinite-ward. We can conceive of duration as it reveals itself in the trinity of the past, present, and future time, but of duration as a whole, that is, as eternity, we can form no definite idea. So of space, as it reveals itself in a trinity of place—here, there and yonder, we can form perfectly definite ideas of it; but of it as infinity or immensity we understand nothing. This holds good of the infinite intelligent as well as the infinite non-intelligent—of God as well as space and eternity. Our religion is divided into three parts—its faith, its doctrine, and its proof; and we are indebted to the Father for the faith, to the Son for the doctrine; and to the Holy Spirit for the proof. In these three works we can see and hear God in trinity; I. e. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—but as the absolute, the infinite, the eternal, we can have no conception of him whatever.

Thus unity becomes the basis of the divine Trinity, as eternity is the basis of time, past, present and future; or as unity is the basis of our own personality, which is physical, animal, and intellectual. Trinity, as displayed in the three parts of Christianity, is the only conceptional idea which Christianity gives of God's existence.

Now there is a class of philosophers, who of all men upon the earth are the most powerful and learned of mind. These eminent savants are unceasingly engaged in efforts to comprehend God in the absolute—the infinite—the eternal; not as revealed in nature, or religion, but as not revealed at all. Instead of accepting God in trinity they would, if they could, grasp him in unity; for which however they have just as much capacity as the newly born babe. This grand conception belongs only to deity himself, and is so lofty and boundless a nature that it strikes into a dead level all the minds and efforts of both men and angels. This is the silly but central thought of philosophy. Philosophers are greatly perplexed with their own speculations on the conditioned and unconditioned, the absolute and the

relative, the finite and the infinite, unity and plurality, the necessary and the contingent, cause and effect—time, space and relation; but whether God is to be found in the subjective or objective, the me or the not-me, in matter or mind, in the positive or the negative, consciousness or the reason, these sages, after three thousand years speculation are not as yet agreed.

The following sentence from Sir W. Hamilton's review of Cousin's *Philosophy*, contains, I believe, the true doctrine touching the divine existence, expressed in a style as luminous and transparent as has been employed by any of the philosophers in 3,000 years! "The conditioned is the means between two extremes—two unconditionates, exclusive of each other, neither of which can be conceived of as possible, but of which on the principle of contradiction and excluded middle, one must be admitted as necessary." The man who looks to philosophy for his knowledge of divine existence has it in that sentence—the fruit of almost three thousand years study of the greatest philosophers from Thales to Hamilton.

Could they even transcend their own nature, and seize God in the infinite and eternal instead of the finite and temporal, they would yet have no God; for "a God comprehended is no God." While God was revealed in unity to the Jews, it was difficult to attach the people to his worship, but in trinity, in which all is definite, he draws all men after him. The subtle and seraphic speculations of these illustrious triflers, therefore, from Plato to Kant, tend only to make men more ingeniously infidel, and to destroy from the thoughts of their disciples the sense of responsibility to God, and the conscious recoil of evil upon those who perpetrate it.

10. Catholicism—In conclusion, the most decided and desperate enemy to this nation and to human responsibility is Popery. The profound ignorance that pervades its masses; the pollutions of its confessional; the arrogant claims of its priesthood; the lewdness of its monks and Jesuits, its nuns and sisters of charity; the proud titles of its higher clergy; their palatial residences and luxury; the blasphemous titles worn by its Pope, and his claims as monarch and high priest of mankind, all

necessarily point us to Italy, Spain and Portugal, France, Austria, Mexico, and South America for that individual excellence and national glory to which this accursed thing styled Popery would conduct the world. In the Scriptures this execrable apostasy is called Beast and Babylon; Egypt and Serpent; the city in which our Lord was crucified, and the cage of every unclean bird. Those who disbelieve that this Italian sect claims temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction over mankind can read the fact in the pastoral of the Archbishop and bishops of the Province of Saint Louis lately assembled in council in that city, p. 134.

How admirable is the revealed system of Adam and Christ! First, we see the Almighty creating, of the dust of the ground, in his own image, an animal man, the life-center of a great social system, into every individual of which he was to transmit his life. On the other hand we behold with amazement the same man influenced by an ab extra diabolical power forfeiting through one act of disobedience this focal life, and ceasing to be automatic.

Again we behold with wonder the Almighty, by a depth of wisdom and mercy, alike unfathomable by angels and men, constituting the same man, in his generic phase, when fallen, the first of a long series of types designed by indices, symbols, signs, or figures of an illustrious deliverer of the Race to come—a second Adam, not made with an animal soul, but, as we learn, a vivifying spirit—"The Lord from heaven," having life in himself, not as Adam, but as God.

Under him men were to be re-created, on a higher level than that of sense, and molded to righteousness, glory, and honor, not, as at first, by conformity to a positive institution, but by a great general principle, namely, faith in God and his Messiah.

Who that understands this system can fail to admire, or admiring fail to adore its author? We conclude, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever and ever." Amen. Rom. 11 c.

*So much for Articles from "The Evangelist."*

**SOME PAGES FOLLOW THAT HAVE BEEN TAKEN  
FROM "GOSPEL RESTORED"  
BY WALTER SCOTT—1836**

The professors of our holy religion having unhappily strayed from the scriptures and true Christianity, there seemed to be no remedy in anything but a return to original ground. This suggested itself to many, in different places, almost simultaneously, about the beginning of the present century, and numerous churches were formed about that time, both in Europe and America, resembling, more or less, the churches planted by the Apostles, or the church of Jerusalem instituted by the Lord Jesus himself.

These churches, with few exceptions, adopted the holy scriptures as their exclusive guide in religion, and rejected the dangerous creeds and confessions of Christendom, which have operated so fatally on the unity of the church. This formed the first positive step towards that return to original ground, for which the present century is distinguished.

In 1823 a plea for a particular ecclesiastical order was put forth publicly, by Brother Alexander Campbell. This for distinction's sake was called the ancient order. Others had, before this time, taken the scriptures alone; but this master-stroke gave a fresh impulse to religious inquiry, and, by a single expression, "Ancient Order," limited that inquiry to a very important branch of our religion as a first step.

Presiding, at that time, over a church which had already attained the ancient order, or at least as much of it as seems now to be attained, the gospel, or rather a uniform authoritative plan of preaching it, became more the object of my attention, as may be seen from a few essays published in the C. Baptist, cut short, however, by the then limited knowledge of the extraordinary topic which had been selected; in 1827 the True Gospel was restored. For distinction's sake it was styled the Ancient Gospel.

The present century, then, is characterized by these three successive steps, which the lovers of our Lord Jesus have been enabled to make, in their return to the original institution.

First the Bible was adopted as sole authority in our assemblies, to the exclusion of all other books. Next the Apostolic order was proposed. Finally the True Gospel was restored.

The above general notice of the progress and order of the present reformation, is deemed sufficient to make the reader feel whither it is we desire to bring him by this discourse, namely, to the gospel; and not to a plea for any particular order, or to any discussion of the previous question concerning the supreme and exclusive authority of the holy scriptures.

A volume of unbroken discourse of the true gospel is still a desideratum. Since 1827, it has floated through our periodicals in essays and fragments of essays very unlike the living orations in which it was then set forth to the public for acceptance. Those are scattered over a wide field, and necessarily apart from each other; so that when a disciple would invite a friend, or fellow professor, or relative, to a perusal of what has been learned and written for the gospel since that time, he must needs invite him to the review of numerous volumes, a task by no means acceptable to readers in general.

In the tenth number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, for 1831, the restoration of the true gospel is referred to, in the following manner: "Brother Walter Scott, who in the fall of 1827, arranged the several items of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life, restored them in this order to the church, under the title of ancient gospel, and preached it successfully to the world—has written a discourse," etc. In the *Evangelist* for 1832 the following paragraph, for the connection between the above elements and sin which they are intended to destroy, occurs. "In regard to sinners and sin, six things are to be considered—the love of it, the practice of it, the state of it, the guilt of it, the power of it, and the punishment of it. The first three relate to the sinner; the last three to sin. Now faith, repentance, and baptism, refer to the first three, the love, and practice, and state of sin; while remission, the Holy Spirit, and the resurrection relate to the last three, the guilt, and power, and punishment of sin. In other words brethren, to make us see the beauty and perfection of the gospel theory as devised by God; faith is to destroy the



love of sin, repentance is to destroy the practice of it, baptism the state of it, remission the guilt of it, the Spirit the power of it, and the resurrection to destroy the punishment of sin; so that the last enemy, death will be destroyed."

On the original arrangement of the elements of the gospel then and on the analysis of sin contained in the preceding paragraphs, the present volume is built. It comprehends a connected discourse of the true gospel of Christ, and has been written by request of some of the most intelligent among our brethren. The task might have fallen upon some one more able to perform it; but as none has appeared yet to occupy this ground, we have yielded to the wishes of those who were perhaps better judges in the case than ourselves, and have done the best we could. May the reader derive as much profit from reading it as the author has been gladdened while writing it.

A discourse on the elements of any science, admits of but little elegance, except so much as attaches to correctness of description and accuracy of definition. The reader, therefore, must not hope to meet with much of it in these elementary orations, which are of the didactic and demonstrative kind chiefly. With this monition to the reader, we commend the book to the protection of God, and to the patronage of the public and the brethren.

Walter Scott