

LARD'S

QUARTERLY,

DEVOTED TO THE

PROPAGATION AND DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL.

BY MOSES E. LARD.

---

VOLUME II.

LEXINGTON, KY.

1865).

*Reproduced and Issued*  
*by the*  
OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB

# INDEX.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| A THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.....  | 1   |
| THE BIBLE UNION—ITS WORKS CRITICISED. J. W. MCGARVEY.....  | 23  |
| ALPHA'S REPLY TO THETA. L. B. WILKES.....  | 38  |
| REPLY TO KAPPA ON IMMERSION IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.....  | 61  |
| THE CONTRIBUTION. ALBERT ALLEN.....  | 64  |
| TRANSLATIONS AND REVISIONS.....  | 73  |
| REVIEW OF SIGMA ON THE SPIRIT.....   | 92  |
| <br>   |     |
| THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.....   | 113 |
| MISSIONARY SOCIETIES AND OUR HYMN BOOK.....  | 134 |
| <br>   |     |
| BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. THOMAS MUNNELL.....  | 156 |
| JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE WORD BAPTISM.....   | 166 |
| H. T. ANDERSON'S TRANSLATION.....  | 176 |
| THE BURNT OFFERINGS. JAMES CHALLEN.....  | 196 |
| A FONDNESS FOR THE MYSTERIOUS. W. C. ROGERS.....   | 205 |
| PROFESSOR STUART. MILLENNIAL ITEMS.....  | 212 |
| SUGGESTED TO OUR COLLEGES.....   | 222 |
| CHRIST AS MEDIATOR.....  | 225 |
| MINISTERIAL EDUCATION. J. W. MCGARVEY.....   | 239 |
| <br>   |     |
| HADES, OR THE UNSEEN.....  | 267 |
| <br>   |     |
| UNCLEAN SPIRITS AND DEMONS. L. B. WILKES.....  | 286 |
| SIGMA'S REPLY TO THE EDITOR. DR. H. CHRISTOPHER.....   | 297 |
| THE OLIVE-TREE ARGUMENT FOR INFANT BAPTISM. THOMAS MUNNELL.....  | 306 |
| PASTORS. J. W. MCGARVEY.....   | 311 |
| LARD'S NOTICE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (FROM THE A. C. REVIEW).....  |     |
| <br>   |     |
| THE CRISIS OF THE QUARTERLY.....   | 336 |
| THE MIRACULOUS AND THE PROVIDENTIAL. J. B. GRUBBS.....   | 337 |
| ORDINATION OF CHURCH OFFICERS.....   | 350 |
| WHO OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED? THOMAS MUNNELL.....  | 361 |
| SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND A SUNDAY-SCHOOL PAPER.....  | 372 |
| <br>   |     |
| TOO MANY CHURCHES—AN EVIL.....   | 396 |
| IS THE LANGUAGE OF JOHN, "HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU IN THE HOLY<br>SPIRIT," LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE. D. CRAWFORD..... | 406 |
| THE CONTRIBUTION. ALBERT ALLEN.....  | 416 |
| DESTINY OF THE WICKED. J. W. MCGARVEY.....   | 424 |
| CO-OPERATION OF MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.....  | 443 |
| THE CLOSE OF VOLUME SECOND.....  | 448 |

# LARD'S QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. II.

OCTOBER, 1864.

No. 1.

---

## A THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.

OF all the subjects treated of in the New Testament, not one possesses a deeper interest for the Christian than the millennium. From the earliest ages of the church to the present, it has been a subject of interested thought, and at times the subject of the most excited thought. None will say that it has received an attention disproportionate to its importance. Whether the interest it has excited has, at all times, been kept within due bounds, or whether it has always been discussed with sufficient moderation, are questions which, I believe, may be fairly decided in the negative. Still it does not follow from this that the subject should be ignored; nor that we may not now legitimately and, it may be, even profitably prosecute an inquiry into it. Feeling that the interest of the subject is constantly increasing as the moment draws near in which the great event is to flash upon the world, we offer the present piece in hope that it shall be the commencement of an end, which shall more than repay the reader for the attention we shall have to crave at his hand while prosecuting the investigation.

On no subject of Christianity can authorities be consulted with less satisfaction than on the millennium. Where men have written on it at all, their views are both confused and contradictory. They write as though they had little confidence themselves in what they say, and hence, very naturally, they inspire little confidence in others; rather they write as if in quest of something to say than as saying something. We have been enabled to derive no aid whatever from authorities. Hence in what herein follows, the Word of God is our sole guide. In following this and this only can we be safe. Whether we do this or not; in other words, whether or not we interpret correctly Holy Writ in its teachings on the millennium, is a question we shall leave to the decision of our readers. We beg that the views here expressed shall not be inconsiderately rejected; we have no fear that they will be hastily adopted. They are intended to wear no air of dogmatism, yet is it hoped that they will rise something above mere feeble conjectures. I am anxious that the earnest attention of the brother-

hood shall be turned to the subject; for with us, as yet, it may be truly said to be a closed question. There is not among us, as far as I know, a single elaborate article in print on the subject; and I have never heard a discourse on it, nor even so much as heard of one being attempted. This silence, I believe, we may well afford to break; and when once broken, I have strong hope that good will result.

On one point, and that, too, the very point on which the reader is almost certain to feel most the want of light, I have no theory to advance; namely, the time when the millennium is to commence. In this our views will be felt to be decidedly defective. We do not know that it is proper to regret the circumstance; hence, we shall not do it. That time we believe to be indeterminate, especially to any high degree of certainty; and mere conjectures would be of no value. This much, however, we may add, that the world is living in the expectation that some momentous religious event will transpire between the present date and the year 1870. But this expectation is looking specifically to the overthrow of the "Man of Sin," and we are free to say, we can not see how, according to dates found in the Word of God, that tremendous crash can be postponed much longer. Our prayer is, that the day may be at hand. Now, of one thing we feel somewhat assured, that soon after the catastrophe of the "lawless one" will begin to happen that series of events which is immediately precedent to the millennium. Of some of these events we shall have occasion to speak soon. How long it may take to complete that series we have no means of knowing. Our persuasion is, that the time will be short. Should such be the case, then it falls not beyond the limit of probability, that there are those now living who shall never see death, but who shall live to see the gorgeous day of the millennium ushered in. If such be thy will, O Lord, count us among that number! But from these hints let no one accuse us of attempting, except contingently, to determine even proximately the time when the millennium is to begin. We have a feeling, we call it not a faith, but a feeling; and of that feeling we can give no account, except that we are as distinctly conscious of it as we are of the love of life—we repeat, we have a feeling that the day in question may be nearer at hand than the world in its drowsy mood is dreaming of. This feeling itself is somewhat distinct, the enormous object which excites it is less so; but how near to us, or how far from us, that object may be, we have no more means of determining than we have of measuring the distance between us and the spectre which strides across our path when shrouded in the fallacious mists of the sea. Of this we are sure, that the object itself is real; only it approaches us in an atmosphere so hazy as to impart incertitude to our faith, and, it may be, to disappoint our expectations. Still, in patience and in hope we shall await the disclosures of the future.

Without, then, making any effort to fix the time when the millennium is to begin, we shall now proceed to speak: 1. Of the events which, in our opinion, are immediately to precede it. 2. Of the millennium itself proper. 3. Of the events which are to follow it.

1. —As inaugurating, then, the first part of our task, we transcribe the following sections from the Book of Revelation, as translated by Tregelles, chap. xix.:

"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 diadems; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but himself. And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood; and his name has been called The Word of God. And 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 winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of God the Almighty. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.

"And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come, and be gathered together to the great supper of God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of those that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.

"And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived those that had received the mark of the beast, and those that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceedeth out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh."

In regard to this and the following sections of the same book, upon which we are about to comment, we have a few things to say generally, before proceeding to notice them in detail. That they contain a comprehensive and, in some places, even a minute account of the closing scenes of man's present state, and of those which are immediately to follow it, we hold to be simply certain. So sure are we that this is correct, that we shall not stop here to argue it, but shall allow the proof to arise as the subject is gradually unfolded. Further, these scenes all stand together as component parts of one great whole. They occur either concurrently or consecutively. One happens with another or immediately after it, and grows out of it. They come into

view, or succeed one another, much as one object does another in a landscape, that is, as conjunct parts of the same whole and not as parts of different wholes. True, in many instances they stand wide, very wide, apart; yet are they all bound up together, and as a chain, a series, or a view, they are one.

In order that we may proceed the more understandingly, it is proper here to say, that the scenes of which we are now speaking—the millennium, with its closely antecedent and closely subsequent events, were all scenes shown in vision to the Apostle John in Patmos. He there saw them in the form of a grand panorama. To him they were mere luminous types, but types of real events then lying deep in the distant future. What he then saw by the Spirit of inspiration he has jotted down. We are now engaged in an effort to read his handwriting or interpret his hieroglyphics. Such is the work before us.

As to the sense in which we expect to take these sections, a few words are thought necessary. The disposition, so long and so widely prevalent, to convert difficult or disagreeable Scriptures into mere figures of speech, and to make them mean any thing or nothing, as may happen to suit the whim of the writer, has been the source of incalculable mischief and error. No book has suffered more from this disposition than the Book of Revelation. In it, men have found ample room for the wildest gambols of fancy, and most wildly has fancy gamboled therein. If this could be set down simply to a desire to understand the book, it could well be viewed as comparatively innocent; but when it is adopted as a method of interpretation, it is difficult to censure it too sharply. By this we do not mean that the Book of Revelation contains no difficult passages. We know of no book which contains more. Neither do we mean to say that it contains no passages which are to be interpreted figuratively. Certainly no book of the New Testament contains so many. Its language is for the most part confessedly figurative, its conceptions are highly wrought, while the drapery of its scenes is gorgeous even up to the height of sublimity. We simply mean to express the belief that a more literal method of interpretation than the one in general use is both applicable to the Book of Revelation, and necessary in order to elicit its true meaning. We shall hence adopt it. Accordingly, in the sections of which we are about to treat, we shall assume that the main thread of thought is literally expressed; in other words, that it lies out upon the surface in the most obvious meaning of the language used; and that it is not to be sought in some enigmatical or fancied sense thereof. But it is necessary that I shall express myself still more fully. When, then, I use the word literal, I do not mean by it the same literalism of inornate narrative, but the absence of a purely symbolic style. As an illustration, I mean that the sections to be treated of will be construed much as we interpret the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. To inter-

pret this chapter very literally would certainly not be allowable; to interpret it very far otherwise, as certainly not right. To avoid these extremes is about all I aim at. With these preliminaries, we now proceed to notice in detail the several items of the sections already cited.

That these sections contain the description of a grand battle scene, we hold to be indisputable. In any other general view, they seem to be without significance. The hostile array of parties, the terms used to describe them, their movements, the plot, the issue—all go to prove this. Accordingly, when heaven is opened to John, Christ is seen sitting on a white horse, accompanied and panoplied as a great general-in-chief prepared for the onset. Now, we are distinctly told the objects for which he makes his appearance in the scene. "In righteousness he doth *judge* and *make war*." These objects, therefore, are two: 1. *To make war*. 2. *To judge*. We arrange them in order in the which they occur, not in the order in which they stand in the narrative. These two objects, so conspicuously stated, can not be too strongly emphasized, nor too constantly borne in mind. They are the guiding objects with reference to which the whole subsequent narrative, down to the 7th verse of the 21st chapter, is to be interpreted. From this remark a single intermediate event, which I shall not here more particularly describe, is to be excepted. We shall speak first

That Christ should appear to act a part in the character of a warrior is certainly something new, and something felt to be at variance with our accustomed views of that gracious person. Still, so it is; and it may be well for us at once to grow familiar with the fact. At first he was introduced to us as an Almighty Creator, without whom "was not any thing made that was made." Next he becomes the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world. To-day he is sitting at the right hand of the Father to complete reconciliation. But this work ended, he is then to act a new part in a new character. We say this work ended, but is it to end? and if so, when? The latter question we can not answer, to the former we reply yes. In two of these characters Christ has already acted; in the third he is acting now; in the fourth he is to act hereafter. When his present work is done, immediately his war begins; and his war once begun, thenceforward let no unransomed soul of man expect salvation. It will be too late. The instant Christ steps from the mediatorial throne, the work of remission ceases. The last act of pardon will have taken place; mercy's door will be shut; and he who is then left out is lost forever. That what is here said is true in part, no Bible student will deny. The work of salvation is certainly to come to an end: the question is, when? We place the event just before the commencement of Christ's great war. To us this seems the most appropriate time. We can hardly suppose

that he will act, at the same time, in two characters so contradictory as those of saviour and warrior. It appears, therefore, more natural to conclude that the work of salvation will cease before the war begins. Should any one cavil at this, and say it is without proof, we beg to remind him that we are inditing a theory—nothing more.

But here a most important question arises; namely, Against whom will Christ wage his war? We confidently reply, "the nations of the earth," or the wicked of the human family. He wages it not against demons, not against abstract wickedness, certainly not against the redeemed; but against the finally disobedient or ungodly. These he will "smite with a sharp sword" at the time when he "treads the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of God the Almighty." Should what is here said be true, it will suggest the answer to another curious question; to wit, What will become of the wicked before the millennium commences? For certain it is, that during that glorious period there will not one be left on earth. We again repeat, what will become of them? To this question, it seems to me, but three answers can be given:

1. They will die as men now die, and thus all pass away. We see not how this can be. Wicked men have been on the increase from Adam to the present. They are rapidly increasing now. And not only so, they increase in a more rapid ratio than the righteous. Hence, should the world stand ten thousand years longer, we see no probability that the wicked will disappear from it in this way.

2. They will all be converted and become absorbed by the church. Of the truth of this there is neither evidence nor probability. I know it is a favorite theory of some, either that the power of Satan will, in some way, be restrained, and thus the Gospel will be enabled to override all opposition, and so all will become Christians; or that the power of the Gospel will be sufficiently increased, by some mystic Spiritual influence, and thus the same end will be achieved. But on what ground this theory is held I know not. The experience of the past does not warrant it, nor do facts of the present; and it has no countenance from the Word of God. We hence reject it.

3. They will continue as now, unchanged. But this can not be; for during the millennium Satan will be bound, temptation will cease, and with it, sin—there will be, in a word, neither wickedness nor wicked men. The truth of what is here merely asserted will appear further

Putting, then, the two questions together, whom will Christ wage war against? and what will become of the wicked? and we make out, as something fearfully probable, that all the wicked will perish in that terrible conflict. But the point rests not on mere inference. It is actually asserted. "The remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse." Now the word "remnant" here does not mean,



as is obvious from the context, a remnant of the human family, implying that a part only were slain and the rest escaped, but all that remained after the capture of the beast and the false prophet, that is, the whole of the adverse army or all the wicked. This is clearly the import of the term.

From all of which I conclude that, in the end of the present state, Christ will make war on the entire wicked portion of the human family, and that in the conflict they will all die. By the term die I mean ordinary or natural death. Such will be the end of the finally impenitent.

But how long is this war likely to continue—one or one hundred years? The answer to this question, which at best is only conjectural, is implied, not expressed. How long, let me inquire, as approaching the answer, do wars generally last? Not longer, certainly, than is necessary to enable one party to conquer the other, or to enable both to discover that neither can conquer the other, when an armistice and terms of peace usually ensue. Now we have no ground to conclude that the war of Christ will be an exception to this rule. And since he has the power absolutely to terminate it the moment in which it begins, we have no reason to conclude that it will last one instant longer. To protract it beyond the initial blow would subserve no end that we can see. We are hence strongly persuaded it will not be done. As proof of this let us notice the only instrument introduced into the deadly affray. "The remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, *which sword proceeded out of his mouth.*" Here, then, is no actual conflict, no tug of war, no clash of steel, no death shriek, no streaming blood; but, on the one hand, all earth's wicked hosts unsuspectingly eating, drinking, planting, building, marrying, as in the days of the Flood; and on the other, Christ with his countless ranks all "clothed in fine linen, white and clean." He simply speaks, and all his enemies instantly fall. A mere "be it so" is said, and the work of death is complete. If now all perish the moment the fatal signal is uttered, then the war ends at once. It lasts not a day, not even an hour. This conclusion seems to be necessarily implied in the fact that the wicked all die by a word, which being instantly spoken instantly does its work.

In further proof of this, let us now notice the facts contained in the 17th and 18th verses. John saw an angel standing in the sun and heard him say with a loud voice to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, "Come, and be gathered together to the great supper of God." This, as previously stated, was to John a vision, a view, a picture, but a picture of what? What is its counterpart or what answers to it? We can not have a picture without its being a picture of something. What now is the thing of scene of which we here have the picture or representation? Does the sun in John's vision stand for

the real sun, the angel for a real angel, the fowls for the real fowls of earth, the supper for a real supper which they are literally to eat? If not, then John saw not the picture of a corresponding reality, but the picture of a non-corresponding reality, and what can this be? Again: is it safer to interpret his vision as having its counterpart in a real angel, real fowls, and a real supper, or as having no reference whatever to these realities? I confess I feel tied down here to uncertainty. The great difficulty in interpreting the Book of Revelation is not in understanding the things which John saw. These he causes us to see very plainly. In other words, he describes to us his pictures well; but the difficulty lies in our inability to determine what the various parts of his pictures represent. Where he explains, of course we have no difficulty; we have it only where he does not explain. In the verses in hand it must be confessed we have no explanation. In the absence of any, then, in what sense shall we take them? As involving, perhaps, the least risk, I shall take them as containing pictures of corresponding realities; that is, I shall understand the picture of fowls as representing real fowls, and the picture of a supper as representing real eating.

Just before the millennium, then, all the wicked will die, and die instantly. And not only so, but, as dishonoring them, God intends that they shall lie unburied, and that the fowls of the air shall eat their flesh. Their dying together and being eaten together, that is, at the same time, would seem to warrant the conclusion that the catastrophe is sudden. And why should it be otherwise? Christ can certainly thus end it if he see fit; and what in this case he can do, we see no reason to conclude he will not do.

That the wicked are to die suddenly, as here indicated, seems fully confirmed by the following passage, which certainly refers to them, as also to the close of the present state. "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write to you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; *then sudden destruction cometh upon them.*" (1 Thess., v., 1-3.) And that the wicked are to lie without sepulture seems more than probable from the following strong language: "*And all the fowls were filled with their flesh.*" It is difficult to reconcile this with the notion of a decent burial, such as we give the dead in the present day.

Besides the end of the wicked, of which we have now spoken, two other events here deserve a brief notice: 1. The capture of the beast and the false prophet, and the casting away of both these alive into the burning lake. Of the beast and the false prophet, I am candid to say, I can speak with no sort of confidence. Of the various theories which have been published respecting them, I have seen none which has given my own mind any degree of satisfaction. I wish it were in

my power to gratify the intense desire for information on this point, which I know the reader must feel: but it is not. This paper will be deemed speculative enough, without inserting any respecting the beast and the false prophet. If any of our intelligent brethren feel that they can shed any light on these two mysterious characters, we shall have pleasure in affording them room to speak. 2. The capture and imprisonment of Satan, spoken of in the following section:

"And I saw an angel coming down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: after that he must be loosed a little season." (xx., 1-4.)

About the character here spoken of we can have no doubt, and the disposition made of him is clear. Satan is mingling with the wicked up to their very last moment. He never deserts them, but to the last is present urging them on to crime by his deceptions. He is never satisfied till their ruin is sealed. The last of earth's poor, wicked children now sleeps his last sleep; and the moment is come when a check is to be imposed upon the great enemy who deceived them. Accordingly he is bound and imprisoned for the exact period of a thousand years. This time is most definite, and most important. During it Satan's power is wholly unfelt by man. He deceives no human being, and no human being commits a sin. The whole earth now rests, and praises the Lord.

II. —But the time is now come to speak of the millennium proper: and first as to the meaning of the word. The term, as many of our readers well know, is derived from the Latin, *mille*, a thousand, and *annus*, a year. It hence means a thousand years. And although it is not found in the New Testament, yet the expression "a thousand years" is, and this expression and the term are used to denote the same thing. These thousand years, however, are not a thousand ordinary years, but a thousand glorious years to which Christians, from the earliest ages of the church, have been looking forward with the deepest solicitude. These thousand years of sinless and painless bliss, constitute the millennium. Such is the meaning of the term, and such the period it denotes.

The millennium will commence in the precise instant in which Satan is bound and locked up in prison. The battle in which all the wicked die, will end. Immediately thereafter, Satan will be seized, and bound for a thousand years. This binding will consist in divesting him completely of all power over the human family. At the moment when he falls, the moment when his great bad power is wrested from him, at that moment the millennium will be inaugu-

rated. From that time it will stretch forward and include, in our opinion, a period of a thousand years precisely. It will not consist of an indefinite number of years, or be merely a long time; but of a thousand years, neither more nor less. Of the events which are further to characterize its commencement we shall now speak more particularly.

1. All the living saints will be changed. The Saviour says, in speaking of the church, "the gates of the unseen shall not prevail against it." This language we understand to mean that all Christians shall not die, but that a part of them shall live on through all time, up to its last moment. But the question very naturally arises: What will then become of them? I answer as above, they will all be changed. "Behold, I show you a mystery," says Paul, "we shall not all sleep, *but we shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." This is the change which is to take place at the commencement of the millennium. It will consist in putting off these mortal bodies, and in putting on those glorious spiritual bodies which await the finally faithful. By it the Christian will be rendered perfect, as perfect as he will ever be throughout eternity. After this he will be the subject of no further change, except such as may consist of a continual increase of knowledge.

2. The sleeping saints will all be raised. Of the truth of this all who have written and spoken on the millennium seem not satisfied; for some have taken the ground that only a part of the just will be raised. The martyrs only, say they, will be raised at the beginning of the millennium; and all the rest of the pious will remain in their graves till the end of the thousand years, and then be raised. In proof of this they cite the following passages:

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given to them: and I saw the souls of those that were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus, and because of the Word of God, and such as had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads and on their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. And the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." (Chap. xx., 4-6.)

Had we no facts or circumstances besides those contained in this passage to shed any light on the first resurrection, then might we conclude that it will be only partial. But, even in that case, I believe

the conclusion would be only probable, and that in a low degree. Now, I submit the following translation of the passage as not a whit inferior to that of Tregelles, except, possibly, in the matter of the supplement in the first clause; and some supplement is certainly necessary to enable the verse to make sense: And I saw thrones and [the saints] sat upon them, and judgment was given to them: and I saw the souls of those that were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus, and because of the Word of God; and I saw those that had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads and on their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. According to this rendering, of those who lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years, John saw two classes marked by very different characteristics: 1. "Those who were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus, and because of the Word of God." This class clearly includes the martyrs, but excludes all others. 2. "Those that had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads, and on their hands." This class just as clearly excludes the martyrs, but as certainly includes all others. Therefore, the two classes include *all the saints*, whether martyrs or not. And this we think to be the truth; that is, that all who sleep in Jesus will rise at the commencement of the millennium.

But even taking the common version of the passage, and all it indisputably warrants is, that the martyrs will certainly be raised; and, besides this, that they will be distinguished above the other saints by the reception of peculiar honors. It by no means implies that no others besides the martyrs will be raised. When the Saviour said to the apostles: "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," he certainly did not mean that no others shall sit on thrones and share in the judgment. So neither does the passage in hand teach that none but the martyrs will be raised. What a passage asserts of one class of saints, without asserting exclusively, we can not deny of a different class, especially when other passages lie against the denial.

But in further proof of a partial resurrection of the just, this passage is cited: "And the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished." But the "rest of the dead" here named are not a part of the righteous dead. They are the wicked dead. The idea is this: All the righteous dead will be raised at the commencement of the millennium, but the rest of the dead, who are the wicked dead, will not be raised until the end thereof.

Again: when the apostle says, "the dead in Christ shall rise first," the expression "the dead in Christ" is incapable of being made to include only the martyrs. It clearly includes all the righteous dead. And further, while the expression "shall rise first" means that the

righteous dead shall first rise, and that then immediately the righteous living shall be changed; it also implies that all who rise will rise at the same time. I hence conclude that whenever one of the dead in Christ rises, all the rest will rise at the same instant.

As further proof of this conclusion I quote the following: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." In this passage a particular event is alluded to and called "Christ's coming." When this event happens, those that are Christ's are to rise from the dead. Now, it seems clear that the expression "they that are Christ's" includes all who are his, and not merely a part, as the martyrs. Indeed, we feel confident that this is its meaning.

But it is most evident that others besides the martyrs are to share the honors of the millennium. Certainly those of the saints who remain alive to that time and are then changed will share them. Now, if these, who of course are not martyrs, share the honors of the millennium with the martyrs, then why not all who are not martyrs? And this would include all the pious dead. We can see but one answer to this question. To put a strong case: let us suppose two men, precisely equal in a moral point of view, and precisely equal in the estimation of our Heavenly Father. These men live on up into the last day before the commencement of the millennium. In the morning of that day one of them sickens and dies. He is no martyr; hence he sleeps on through the millennium to its end. The other lives on through the day to the moment when the millennium begins; he is then changed, and reigns with Christ a thousand years. Is there reason in or reason for the difference? I confess I can not see it; hence I do not believe the difference will exist. On the contrary, I not only believe that all the saints who are alive at the coming of Christ will then be changed, but also that all who sleep, not one excepted, will then be raised and also changed. So that all the ransomed children of God shall meet, in time now coming, on the margin of the empty tomb and there greet each other. Proud day! It makes me wild to think of it. My kin lie sleeping, sleeping in the ground. My brethren sleep there, brethren loved as life itself is loved. The forest tree stands over them, and night lies dark on their bed. The grave worm is in their flesh, and no voice of friendship is heard to cheer them in that silent world. They have been, many of them, long absent; yet how oft in the restless night, when the spirit is troubled, and dreams troop through the brain, do they return. The maternal face looks on us again, sisterly voices send a strange sweet thrill through the soul, such, it may be, as the disembodied spirit alone knows truly. If such be the feeling which the mere phantom excites, what must be the joy which the reality shall induce? But we

shall not be undutiful and fret for that day, except as it is the Father's will to hasten it.

The event of which we are now speaking, the resurrection of the just, is called by way of distinction "*the first resurrection.*" It is not so called, however, because it is a first resurrection of the just, thereby implying that there will be a second resurrection of the just. It is so called simply because it is the first, in contradistinction to the second resurrection. In the first resurrection all the righteous will be raised and not one of the wicked; in the second resurrection all the wicked will be raised and not one of the righteous; and these two resurrections will stand a thousand years apart, the first occurring at the beginning of the millennium, the second at its end. The popular notion, therefore, that all the dead, both the righteous and the wicked, will rise at the same time and be indiscriminately mingled together is an error. Each one rises in his "own order," rank, or division—the righteous with the righteous at one time, the wicked with the wicked at a different time.

3. The actual personal and literal reappearance of the Saviour. We confidently expect this event to take place in the commencement moment of the millennium. That Christ is to revisit the earth one day, as literally as he left it, is what we think no Bible student can deny without, in the act, avowing a principle, which, if sound, at once extinguishes the truth of Christianity. The only question which is at all debatable is, When will he come? And even on this we think little doubt can arise, except as doubt arises as to when the millennium will begin. It is expressly declared, as already quoted, that those who are Christ's will be made alive "*at his coming.*" No language can be clearer than this, and of itself it ought to be decisive of the question. Now, if those who are Christ's will be made alive at the commencement of the millennium, and this we shall now assume, then, at that time will Christ personally reappear. The time when his disciples are changed determines the time of his coming. The two events are simultaneous. To the same effect is the following: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say to you, by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess., iv., 13-17.) Here the descent of the Lord is described in language as unfigurative as that

in which the resurrection of the dead is described. If we take the one event literally, so also must we take the other. The whole piece of information was communicated to comfort the disciples; besides, it is upon a subject of great intricacy to them. It is hardly natural, therefore, to suppose that it has been expressed in other than in very plain language. Certain of the disciples are represented as being alive, as remaining *to the coming of the Lord*; then the dead arise, the living are changed, and all are caught up together with the Lord in the air. This does not sound like any thing else than a strictly literal detail of facts. Accordingly, I can not look upon it in any other light. I hence conclude that Christ will literally come in person at the commencement of the millennium, and literally remain here on earth during the entire thousand years.

Such are a few of the great events which are to mark the commencement of the millennium. We feel overwhelmed with their significance and importance. So marvelous are they, and so deeply do they involve our happiness, that we are shy to believe them. Our very fear that they may not be true increases our incredulity and causes us to distrust them. We hesitate to commit ourselves even to our own faith, lest in the end we should be made sick at heart by disappointment. Yet, if the Word of God assert these things, then we shall not be disappointed. Does it then teach them? This question settled, and we may wait in confidence.

It does not appear, from the record before us, that any change will take place in the earth itself at the commencement of the millennium. It seems that it is to remain in all respects as it now is till the end of that time. Then, and not till then, will the new heavens and the new earth appear. Here, at least, the narrative seems to locate that great change. Now this jars not a little on our feelings. We are so accustomed to associate the resurrection of the just and the new earth together, that we find it difficult to separate them. Not only so, but we have half learned to feel that the new earth is necessary to the new body, and that we can not be happy in this, without that. The shortest thought, however, should satisfy us that this feeling is ill-founded. That the new earth will be, in some way, necessary to the perfection of our happiness, we may correctly infer from the fact that God is going to provide it. We must, however, think it necessary rather on the score that he is going to provide sumptuously and even gorgeously for our happiness, than on the ground that no measure thereof can exist without it. This earth at present may not be a very desirable home, and we are not in a condition to affirm that it is. Still, where does the defect lie? Not so much in the earth surely as in us. When we are changed we shall the less need a change in the earth. We have a fancy, it is but a fancy, that it will then be a pretty respectable home. When our bodies cease to be what they now are,



we shall not so much need the earth to be what it is not now. Its heat can not affect us injuriously then, neither can its cold. These do not, that we know of, affect angels' bodies, if they have any, when visiting the earth. As little will they affect those spiritual bodies for which we look. From the influence of poisonous miasmas we shall be wholly free. We can not sicken, nor otherwise suffer. With sin, with death, with the infirmities of the body, all that makes this world bitter will pass away. When such is the case, we can well afford to be content with the present earth till the time comes to change it. As long as the wicked dead lie in it, it seems not to be the purpose of our Heavenly Father to disturb it. Not until they arise will it be touched. The dust of the dead, though they be the wicked dead, must not be disquieted to provide a home even for the millennial saints. The bed of God's unransomed children is sacred in his sight. For those degenerate ashes he has a mournful regard. Their deep and awful repose he will not break till the time of their waking comes. That time will not be till the thousand years are past. Thus long, then, must those who shall be accounted worthy of a part in the first resurrection wait before they enter into the full measure of their honors.

We have now spoken of the great events which are to mark the millennial dawn. In treating them we have aimed to follow pretty much the order of the sacred narrative. These we have made no effort to embellish. Their own sublime significance forbids it. Should they turn out to be true, no flight of fancy can exaggerate their importance. The most fertile imagination is too poor to do them justice; and although we have touched them with a diffident, nay, even a doubting hand, still we feel that they are just sufficiently probable to cause us to tremble over them while we think.

This seems the proper place to say a few things of the joys and honors of the millennial state. Of these the Scriptures speak but briefly and only in general terms. The following is about as full as any tiling we have: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." We learn also that the saints have a "camp" and a "beloved city;" but beyond this we know but little. All else is inferential and implied.

Among the high spiritual pleasures of that long tranquil Sabbath, surely the chief will be to see the Saviour himself in person. Of all the events of the future, I look forward to this with the profoundest emotion. As I write by a little dark window, a bridge lies north of me half a mile. I try to realize what the sensations of my soul would be, if it were announced that the Saviour is coming to-day. I can see the excited crowd rushing by shouting, He comes! he comes! But

let me dream that I hear it said, Now he is on the bridge; and in an instant more, that from ten thousand bursting hearts the loud glad cry goes up, Yonder he is! yonder he is! Oh, ye sorrowing children of earth with bitter spirits, lift high your heads, and check your tears; for a better day than even this awaits you. How exquisitely sweet, rather how ecstatic, will it be to stand in the presence of the Redeemer and gaze on that glorious form. I want to get close beside him, and note his night and the color of his hair; I want to look him in the face and in the eye, that deep calm sweet eye; I want to see his lips move, and hear him talk; I want to strike my hand in his, and feel its grip; to ask for the nail-scar therein, and look on it; and if it meet his approval, I will thank him if he will lift that hand and gently lay it on my poor head, and say, Well done, good and faithful Servant, your sorrows are ended now! What then will be all the by-gone griefs of earth amid the entrancing excitement of that proud moment? As the black cloud serves as a fitting ground on which to paint the rainbow's "lovely form," so these griefs will be but the dark remembered shadows of the present life, which shall serve to set out in more resplendent outline the pleasures of that state.

Next to meeting the Saviour, and hardly inferior to it in its effect on our feelings, will be the joy of meeting the children of God. This will be no brief meeting to be broken again by death, amid the falling of tears and the parting of heart-strings. It will be forever. Nevermore shall it be interrupted for so much as an instant. To all its other joys may be added this, as no mean one, that it will never end. Met, and met forever, will be mingled in all the salutations of the blest. No sad farewell shall ever there tremble on the lip. Adieu will be memories of life past, but no part of life present. They make up much of our daily dialect now, they shall be obsolete then. We shall be happy to let them fall into complete disuse.

How the redeemed shall employ their time we know not; but some things which they will not do we know well. They shall never gather about the bed to wipe the death-drop from the brow of dying kin and neighbors. The winding-sheet shall nevermore be wrapped about pulseless forms; nor the hard board be brought in as the last bed for the sleeper; nor watchers sit the live-long night looking on silent bodies. Ponder old songs shall no more be sung by breaking hearts at the request of departing friends; nor sobbing prayers be offered amid the bent forms of weeping wives and helpless little ones. Those leave-takings shall never happen more when the father collects his flock about him, whispers his benediction on all his children round, drops a few words of weighty affectionate counsel to mother, gazes on all for the last time with those strange tearless eyes, and then goes hence. These scenes shall never happen there; and, Almighty Father, let me pause here to thank thee that they never shall. No

pick shall be bought nor spade lifted to open a gate into the unseen, that the hence-bound may enter therein. No; all these things will lie far in the shadowy background of the present life.

When all the past is revived in memory, and nothing learned can be forgotten; when, what is far better, the heart shall be free from every stain of sin and from every evil passion; when selfishness and covetousness shall be known only as belonging to the regretted past, how lofty and how pure must then be our intercourse. What grand poems shall be conceived and uttered; what lofty melodies chanted; what polished, luminous, and gorgeous eloquence shall adorn every theme; and how varied and how deep shall knowledge be. When the old human harp shall again be strung to pour forth the praises of God its maker, lofty and grand will be its peals. Then shall the worship of the Most High be a perpetual feast of the soul; all shall join therein, and bless his holy name forever.

We may be sure the saints will not be idle during those thousand years. It seems that they are to be employed in building them a glorious city. Certain it is that they are to have one, and we know not who else is to build it. Whether the camp and the city are to be the same, we know not. But here the ransomed shall be ever together, praising the Lord, with the Saviour in their midst. Thus shall the millennium pass away, but not like a splendid dream. It will serve as a prelude to the yet more enrapturing future, and prepare for the new heavens and new earth, of which we must speak soon.

III. —Having now spoken of the events which are to precede the millennium, and briefly of the millennium itself proper, we come next to speak of the events which are to succeed it. This will bring us to the close of all earthly scenes, as well as to that of the present article.

At the end of the millennium, then, as already quoted, Satan is to be loosed a "little season." We trust it will be a brief one indeed. He will again go out to his ancient work of deceiving the nations, and stirring up war. The following paragraph gives us the close of his grand bad career:

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down out of heaven, from God, and devoured them. And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where both the beast and the false prophet are, and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

An important question, and not free from difficulty according to some, here presents itself. Who are the nations, whence do they

come, and where are they, whom Satan goes out to deceive and to gather together to battle? We think it easy to find the answer to this question. It will be remembered that "the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Now the "rest of the dead" here spoken of are the wicked dead. At the precise instant, therefore, in which Satan is loosed out of prison, all these will be raised. Every one comes up in his own rank, and this is the rank of the wicked. This, moreover, is the second resurrection. In the first, the righteous only were raised; in the second, only the wicked. That takes place at the beginning of the millennium, this at its end. As that embraces all the righteous, so this embraces all the wicked. Hence, those whom Satan goes out to deceive are the wicked nations who rise in the second resurrection. These are the true Gog and the Magog, about which so much has been needlessly said. These nations are those who have given Satan the service of their lives. They are his old subjects, the dupes of his tricks, whom now, perhaps, from a habit grown easy, he will find it not hard to deceive.

In what the deception will consist can not with certainty be affirmed. Most likely, we think, in promising the wicked a victory over the saints and the beloved city. This we infer from the fact, that consequent on the deception they collect together in countless numbers to invest the city, which doubtless they would not do without some hope of taking it.

From what has now been quoted and said, it will be seen that there are to be two great battles in the future, with Christ and the wicked as the opposing parties. The first occurs just before the millennium commences. In this only a part of the wicked will be present—those who are alive at the time. The second happens at the end of the millennium. In this every wicked human being of earth will be present. Not one will be absent. In the wisdom and providence of God, all the wicked must be crushed by the power of his Son. They have all carried a high and rebellious hand against righteousness, truth, and holiness. For this they shall be made the "footstool" of the Prince of peace. As victims they must bow their backs to the burden, and own that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Such is the bitter fate to which they are reserved.

It appears that as soon as these wicked spring into life, as soon as they are brought from their dishonored graves, they turn their eyes toward the beloved city, and set their hearts on mischief. For the last time they raise the fiendish shout of battle, On, warriors, on! and they rush to the deadly *melee*. Satan knows that his time is short, and with the grand port of his great nature, with restless eye, with quick step, with hellish hate, he moves amid those long lines and deep ranks of haggard human wrecks, and urges to the affray. On the breadth of the earth they come up, and beleaguer the camp of the

saints and the beloved city. And now their end is come. The last sand has dropped from the glass which measures their crimeful career. *Fire comes down, from heaven, from God, and devours them.* Is not this the event to which Paul alludes when he says: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?" The question is worthy of thought, and the possible coincidence in the teachings of the two passages striking. Earth's last battle has now been fought, and its strife brought to a close; and we have but to sum up its results.

Satan is taken and cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, there to be tormented day and night, forever and ever. My soul, let us pause on the brink of that pit, whither we have gone to watch his last leap, and look back over the track of that dreadful spirit. From the garden of Eden all along what desolation and ruin glare on us! Count, ye unfallen spirits above, count, if ye can, the wars he has excited, the human beings he has murdered, the human forms he has mangled, the sins he has tempted to, the tears he has caused, the hearts he has crushed, the ties he has sundered, the hopes he has blighted, the spirits he has damned—count them, and then we shall but know in part the work of that dread being. But his long bad work, all thanks to the victorious Saviour, is now done, forever done.

In what the devouring of those wicked will consist, or what will be its precise nature, we can not say. In annihilation certainly it will not consist; for immediately these same wicked appear in judgment. Beyond this all is conjecture.

In the first part of this article special attention was called to the fact that the Saviour had two objects to accomplish in making his appearance in the last time; namely, to make war, and to judge. How and by what means he will attain the first object we have now seen. It remains, therefore, only to speak of the second. The sum, or nearly so, of what we know in regard to the judgment is contained in the following passage:

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hades gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the

lake of fire. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

On this passage but little need be said. It contains a brief account of the final judgment, together with a reiteration of some things already elsewhere told in different language. For instance, the sea is represented as giving up the dead which were in it. Now, of course, all the dead, whether in the sea or not, are raised either in the first or in the second resurrection. When, therefore, they are, on another occasion, as above, represented as being given up, this must be regarded as a reiteration. Two more points yet merit notice:

1. The second death. This, as will readily be perceived, is not a literal death. It consists in casting away the wicked, after judgment, into the lake of fire and brimstone. It is more awful, therefore, than any literal death we can possibly imagine. Death is a term full of horrors, and is hence used to describe the event. We hardly, however, suppose we go too far when we express the opinion that it still falls far short of giving us a complete view of the dreadful scene.

2. The baptism in fire. On this much has been written, and much spoken; and very much of both to little effect. Now we request the reader to place himself on the margin of that lake of fire just after the judgment. Watch the countless thousands of the wicked as they approach its brink, and fling themselves into it and disappear. If this be not the baptism in fire, then are we ready to admit that we can not even imagine what it is. It may be objected, that this takes too literal a view of the subject, that, in other words, it unjustifiably materializes the punishment of the wicked. In reply to this we have nothing to say, except that we distrust those exegeses which convert such language as we are now considering into mere figures of speech or rhetorical flourishes.

We are brought, in the history of the marvelous events attendant on the millennium, to the point where the new heavens and the new earth come into view. On this subject we have the following:

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.

"And he that sitteth upon the throne said, Behold, I make all

things new. And he said, Write: for these words are faithful and true. And he said to me, They are done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end."

It appears, then, that no change will take place in the earth at the commencement of the millennium; nor any at its end, until that last great battle is fought, and the judgment ended, and the wicked cast away. Then no one will be left sleeping in the earth, nor the dust of any lying on it. Every grave will be empty. This, therefore, seems a fitting time to renew both earth and heaven. Where the saints shall be during this event we can not say. Caught up, it may be, to meet the Lord in the air, as he now descends from the throne of judgment, to dwell with his people forever. Be this, however, as it may, they are safe; and the moment has come when the old earth, like the old body, must be changed, and the last stain of sin be blotted out forever.

In an instant, then, as we conceive, consuming no more space than it takes to produce the spiritual body—in an instant, we say, like the explosion of a vast magazine, will the earth be wrapped in a sheet of flame; and in an instant more, all will pass away. The new earth now lies beneath the smiles of God, decked in light and loveliness such as the unfallen only know. Over it hangs the bright, glorious, outspreading heavens resplendent as the throne of the Eternal. And now to this earth, thus refitted up, the saints return to dwell forever and forever. This is to be their eternal home, their everlasting habitation. Then will be realized the truth of the Saviour's beatitude: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." This will be a promise till that moment, then a sublime fact in the fruition of God's children. The saints have never owned the earth, and never will, till then.

The notion, so very prevalent, that the Christian's future home lies away in some immeasurably distant region, is only a vulgar error. No foundation whatever exists for it. God built this earth for man, and he does not intend to be defeated in his purpose. Nothing can be weaker than to suppose that the Saviour will rebuild, out of the old material, a new earth, and then leave it to float in space without an occupant. Such will not be the case. The earth in its renewed form will be man's everlasting dwelling-place. On it will stand the New Jerusalem, the true city of the Great King, and the home of God's ransomed children. Here amid the splendors of that grand fane shall they spend the cycles of eternity.

## THE BIBLE UNION—ITS WORKS CRITICISED.

THE American Bible Union, a Society organized for the purpose of procuring and circulating correct versions of the Scriptures in all languages, has now been in existence about fourteen years. The first two of these years were devoted to active propagation of the principles of the Society, and to perfecting a plan of operations. At the second annual meeting, in 1852, it was announced that a plan had been devised for the revision of the English Scriptures, which would insure the speedy completion of the work, with scarcely the possibility of sectarian bias. Eminent biblical scholars of different religious parties were to be employed, and the expectation was announced that the entire New Testament would be completed "in *three* years, and perhaps in two." (Documentary History. Vol. I.) In due time the plan was put into operation, and it was announced that about forty distinguished men of nine different denominations were actually at work upon different portions of the New Testament.

Specimens of the work of some of these revisers were published from time to time, and in 1857 it was officially announced that "nearly *sixty* manuscript revisions, each of some whole book of the New Testament," had been furnished from their pens. (Documentary History. Vol. I.) At the same time we were greeted with the intelligence that a final Committee had been employed, composed of four most eminent scholars, the number to be increased to seven if suitable men could be found on either continent. It soon became evident, however, that only one of these final revisers was fully engaged upon the work; and that he, instead of dressing up the rough-hewn timber of previous workmen, began his labors *de novo*. Thus the boasted results of five years' labor, and of a vast expenditure of money, were all found to be worthless, and cast aside as that much money and labor lost. When, some two or three years later, the people were favored with specimens of revision from the final Committee, they fell so far short of public expectation that thousands of the most ardent friends of the enterprise began to lose confidence in its ultimate success. Public confidence, once on the wane, declined rapidly, and nothing has since occurred to restore it. On the contrary, the Society which was once so catholic as to employ forty men of nine different denominations, whose conflicting prejudices were to neutralize each other, and subsequently proposed to give employment to seven of the most renowned scholars in Europe and America as a finishing Committee, seems at last to have resolved



itself into a mere Committee for the publication of one man's revisions, and he not noted for freedom from sectarian bias.

Such being, in brief, the history of the Society's management, it is not surprising that many of its former friends have deserted its fortunes, in despair of ever realizing from its hands the great and good object of their hopes. But they were willing to forgive all this unfortunate management and loss of means, together with all this tedious delay, if at last, notwithstanding their despair, a satisfactory version should appear. Within the last two years, two volumes have been issued from the final Committee, embracing about two-thirds of the entire New Testament. The Committee declare, in their preface to the first volume, that they found it necessary to "reserve their decision on some questions which are still under consideration," but add, that "these questions, for the most part, relate to points of expression merely, and not to the meaning of the text." We may regard this work, therefore, as finished, in the estimation of the Committee, with comparatively unimportant exceptions. Moreover, as these volumes are evidently from the pen of Dr. Conant, the chief reviser, we may regard them as finished in his estimation, and suppose that the questions yet under consideration have reference to objections urged by other members of the Committee, the propriety of which he has not yet conceded. We may certainly, therefore, consider it a fair test of his ability as a translator.

With these specimens before us we are prepared to judge the Bible Union by the mature results of its management, and thereby determine whether to reverse the conclusion which its former unsuccessful management forced upon us.

In order to do justice to an author, we must judge his work with reference to what he himself proposed to accomplish, and, in a case like this, with reference to the rules imposed by his employers. These rules have been before the public for twelve years, and are quite familiar to all the well-informed friends of the revision enterprise. The first of the series reads as follows:

"The exact meaning of the inspired text, as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were written, must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, so far as they can be found, in the vernacular tongue of those for whom the version is designed, with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness."

That "the exact meaning of the inspired text" should be translated is an indisputable proposition. But the declaration that it should be "translated by corresponding words and phrases" is liable to misconception. If it means that each word and phrase should be *literally* translated, without reference to the context or to differences of idiom, no scholar could possibly assent to it. It would, therefore, be doing

injustice to the authors of it to suppose that such is their meaning. We rather understand the rule to require that the exact meaning of the inspired text be translated by such words and phrases as are properly employed in English to express that meaning. In cases where the idiom is different, it requires the English idiom to be employed, instead of transferring the Greek idiom; and it requires that everywhere the translation should be understood by an Englishman, precisely as the original was understood by a Greek. Thus interpreted, the rule must be regarded as a good one.

The second rule is as follows:

"Wherever there is a version in common use it shall be made the basis of revision, and all unnecessary interference with the established phraseology shall be avoided; and only such alterations shall be made, as the exact meaning of the inspired text, and the existing state of the language may require."

As regards the English language, this rule requires not a new translation, but merely a revision of King James' version. It requires such alterations as the exact meaning of the original may demand, and such as shall conform the style to "the existing state of the language." It forbids all other changes.

Another rule requires that "every Greek word or phrase, in the translation of which the phraseology of the common version is changed, must be carefully examined in every place in which it occurs in the New Testament, and the views of the reviser given as to its proper translation in each place."

Whether the views of the reviser required by this rule were intended for publication, or merely for the use of other revisers, we are not informed; but it certainly demanded a thorough examination of the New Testament usage of every Greek word. Without this it would be difficult to maintain any great degree of consistency in the

Combining now the requirements of these three rules, we learn what Dr. Conant was expected to accomplish. He was expected,

1. To express in the translation the exact meaning of the inspired text.
2. To express that meaning in idiomatic and modern English.
3. To determine the meaning of each word, the translation of which is changed, in every place in which it occurs throughout the New Testament.

In the two volumes before us, reaching to the close of 2d Corinthians, these rules have been complied with to some extent, and to this extent the revision is an improvement on the common version. But inasmuch as the acceptability of a revision depends less upon the number of improvements which it contains, than upon the number of inaccuracies which still disfigure it, we propose to point out some of

the latter. This is a severe method of testing a version, and one in which the critic must appear not to appreciate the excellencies of the work he criticises; but it is the only one which can be of service in securing further improvement.

Does this revision, then, fail in any instances to express the exact meaning of the original? We think it does, in many; and shall proceed to point out a few of them. We will select, under this head, such only as have an important and general bearing upon the teachings of the New Testament.

The masses of the people have experienced no little perplexity over the command of Jesus: "*Take no thought*" for life, for food, for raiment, for to-morrow. Many attempts have been made to harmonize it with the actual experience of the best of men, even of the apostles, and with other injunctions of the New Testament; but as long as the words stand in their naked simplicity, "*Take no thought*," the people feel that these attempts are unsatisfactory. Dr. Conant has it, "*take not thought*;" but the difference is in the expression, not in the meaning. In this he follows John Wesley, and offers no reason for the change.

The fact that the common version stands almost alone in this rendering furnishes strong ground for suspecting its accuracy. Dr. George Campbell says: "No foreign version that I know, ancient or modern, agrees with the English in this particular. As to the later English translations, suffice it to observe, that, Wesley's alone excepted, there is none of those that I have seen that does not use either *anxious* or *solicitous*." The critical commentators are about equally uniform in their testimony, though some of them, as Bloomfield, retain the idea of *thought*, and render the command: "*Take no anxious thought*." But Dr. Campbell affirms correctly that for this meaning of the original term there is "*no authority, sacred or profane*." The idea of *thought* is not in the word. It is *merimnao*, a term never used to express the act of thinking, and never so translated except in the sermon on the mount, and the Saviour's instructions to the apostles when sending them on their first mission. In every other connection it is rendered in the common version by the term, *care*, and Dr. Conant, so far as he has met the word, follows this example, with a single exception. Here are some of its occurrences: "Martha, thou *art careful*, and troubled about many things" (Luke, x., 41); "He that is married *careth* for the things of the world, how he may please his wife" (1 Cor., vii., 33); "*Be careful* for nothing" (Phil., iv., 6). The exception is the rebuke of Martha, which Dr. Conant renders: "Thou art *anxious* and troubled about many things." He agrees with the common version in rendering the noun *merimna* uniformly by the term *care*. Now, if the meaning of the word is correctly rendered in these passages, it certainly does not mean to *think*.

It expresses not an *act of the mind*, but a *feeling of the heart*. It is not used to prohibit *thinking* about the things of the world, but to prohibit a certain *feeling* which is apt to attend this thinking, and which can be avoided. The Apostle Paul, going more into detail than Jesus, gives us directions by which, though thinking, and thinking seriously on, these things, we may be without this feeling, and in place of it enjoy a peace which passes understanding. He says: "Be *careful*" (*full of care*) "for *nothing*; but in *everything*, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known to God, and the *peace* of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Now, in the very act of making known to God our requests about *everything*, we *think* of it, and think seriously; but this is the very way by which to avoid the *care* which Paul and Jesus both forbid.

Seeing now that the rendering "*take thought*" is employed in only two connections, and everywhere else a very different meaning is given to the word, it is a matter of interest to inquire how this unusual and objectionable rendering came to be employed. Dean Trench answers this inquiry by showing that the term *thought* was once used in the very sense that we contend for as the meaning of the original word. He quotes from Bacon the statement, that "Harris, an alderman in London, was put in trouble and died of *thought* and anxiety before his business came to an end;" from another writer of the same period, that "Queen Elizabeth Parr died of *thought*;" and from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, a passage in which he makes Brutus say of Antony, when speaking of the effect on him of the contemplated assassination of Caesar: "All that he can do is to himself—*take thought* and *die* for Caesar." These writers belong to the same age with our common version, and in these extracts they clearly use the term *thought* in the sense of *melancholy*. When, therefore, our translators departed from their common rendering of the original *merimnao*, and rendered "*take not thought*," their purpose was to express the meaning more intensively than they could by the term *care*. They meant *go not into melancholy*; or as the masses now would more familiarly say, *take not the blues*. If they had wished to prohibit *thinking*, they would not have adopted the awkward and circuitous expression, "*take no thought*;" but would have come right at the matter by saying, "*think not*." It is manifest, then, that the originators of this rendering used it in a sense entirely different from that it now bears, and that in which it is used by Dr. Conant. He has adopted their words without the idea which they were intended to express.

The true meaning of *merimnao*, in the sermon on the mount, was expressed as long ago as the second century, by the Latin Vulgate. It has "*Ne solliciti sitis*," *be not solicitous*. As an English rendering, Dr. Campbell very justly prefers *anxious* rather than *solicitous*, "both

as coming nearer the sense of the original, and as being in more familiar use." I would add, that *anxious* is better than *careful*, because the latter has departed from its original sense, *full of care*, and is now more commonly used in the sense of *prudent watchfulness*. The terms *anxious* and *anxiety* will translate the original accurately and uniformly throughout the New Testament, and they are the only terms that will do so. They should, therefore, by all means be employed.

Before dismissing this topic, I must notice one objection which Dr. Conant urges against the rendering "*be not anxious*." He argues; "if this be the idea, how can it be said in verse 34, *the morrow will be anxious for its own*. Is that, then, permitted to-morrow which is forbidden to-day." The Doctor's artillery recoils against himself. Try it in reference to his own rendering, "*take not thought*." If this be correct, how can it be said that to-morrow will *take thought for its own*? Is that, then, permitted to-morrow, which is forbidden to-day? When he answers his own question in reference to his own rendering, his objection will be withdrawn. He will see that Jesus meant to assert that to-morrow would have its own *temptations* to anxiety about its own affairs, while he forbids the anxiety both to-day and to-morrow.

It is highly important that all Scripture statements concerning the beings and things of the spirit world be accurately represented in a translation; for all we can possibly know of these things is by the exact words of revelation. In this respect Dr. Conant's version is exceedingly faulty. There is one great enemy of God and man, called Satan in Hebrew, and *the Devil* in Greek; and there are innumerable unclean or wicked spirits, called *demons*. The two are never confounded in the Word of God, nor in the writings "of scholars; yet, Dr. Conant, in defiance of all criticism, persists in styling them all *devils*. By this rendering he *hides* from the unlearned a class of beings mentioned in the Word of God, while he makes the false impression that there are *many devils*. But even in this he is not consistent; for in one passage (Acts, xvii., 18) he calls the demons *gods*, instead of *devils*; and in one (1 Cor., x., 20) he calls them correctly *demons*. In the latter passage the common version makes Paul say that, "what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils*, and not to God." Now this is not true. The Gentiles knew nothing of the Devil, much less of *devils*. In order, therefore, to save Paul from making a false charge, Dr. Conant felt compelled to give the term here its true rendering. That he made this change here proves that he recognizes the distinction between *demons* and *devils*, and renders him inexcusable for not preserving it elsewhere. There can be no justification for such work, and none is attempted in the elaborate notes accompanying his first edition of Matthew.

It is universally conceded that *demon* is the proper representative

of the Greek *daimon*, yet few, if any, critics have been altogether consistent in giving it this meaning. If the term means *demon* when standing alone, it means the same when found in composition. The term *deisidaimonia* is compounded of *deido*, to fear, and *daimonia*, demons, and means the fear or worship of demons. When rendered in the speech of Festus (Acts, xxv., 19) by *superstition*, as in the common version, or by *religion*, as in Dr. Conant's version, its true meaning is not brought out. True, demon-worship is both a *superstition* and a *religion*; but, the sacred writer by this term specifies a particular superstition and religion, and he ought to be allowed in the translation to make the same specification which he does in the original. This can not be denied. When Festus, therefore, tells Agrippa that the difficulty between Paul and the Jews was about "certain controversies concerning their *demon-worship*," let his exact thought be expressed. That this was his exact thought is evident, not only from the word that he employs, but from his explanation of it; for he adds, that it was "concerning a certain *Jesus* who was *dead*, whom Paul affirmed to be *alive*." Now demons are the spirits of dead men, as defined by both Jewish and Gentile writers (see quotations in address on Demonology, in Campbell's Popular Lectures), and demon-worship is that deification of dead heroes for which the Greeks and Romans were so famous. How, then, should the controversy between Paul and the Jews, in which the former contended that Jesus was risen from the dead, and ought to be worshiped, be regarded by a heathen like Festus, as any thing else than a controversy about *demon-worship*? With this rendering, we have a glimpse of the light in which heathen philosophers first saw the Christian worship. In the common version this thought is lost to the common

The same is true of the passage in which Dr. Conant has *gods* instead of demons. When the Athenian idolators heard Paul speak of Jesus and the resurrection, they correctly understood that Jesus was a man who had died, and whom Paul affirmed to be risen again, and to be an object of worship. They expressed this conception exactly when they said: "He seems to be a proclaimer of foreign *demons*," not *gods* (Acts, xvii., 18). They used the term, not in the evil sense that we have learned to attach to it, but in its proper sense of departed human spirits. Most of their objects of worship were confessedly of this class of beings. Such were Hercules, Apollo, Esculapius, etc.; and they supposed that Jesus was of the same class in the estimation of the foreigners whom Paul represented. When they took Paul to the Areopagus, to learn more of the matter, he spoke of their worship by the use of this same term in the adjective form. He said, not that they were too *superstitious*, nor, as Dr. Conant has it, *very devout*; but that they were "*deisidaimo-*

nesterous," much given to the worship of demons. This was the exact truth in the case, and it is just as Paul afterward said of them when writing to their neighbors, the Corinthians: "What they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, not to God."

There is another term connected with the spirit world which is inaccurately rendered by Dr. Conant. It is the term *hades*, which he uniformly renders *underworld*. The reason which he gives for this rendering is the fact that *hades* was conceived of as *beneath the earth*, and that men were spoken of as going *down into* it. This fact can not be denied, and it was a most natural conception to men who supposed the earth to be a vast plain, and to have beneath it a region never visited by the light of the sun. But while such was the popular conception of the *location* of *hades*, this conception is not in the word, nor is it at all a necessary conception. The word primarily means "*the unseen*," and, by appropriation, the *unseen place of departed spirits*. It indicates no locality; and to render it by a word which limits its locality, as *underworld* does, is to misrepresent its meaning. Moreover, the conception of locality expressed by *underworld* is now known to be incorrect; for there is no such space under the earth as the ancients supposed. This rendering, therefore, is entirely inadmissible. The only available alternative is to use the term *hades*, which has already been transferred into English usage. There can be no objection to this term on the ground of obscurity to the mere English reader; for if it were uniformly adopted, its own Scripture usage would clearly indicate its meaning; and if the reader were left to his English lexicon, it is a better rendering than *underworld*, for *hades* is found in Webster's dictionary as an English word, and *underworld* is not.

While we charge Dr. Conant with thus incorrectly rendering the term *hades*, we must give him credit for carefully preserving the distinction between this term and *gehenna*, a distinction completely ignored in the common version. The latter term he uniformly renders *hell*, the former never.

The work of the Holy Spirit is one of those leading themes of the New Testament, a misconception of which may involve very serious consequences. The words used to describe it, therefore, can not be too carefully translated. The first passage in which this work is distinctly announced by Jesus, is greatly obscured in the common version by the term *reprove*: "He will *reprove* the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Every reader feels the incongruity of saying he will *reprove* the world of righteousness and of judgment. Dr. Conant has amended the passage by substituting *convict*: "He will *convict* the world." But this is equally incongruous. We can convict the world of sin; but not of righteousness or of judgment. We must have here some term equally suited to all

the dependent clauses of the sentence, in order to be sure that we correctly express the Saviour's idea. The original term *elencho*, covers the ground of the two English words *convince* and *convict*. The latter has reference to crime, the former to any fact or proposition. When the original term has reference to crime, it should be rendered *convict*, when not thus limited, it should be rendered *convince*. It also sometimes has the sense of *reprove*; but this is a secondary meaning, and arose from the fact that to *convict* one of sin is to administer a *reproof*. The connection is to determine which of these words to employ. In this case, two of the limiting clauses forbid the idea of sin or crime, therefore both *convict* and *reprove* are improper. The terms righteousness and judgment designate facts, which must be established by testimony. So of the term sin: for it is the fact that men are sinners which is referred to, and not the awakening in them of a sense of guilt. This latter is a result of the former; it is the former alone which the word here designates. Consequently, *convince* is the only English representative of *elencho* which will express the true idea. The Spirit was to *convince* the world that it was a sin not to believe in Jesus, that there was righteousness attainable in him, and there is a judgment to come.

In another well-known statement concerning the Spirit's work, Dr. Conant, in common with most of the commentators, follows an inaccurate rendering of the common version: "The Spirit itself makes intercession for us with *groanings* which *can not be uttered*" (Rom., viii., 26). Now, a groan is an *utterance*—a sound of the voice which indicates deep feeling. Groanings which *can not be uttered*, therefore, are simply *no groanings at all*. The language involves a contradiction in terms. The original word *alaletos* means either not *expressible in words*, or merely not *expressed* in words. When applied to a *sound*, as in this case, it means that the sound, though uttered, is not uttered in words. An *alaletos* groan, therefore, is simply an *inarticulate* groan. "We know not what to pray for as we ought, but utter inarticulate groanings, and by these the Spirit interceded for us, thus helping our infirmities." This is the idea of the passage. The groans are the very same mentioned by the apostle in the paragraph immediately preceding, where he says "the whole creation *groans*," and "even we ourselves *groan* within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body."

The claims of Jesus Christ depend upon testimony. Much is, therefore, said in the New Testament concerning witnesses and the testimony which they bear. Upon this subject Dr. Conant has left his readers in much confusion, and has flagrantly violated the rule which required him to give the exact meaning of the original, "with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness." The verb *to witness*, in modern English, means *to behold*. The noun *witness* means the



person who beholds an event, or he who *testifies* concerning a fact; and the statement of the witness is his testimony. Dr. Conant, following the common version, uses the one word witness both for the witness and his testimony, and also for the act of *testifying*. This produces extreme confusion and awkwardness in some passages, and conveys the wrong idea in others. It makes Jesus say: "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another, that bears witness of me, and I know that the witness which he witnesses of me is true." Now it would be difficult to form a more awkward sentence than this; and it is passing strange that any man, deliberately engaged in revising and modernizing the common version, should have allowed this awkwardness to pass under his pen. But we have a still more serious objection to such renderings as the following: "John came for a *witness*, to bear witness of the light" (John, i., 7); "Why need we any further *witness*?" (Luke, xxii., 71). In both of these places the term "witness" conveys to the English reader only the idea of the *person who testifies*. But the original term is *marturia*, *testimony*. John came not for a *witness*, but for *testimony*, and the Sanhedrim inquired not concerning some other *witness*, but further *testimony*. If the Doctor continues this species of rendering, we will have in 1 John, v., 10: "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the *witness* in himself," and his Baptist readers will still find proof that the moment one believes he has the Holy Spirit in him as a *witness*, that he is born again. But here again the word is *marturia*, and the rendering should be: "He who believes in the Son of God, has the *testimony* or *evidence* in himself."

The confession of the Lord Jesus with the mouth, though conceded by all historians and critics to have been the custom of primitive times, was not perpetuated in the Catholic Church, and has never been known among the Protestant sects. It is not surprising, therefore, that in their versions of the New Testament it is greatly obscured. This is sufficiently the case with the common English version; but Dr. Conant has obscured it still more. In several passages where the common version has "confess," he introduces the term "acknowledge;" and in the 10th of Romans, he has "profess with the mouth the Lord Jesus," and "with the mouth profession is made unto salvation."

If the Doctor had adopted either *acknowledge* or *profess* as the established meaning of the original, we might suppose that he had some definite reason for his mode of rendering; but he has preserved neither uniformity nor consistency in his treatment of this subject. If he had any definite purpose at all, it must have been to produce confusion. In Matt., x., 32, he makes Jesus say, "Every one, therefore, who shall *acknowledge* me before men, him will I *acknowledge* before my Father who is in heaven;" and in Luke, xii., 8, he renders

the same speech thus: "Whosoever shall *confess* me before men, him shall the Son of man also *confess* before the angels of God." There can be no good reason for thus varying the rendering of the same word in the same connection. It makes upon the uneducated reader the false impression that two different words were used by Jesus; and it violates the rule of the Bible Union, which requires every word that is altered to be examined in all its occurrences in the New Testament. But this is not all. After thus changing the rendering with which he started out, to *confess* in Luke, he retains it through John's gospel, returns to *acknowledge* in Acts, then leaves both, and resorts to *profess* and *profession* in Romans.

Now, the original term *homologeō*, at least where it is connected with faith in Christ, preserves uniformly the same meaning, and should be rendered uniformly by the same word. Dr. Conant himself will scarcely question the correctness of this proposition. Its verb, its noun, and its adverb should be represented by some word whose verb, noun, and adverb correspond to it in meaning and usage. This is a universal law of translation, which is self-evidently just, though it has been much neglected by translators. By this rule the term *acknowledge* must be rejected; for, though it is not inappropriate in some places, it would be extremely so in others. For instance: "The apostle and high-priest of our *acknowledgment*" (Heb., iii., 1); "Thou didst *acknowledge* the good *acknowledgment*" (1 Tim., vi., 12). The term *profess* is better, but there are some passages in which it would be improper; as, "He *professed*, and denied not; but *professed*, I am not the Christ" (John, i., 20); "Whosoever shall *profess* that Jesus is the Son of God" (1 John, iv., 15); or, "*Professedly* great is the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim., iii., 16). *Profess* is never used in opposition to *deny*; neither do we *profess* a fact or a proposition.

The use of *profess* and *profession* in these connections is objectionable on another account. So frequently have the professions of men, both in reference to religion and other things, proved false and hypocritical, that when it is said a man *professes* to be thus and so there is always a lurking suspicion of insincerity. This is especially so when it is said that one *has professed religion*; or when we speak of *professed Christians*, or call members of the church *professors*. These professions are so often mere pretenses, or the result of self-imposed deception, that the very word which designates them has acquired a tinge of this meaning. The original term is not thus contaminated, and we should seek to preserve its integrity by employing a representative equally free from suspicion. Such a representative we find in the term *confess*. Both as a verb, noun, and adverb, it will uniformly and idiomatically translate the original; and while doing so, it will make "the good confession," so styled by

Paul, stand out distinctly in all its connections, before the English reader. The importance of securing this end can not well be exaggerated, and it becomes the friends of primitive Christianity to insist upon it as indispensable to a good translation.

There has been much discussion in the public prints in reference to Dr. Conant's rendering of *eis to onoma*, in the commission as recorded by Matthew. The number and variety of the issues involved in this discussion forbid that we should enter upon it here. To treat it as it deserves would require an entire article in the *Quarterly*, and it is to be hoped that some one will yet furnish an elaborate and exhaustive dissertation upon it.

We notice another rendering of the preposition *eis*, to which we must devote a few lines. He makes John say: "I immerse you in water *unto* repentance;" and renders the conversation of Paul with the twelve disciples in Ephesus thus: "*Unto* what, then, were you immersed? And they said, *Unto* John's immersion." Now, there is some meaning, though not the true meaning, in the former passage; but what can be meant by immersing men *unto* John's immersion? When a man is immersed he is brought *into* some kind of immersion, and *into* some new religious condition; not merely to them. When it is said: "I immerse you into repentance," the term repentance is used by metonymy for the course of life consequent upon repentance; and it was immersion which introduced John's disciples *into* this course of life. *Unto*, in all such passages, expresses the wrong idea. Besides this, it is obsolete and ungrammatical, so declared by Webster in these strong terms: "It is used instead of to, but it is not in our mother tongue; nor is it used in popular discourses, or in modern writings. It is therefore to be rejected, as obsolete and not legitimate." Strange must be the taste of a writer who will cling steadfastly to terms thus condemned by the highest standards of his own language, and equally condemned by the rules under which his work is confessedly prosecuted.

In his first edition of Matthew, Dr. Conant marked the distinction between *metanoeo* and *metamelomai*, both rendered *repent* in the common version, by rendering the former *repent*, and the latter *regret*. This was a decided improvement, and one absolutely necessary to enable the English reader to understand the subject of repentance: In the present edition this just distinction is in the main obliterated, and the old confusion of the common version brought back again. I say in the main, because in the seventh of 2d Corinthians, where the terms come together in such connection that it would be mere stupidity to confound them, *metamelomai* is correctly rendered *regret*. Here, then, is another instance of the inconsistency and vacillation which we have so frequently noted in this revision. If *regret* is a proper rendering in 2d Corinthians, it is in Matthew.

At any rate, if these two Greek words should be distinguished from each other in Corinthians, they should be in every other part of the New Testament. Moreover, it is not true, as this version declares, that Judas *repented*; and to affirm that he did is to confuse the English reader as to what repentance is. It confounds the remorse which drives the traitor into suicide with the change of will which brings the sinner into humble obedience to Christ. In his present treatment of these terms, therefore, Dr. Conant is both unfaithful to the original and inconsistent with himself.

I had noted some other passages in which the exact meaning of the original is not expressed in this revision, but it would too greatly prolong this article to speak particularly of them all. I will merely mention Acts, xiii., 48, where the statement of the old version, that "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed," is rendered, "as many as were *appointed* to eternal life believed." For the correct rendering of the passage, and the reasons therefor, together with a consistent exhibit of the meaning of the whole connection, I refer the reader to McGarvey's *Commentary on Acts*.

The rule, upon the observance of which we are commenting, requires not only that the exact meaning of the original be expressed, but that it shall be expressed in "corresponding words and phrases," which we ventured to understand as requiring not a literal, but an idiomatic version. We have already noticed some violations of English idiom, and we now mention three classes of errors of this kind which abound in this revision. The first is in the use of the article. He says: "A queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and condemn it," when the reference is to that particular queen who came to see Solomon; and it should therefore be *the* queen. In Mark, v., 30, he says that the man from whom the demons were expelled "departed, and began to publish in *the* Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him;" and in viii., 31, he says, Jesus "came through the borders of Decapolis," omitting the article. Now, if there is any thing in the usage of the term Decapolis which requires the article in one of these passages, it should have been employed also in the other, *et vice versa*. Again: in Luke, xi., 17, he says: "A house divided against *a* house falls." Now, *a* house against *a* house makes *two* houses, and destroys the entire force of the Saviour's remark. If the definite article were used, *the* house against *the* house, the expression would, as Jesus intended, indicate but one house. A still better rendering, according to English idiom, though not literal, would be: "A house divided against itself is falling." This is the precise meaning of the Greek.

The second class of violations of idiom which I will mention, and the most numerous, consists in reversing the order of the verb and its subject. Except where the structure of sentences is varied for

poetical or rhetorical effect, English syntax requires the subject to precede the verb; but, in imitation of Greek idiom, Dr. Conant has frequently violated this rule. We note such examples as these: "Another *parable spake he*;" "Then *came his disciples* and said to him;" "And the two *fishes divided he* among them all;" "*Fear not ye*." The most charitable excuse for blemishes like these in the revision, is the supposition that they were carelessly copied from the common version; but such carelessness is extremely reprehensible in one whose very business it is to correct the common version, instead of imitating it.

The third class is not much less numerous than the second, and is far more serious. It consists in an improper use of the English tenses. We take space for only a few examples: "The Lord added to the church daily those who *are* saved." Now, the present tense in English designates the time at which one is writing or speaking. But Luke certainly did not mean that the Lord added daily to the church in Jerusalem those saved at the time he was writing Acts; he meant those saved at the time they were added. Hence the present tense "*are* saved" is entirely inadmissible here. The Greek very properly has the present tense, because the present tense in that language is used in connection with another verb in a past tense, to show that the action was contemporaneous with the action of that other verb. The present participle *sozomenous* shows that the *saving* was contemporaneous with the *adding* expressed by the leading verb of the sentence. The English uses the *past* tense for the same purpose, hence "*were* saved," is the correct rendering.

In Acts, x., 31, our revision makes the angel say to Cornelius: "Thy prayer *was* heard, and thine alms *were* remembered before God." Here the past tense is used in imitation of the Greek, where we always use the present, or the present perfect. Dr. Conant himself knew that he need not have used the past tense here; for in Luke's version of the same speech of the angel, and where the aorist tense is used in Greek, he renders, "Thy prayer and thine alms *are* come up for a memorial before God."

One more example under this head must suffice. It is one that needs no comment; it needs only to be seen to be appreciated: "All things whatsoever ye ask, when ye pray, believe that ye *received*, and ye *shall* have them I" According to this, when we pray for any thing, if we will only believe we have already *received* it, we will be certain to *obtain* it.

The second rule under which Dr. Conant works requires him to make his version correspond to the "existing state of the language." This rule is aimed primarily at the obsolete terms so abundant in the common version. He has observed this rule to a very considerable extent, but if it is worth any thing it is worth observing strict-

ly. If we are to have a version in the style of the reign of James I., let us have it in that style entirely; but if it is to be a modern version, let us have no obsolete terms in it. Let us have no patch-work, but a version unique and consistent throughout. In this revision we have *thou* and *ye* employed, not consistently, as in Quaker speech, but interchangeably with the modern forms, the new patch being sewed upon the old cloth. We also have *spake*, instead of *spoke*; *bare*, instead of *bore*; *tare*, instead of *tore*; *twain*, instead of *two*; *lade*, instead of *load*; *unwashen*, instead of *unwashed*; *slaves*, instead of *staffs*; and many others of the same kind. All such forms of speech are entirely inexcusable in a version pretending to conform to the existing state of the English language.

In addition to these specifications, I find in this revision some renderings in which the reviser evidently failed to express the idea which he intended, and others in which the style is the most awkward and bungling that could well be invented. Of the former class, the following may serve as a specimen: "And *coming* to the other side, his disciples *forgot* to take bread." Now this mode of expression locates the forgetting at the time of coming to the other side; but they really had forgotten the bread at the time of starting, and so the version ought to have indicated. The term *coming* is also improper in this connection. We say *coming* when the motion is toward the speaker; *going* when it is in some other direction; *coming* to *this* side, *going* to the *other* side. It is the *other* side of the lake in this case, therefore it should be *going* instead of *coming*. This misuse of the verb *come* is very common in this version.

Again: we read, "So they went, and made the sepulchre secure, *sealing the stone, together with the watch*." It is difficult to tell whether this means sealing the watch separately from the stone, or sealing the watch and the stone to each other. Certain it is that it makes the sealing take effect on the watch as well as the stone, though what was the exact process of sealing sixteen soldiers is not apparent. We are left equally in the dark in Matt., xii., 10, where we read that in a certain synagogue "there was a man *having his hand withered*." If he was *having* his hand *amputated*, or having it *wrapped* with a *bandage*, we could understand the process, but we are at a loss to know what he was doing when he was having it *withered*. We are perplexed, too, at the procedure of certain officers mentioned, Mark, xiv., 65, where it is said: "And the officers, with *blows*, took him *charge*." Perhaps the printer has clone the same injustice to the reviser here that the reviser has to the inspired writers elsewhere.

Of the second class just mentioned above, in which the idea is sufficiently clear, but expressed in the most bungling style, we need only quote, without comment, the following examples: "Likewise also the chief priests, *mocking one with another, together* with the

scribes, said, He saved others, himself he can not save;" "You shall find a colt tied, whereon no man *has sat*;" "Between us and you a great gulph is fixed; that they who would pass from hence to you may not be able, nor *those from thence pass over to us*;" "Can any one forbid the water, that these should not be immersed, who *received the Holy Spirit even as we also*;" "Repent, and be each of you immersed *upon* the name of Jesus Christ;" "The God of our fathers appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Just One, and to hear *a voice out of his mouth*;" "Wishing to know the *certainty* wherefore he was accused by the Jews, he released him;" "With *little pains* thou persuadest me to become a Christian;" "The temple of God is holy, *the which are ye*."

It would be useless and tedious to make any other specifications of the inaccuracies of this revision. These are sufficient to prove it very far from satisfactory, either as a translation or as an English composition. They justify us in charging upon it these four very serious faults: 1. In many places it fails to give the exact meaning of the original. 2. In many places it violates the idioms of the English language. 3. It retains many obsolete words. 4. It fails in some places to express the idea which the author intended, and in others is disfigured by the most inelegant style.

In pointing out these defects, we have not entered into those nicer shades of distinction in which serious differences of opinion prevail among scholars, but have confined ourselves chiefly to such errors as can not be tolerated even by the ordinary scholarship of the age. Until the version is purged of these, the Bible Union will hope and labor in vain for its introduction into common use. If, at any future time, this should be done, and a satisfactory version be presented, it will not be hailed with greater delight by any individual than by the writer of this article, nor by any people than by the Christian brotherhood. In the mean time, we occupy the position of patient lookers on, desiring much, but hoping for little, from the present revision enterprise.

ALLAN.

---

A NEW HYMN BOOK. —Do we need one? *Not bad*. And we are more than pained to see the anxiety of a few brethren in our ranks to inaugurate the strife and bitterness which must inevitably grow out of an effort to force on the brotherhood a new hymn book. Let the high passion of the day subside before we consent to entertain any question which might have the effect to increase further the existing alienation. The question of a new hymn book is a dangerous one. Let it sleep.

## ALPHA'S REPLY TO THETA.

THETA'S reply to Cullan and Alpha is before me. The same fine spirit and high Christian bearing that characterized his former article are found in this. I am inclined to think, therefore, that, if no good has been done by the preceding discussion, no evil is likely to ensue. But I hope much good will result to us for our work of faith and labor of love.

It is eminently important that every one should know whether he has a right to sit at the Lord's table, in the Lord's house, "which is the Church of the living God," or not. In deciding this question, we must not trust fallible human reason too far; we must not rely upon the deductions of our own minds, drawn from premises not well and plainly laid down in the Word of God. Indeed, it is a postulate with us never questioned, that nothing shall be an item of our faith, nor shall any thing be required in our practice, for which the Word of God furnishes not the law. Now, that the Word of God does either plainly or obscurely require us to believe that the pious unimmersed are in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, I do most confidently deny.

My *feelings* might incline me to say much in behalf of the honest, earnest, misguided soul, who, like blind Bartimeus, may sit close by the way-side of "the truth," and cry: Lord, have mercy on me. But what, when all had been said, would it avail? Would it benefit the misguided one? No. It is "the faith" for which we are to contend, not a feeling. The prayers and alms of a merely "good man" may go up as a memorial before God; God may answer his prayers, bless his soul, and even count him "as a child;" but unless the Lord should reveal it to me, I can not know it, and, of course, can not, in good faith, say that I believe it. If it be answered that this view of the subject is uncharitable, I reply, that the love of God, so far as I know, hath no greater bounds for man than the Word of God lays down; any charity that transcends this limit, transcends the limit of my faith. Nay, it is sickly, and even dangerous.

While I admire the brotherly kindness and charity "that believeth all things," manifest in Theta's second essay, I would suggest that, to my mind, there is a little too much ductility in it; a little too much wiry special pleading. I feel no very great concern as to whether I am consistent with Alpha or Cullan, or neither. Such compositions have their value, but it is a very small one indeed when we come to settling the faith or fate of an immortal being. Here, let God be true, "though every man a liar." Here, though wrong yesterday, let us be right to-day. Our earnest, prayerful desire should be, that in faith



and practice we may be consistent with the Bible—the only infallible rule of both.

Could I see my brother Theta, face to face, I should chide him a little for some naughty things his piece contains. I did not affirm, my dear brother, without qualification, that any one's sins are pardoned, or that any one is or can be saved in heaven, without immersion. Both *may* be true, and yet the truth of your position is not involved in either; this is what I tried to show, and I believe did show. Neither of these hypotheses is known positively to be true, and this is precisely the reason why the conclusion resting upon one or both of them can not be accepted. The tingle of satisfaction that may have been felt upon the supposed discovery of absurdity in my reasoning will be entirely lost after a more mature reading of my former article. I may admit, for the sake of argument, that Luther, and "such like," are saved in heaven, as I have. I may admit that, allowing Luther to have been saved, his sins *may* have been pardoned "at death, or even before death," without its being necessary to conclude that God "put him into the church." But to *affirm*, categorically, either of the foregoing propositions as my *faith*, I can not.

I asked Theta in my former essay to tell us for what he baptized the pious unimmersed, if they are, as he contends, already in the church. He proceeds at once to give us four distinct, inharmonious, and mainly unscriptural answers, viz., 1. "I baptize them for the answer of a good conscience" (which, of course, they could not have had before), "that the evidence of their pardon may be based in the Word of God instead of their own unsteady feelings." Of course, then, according to Theta, their evidence of pardon was not "based in the Word God" before they were immersed; or, which is the same thing, the Word of God does not authorize the pious unimmersed to believe that his sins are pardoned. So reasons Theta, and we leave him in the glory of his first answer.

2. "I baptize them because, though they may have been counted for circumcision, they have not been properly introduced into the kingdom." This answer, though not, in word, phrase, or sentence, the exact language of the Saviour, or of the fishermen, is nevertheless nearer the truth. Not properly in the kingdom! Then they are not in it at all. Or, if our brother must have them in the kingdom, I would cite him to a careful perusal of Matt., xxii., 11, 12, 13.

3. "I baptize them because, though 'an independent act of sovereignty' may have placed them in the kingdom, their disobedience, when their duty is known, would soon put them out of it." Whether this position should be flanked left or right, or whether it should be taken in the rear, I hardly know.

It seems the pious, etc., are in the church, not properly, but by; "an independent act of sovereignty;" but notwithstanding the "King

Eternal" did, by an act of sovereignty, put them in the church, some simple-hearted preacher may come along and preach the truth to them; "their disobedience, when their duty is known, soon puts them out of it." The simple truth, according to Theta, is that the God of truth puts a man into the church, and the preaching of God's truth puts him out again; so, after the preacher preaches him out of the church, for "pity's sake" he baptizes him back again 1

The current value of baptism, in Theta's literature, is certainly on the rise; for it is found to be equal to a sovereign act of the Omnipotent. The fourth reason for baptizing the class under consideration I will not quote. It is stranger than fiction. Why our brother did not give us a dozen or so more reasons for baptizing the pious, etc., I can't say, unless it was for the want of space.

But since I am understood to believe (which I do not) that Luther, and "such like," are saved in heaven without immersion, Theta asks, with some apparent feeling: "For what do you baptize them? Answer me." I will. I baptize them in the "name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

I baptize them because, "except they are born of water (baptized) and of the Spirit, they can not enter into the kingdom (church) of heaven."

I hope this will be satisfactory, and I am sure it is scriptural.

After passing these a b c items, our author says: "We now approach the discussion of several subjects requiring an ample development. First, in this 'deep water where an elephant may swim,' is the novel doctrine of 'equivalents.' Whether God ever accepts any other thing than that which he appoints for man's good, instead of the thing appointed; or, more briefly, is it a "vain thing to worship God, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men?"

Suppose it could be established that equivalents are *sometimes* accepted, of what advantage would that be to Theta's "position?" None that I can see; unless it could be shown that they are *always* accepted. And even then we must know whether these equivalents are accepted in favor of everybody, or of only a class or classes. If they are accepted in favor of a class only, then of what class? And does any given man belong to this class? Again: we must know whether any thing will pass as an equivalent, or whether some particular thing must be done; and, further, will this particular thing do for every member of the class, or for a part only? If this particular thing, when once ascertained, will avail for a part only of the class, then what other thing must be done by each of the rest of the class? Again: must this particular thing be prescribed by the Word of God, or does God leave each one to his own taste, judgment, or "inner light," in selecting the equivalent of the Bible requirement?

These and many similar questions I would propound to the benevolent Theta, for his reflection. I propound them not to *plain* men and women, who "are not prepared to read this controversy, but to those who venture more;" who, like the Spirit, would "search all things, yea, the deep things of God." In vindication of the assumption that this controversy is not to be settled by appeal to the *plain truths* of the Bible, Theta affords us the following delightful specimen of verdant logic: "Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division will not serve for the solution of problems in the higher mathematics, yet these are the plain simple teachings of mathematics." The argument, immediately following is: That John, iii., 5, is the plain, simple teaching of the Bible on the question who is, and who is not, in the kingdom; that this text and other similar ones answer to the elementary rules of mathematics, and, of course, the truths not plain—the higher and more difficult texts of the Bible—answer to the higher rules of the more abstruse branches of mathematics. Unfortunately for our essayist, this illustration fails at the very point in the comparison where it should not. For while it may be admitted that the elementary rules of mathematics will not suffice for the solution of problems in the higher mathematics, still it is untrue that the higher rules will or do *contradict* the elementary ones, which is the thing that they ought to do to make the illustration worth any thing to Theta's purpose.

Now let us examine this doctrine of equivalents. While it is by no means necessary to infer from Theta's articles that he would require a Bible equivalent for a Bible requirement in every case, yet I will not conclude that he would intentionally do otherwise. That I am right in this opinion is manifest from the following: In denning the *real* question, he says: "It is rather what does the *Bible teach* as to the moral condition of such men as have not been able to learn the whole truth." Here, then, comes the contest as to Scripture teaching, etc. But still we must settle a few other preliminaries. I here enter my protest against a distinction which Theta now makes between men belonging to the same class, "good men." Up to this time all sails have been set, and decks have all been cleared, to receive this class, all of them of course, into the church. But perceiving now, as Cullan has most effectually shown, that the phrase "good men" is rather too broad; that he might be compelled to associate in the church with the Catholic, Universalist, Deist, Atheist, Spiritualist, Moralist, and Heathen, our good brother narrows the foundations a little, and insists that to some extent a man must know and do God's will in order to be a citizen of Christ's kingdom. (The programme might, nay, would necessarily exclude Borne men, good in the sense in which the term has all along been used.) He says (vol. i., p. 423): "To be in the kingdom of Christ, it is necessary for a man to know

the will of Christ; if not the entire will, at least so much of it as will put him under God's spiritual control." Stripping this beautiful and cautious theological preparation of its unnecessary verbiage, which tends only to confuse the unwary, makes it stand thus: It is necessary, in order to be in Christ's kingdom, for a man to know enough to put him in. Marvelous! But why does not our author tell us how much a man must know, or what particular part he must know? Of course, I understand that it *is not* essential to know John, iii., 5; Mark, xvi., 16; Acts, ii., 38; Acts, xxii, 16; Rom., vi., 4; Gal., iii, 27; 1 Peter, iii, 21, *et al.*; but there is a large area of truths besides these texts. Is it true that a man must know the whole of Christ's will on the subject of entering his church, in order to induction, except *baptism*? Is it true that *all* who are so unfortunate as to be unable to believe or repent must be left out in the cold; must not be taken into the church; must not be allowed to commune; must be allowed to die without ever having sat at the Lord's table in the Lord's house?

But why, I press the question, will our essayists exclude from the church and table of the Lord the man who is simply unfortunate, and therefore has not learned the duty of godly sorrow and "repentance into life;" or of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved? How does Theta know that the knowledge of such a one is too limited to admit him into Christ's kingdom? Is it because the Bible does plainly teach it? So it teaches, and quite as plainly, that to enter the kingdom of heaven we must be baptized.

If it must be denied that the unfortunate infidel, or impenitent man, is in Christ's church, on the ground that the Bible plainly excludes them; on the same ground must we deny that the unbaptized man is in the church.

But if it be replied that the plain Scriptures are not the authority by which this controversy is to be decided, I shall answer that the Scriptures, on the subject of faith and repentance, are as plain as on the subject of baptism, and that the fate of the first and second shall be the fate of the third. Nor am I prepared to believe that the higher truths of the Bible are in conflict with the elementary plain ones. In fine, I do not believe that the higher truths do teach that the unbaptized man is, or can be, in the church of Christ. Neither is it true that the higher rules of mathematics are, in any sense, in conflict with the elementary ones. Not only so; but the higher principles and rules of every science, Christianity included, must in the very nature of the case, or according to the demands of science itself, be in perfect harmony or accord with the elementary ones.

So true is this, that if any one should construct a science so arranged that the higher truths would contradict the more elementary ones, such an unqualified and unsparing condemnation would

come thundering from every scientific quarter, that he would soon wish that it had never been born.

This is precisely the predicament of our brother, from which no amount of logical legerdemain can ever extricate him. If this be true, and I feel certain that it is, the whole controversy is ended; for it is not denied that the *plain* truth puts every man out of the church, who has not been baptized.

But this doctrine of equivalents must receive a more minute examination. The text offered in proof must not be one from which it *might* be inferred that one thing may perchance be accepted as an equivalent for another; it should be one in which the doctrine is positively declared; or from which it must necessarily be inferred that one thing will, in every case, be accepted instead of another. As an illustration, or it may be as an example of the doctrine under review, Theta says: "Did not God accept Abraham's faith as an equivalent for a perfect obedience to law?" No. God never accepted Abraham's faith instead of any thing lacking in his obedience to law. And it is singular that Theta makes no attempt to prove it, except to cite the following text: "Faith was counted to Abraham for righteousness." What law was enjoined on Abraham which he did not obey, whose faith, while he was in disobedience, was counted to him for righteousness? None whatever.

There is no such case of equivalents, in view of any disobedience of Abraham's, to be found in the Old Testament or New." The monosyllabic brevity with which this, almost the only, text cited in proof of a strange doctrine is dispatched is most suggestive. Why was it not shown to be in point; or why, at least, was not the attempt made? Was not a certain troublous dubiety—a degree of painful uncertainty as to its applicability to the thing to be proved—the reason why no exegesis of the passage is attempted; and why one or two brief lines of common-place remarks should suffice?

Abraham had been a servant of God long before this passage was said of him, or was applied to him. Melchisedek says (Gen., xiv., 19): "Blessed be Abraham of the Most High God." See also Gen., xii., 7; xiii., 18; xv., 1. By an examination of these passages it will appear that Abraham was already in whatever kingdom, state, or relation was vouchsafed to the good and pious of his time. Now, after all these things, in Gen., xv., 6, it is said: "Abraham believed in the Lord and he counted it to him for righteousness." So the passage proves nothing for the doctrine, so far as terms of induction into any state or kingdom, patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian, are concerned. Abraham, at this time, was childless, and yet God had promised that in him "all the families of the earth should be blessed." Sarah was past age; and Abraham questioned whether "one born in his house" should be he through whom the world's Saviour should come.

God decided the question for him: "This shall not be thine heir: but be that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir." "And God brought him forth abroad, and said: Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars if thou be able to number them. And he said unto him: So shall thy seed be." Now it is said, and not before, "Abraham believed," etc.

In view of these facts I ask, was Abraham's faith received as the equivalent of some law which he did not keep, or of some obedience which he did not render? Certainly not. God had made a great and comforting promise to Abraham, requiring of him nothing, except that he should believe it. This Abraham did; and hence, having fulfilled the Divine requirement, he was accounted righteous.

In Paul's time the Jews insisted that the Gentiles should be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, else they could not be saved. Their major premise was a sweeping denial that any one could be saved as righteous who neglected or refused conformity to this law. But Paul puts them to shame, by citing a favorite text from their own Scriptures, showing that their father, Abraham, who lived hundreds of years before the law was given, and also many years before he was circumcised, was accounted righteous; hence their major premise was false, and their whole argument a fallacy.

The Apostle James quotes this passage also: "Was not our father, Abraham, justified by works when he had offered his son, Isaac, upon the altar? \* \* \* and by works was faith made perfect. And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness."

That is, when the command to Abraham was to offer his son, his only son, Isaac, upon the altar, the only way in which it was possible to fulfill the Scripture "which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness," was by offering his son, which he did. I affirm it, as my settled conviction, that no man was ever, is, or will ever be decided righteous, according to the Bible, for his faith only; provided that, in the case, specific acts of obedience are required, but not rendered.

Some of the twelve tribes addressed by James had fallen into the error of supposing that, so they had faith in God, it was not very necessary to keep his commandments. It may be that the very dangerous doctrine of equivalents had occurred to them, and that by a substitution here and there, they were endeavoring to make the way to heaven shorter or easier. Certain it is, that the Apostle James taught them that the Scripture under examination could not be fulfilled by those who refused or neglected obedience. It may be, nay, it is likely, that this very text was relied upon by these Jews to support them in their error. But the apostle settles the controversy very briefly; he says: Abraham was commanded to offer his child upon the altar; that he did it; that then, and not before, was the

Scripture fulfilled: "Abraham believed," etc. That is, wherever a command of God is, requiring obedience of either body or mind, the righteousness in request is not attained unless the obedience is rendered; that no man's mere faith is worth any thing, is the equivalent of any thing good, where God requires any act or acts of obedience, unless the prescribed obedience be rendered.

Will Theta say that, in fact, Isaac was not offered upon the altar, and that a ram was accepted as an equivalent? I hope not. I think not. The statement would not be true. The ram was not accepted as an equivalent for Isaac. The offering of Isaac was stopped; though the righteousness of Abraham depended, up to this time, upon offering Isaac; now, however, since it is forbidden, it would be wicked to offer him. In both offering and withholding his son, righteousness with Abraham depended upon doing the will of God. If, in the first instance, Abraham had selected a ram and offered it as an equivalent for his son, and God had accepted it, then the doctrine might have received some support from the transaction; but as it is, it receives none whatever.

"In Paul's day," says Theta, "did not the Jews fail to attain to righteousness, seeking it by a perfect obedience?" Very likely they did; but the reason of their failure was not that their obedience was imperfect, making way for the doctrine of equivalents, but rather because they sought it, not according to the righteousness of *the faith* of Jesus Christ, but by the law of Moses, not then in force. Again: "did not the Gentiles attain to righteousness by means of faith?" Very likely they did; but not by faith, without the acts of obedience prescribed in *the faith*. "Now, a perfect obedience is equivalent to legal righteousness (no; it is legal righteousness itself), and faith is equivalent to legal righteousness (in the sense here used, it never was in the world), and two things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; that is (or therefore), an active faith in Christ (a term not introduced into the premises, and hence the whole thing is a fallacy) is accepted as an equivalent for a perfect obedience to the law of Moses." An *active faith* in Christ is now received instead of a perfect obedience to the law of Moses, not as an equivalent for such perfect obedience, but *instead of it*, and this only because the law of Moses is, and was in Paul's day, done away. But Theta says: "In this way alone the 'righteousness of the law (of Moses) is fulfilled in (by) us,' faith being a constant work of God." I do not understand this. Truth is said to be stranger than fiction; but this is fiction, and is a case stranger than any truth known to me. Moses and Paul settle the manner in which the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us. Their explanation may be *too plain* for Theta, and be rejected on that account; for he tells us that this controversy is not to be settled by *plain* Scriptures. Yet, as I write to benefit people, not to confuse

them, I do not object, even in this controversy, to the plainness of Scripture texts. "Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law. That the man which doeth these things shall live by them" (Rom., x., 5); that is, the man under the law is righteous who keeps the law, and no one else is. Now Paul, after telling us that we are made free from sin, etc., by the law of the Spirit of life, says: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." That is, he who walks after the Spirit is the man in (by) whom the righteousness of the law is fulfilled. Just as the man under the law was righteous who obeyed the law, and no one else was: so, under the ministration of the Spirit, the man is righteous who minds the things of the Spirit, and no one else is. Where now is there foundation in these passages for the doctrine of equivalents?

There are other strange things found on pages 420, 421, to which I feel no disposition to make any answer. I will just raise one or two of them up from their recumbent posture a little, that the reader may take a fresh look at them, and then let them lie down again, and sleep that sleep that knows no waking. Here they are. "It still remains that uncircumcision was counted for circumcision—taken as an equivalent under the circumstances—the will for the deed, the spirit of obedience for obedience!" "What! Fulfill the law without having obeyed that ordinance which initiates a Gentile into the Jewish Church? It really seems so," etc.

I omit the discussion of several points cleverly and even sharply made, in word, phrase, and sentence well selected, because, though answerable, they do not seem to me to have much weight in this controversy. In other connections, and sooner or later they must be met. I reproduce a few of them: "Has communion any peculiar effect in averaging the aggregate piety of the communicants all around?" "People generally seem to think the object of this ordinance is not so much to, etc., \* \* \* \* as to produce a sort of spiritual equilibrium among the communicants; that is, they all indorse for one another," etc. We now come to the discussion of an old subject in a new dress. The subject of equity.

The rules and laws of a court of equity are just as definite and vigorous as those pertaining to courts of common or statutory law. The laws and principles of procedure are all of record and of easy reference, so that the judge has no more option in the case than in a common law court; and the litigants, through an intelligent lawyer, may anticipate the result with the same degree of certainty as though their suit were one at common law. Now, before the reference to a court of equity is to serve any valuable purpose for Theta's cause, it will be necessary for him to show that, besides a birth of water and spirit, by which persons are allowed entrance into the



church, there are rules and laws, definite and rigorous, plainly laid down, and of easy reference, in accordance with which a high court of equity receives men into the church, not so born. Nor need there be any controversy if such be the case; for, on a single page, Theta might read us, from the Christian's book of statutory, common, and chancery law, these laws and rules. Then and there the controversy would cease. This he has not done, and can not do.

He insists that there is a court of equity in heaven, and also in front of the church. He asserts the fact and gives us the philosophy of its existence. He says:

"The court of equity proceeds upon rules of equity and conscience, to moderate the rigor of the common law, and to give relief in cases where there is no remedy in the common law."— *Webster*.

Three questions legitimately arise: 1. Does such a court exist? 2. What is the philosophy of its existence? 3. Besides being held "in front of heaven," is it also held "in front of the church?" If the first question be decided in the negative, then, of course, it can have no philosophy. If it can not, by incontestable evidence, be decided in the affirmative, then, concerning it, there is no ground afforded for any man's faith. An opinion he may have, but faith he can not.

Now, will Theta affirm that he has, by such evidence, established the existence of such a court? I ask not whether Cullan or Alpha may have admitted that from which the existence of a court of equity in Christian jurisprudence must be inferred. My logic does not authorize me to make logical deductions concerning a question, from admissions which may have been improperly or foolishly made. True, as our chancellor says: "God can hold his high court of equity in front of the church as well as in front of heaven." But does he do it?

How it happened that our essayist, in studying English grammar, became so enamored of the potential mood, I do not know; but he has certainly worried some of its auxiliaries nearly to death; especially may, can, and might. What God may, can, or might do, we ought all, by this time, to know pretty well, provided Theta is competent to inform us.

Yes, in one sense, God can hold a court of equity "in front of the church." But, as before asked, does he do it? And is it the decision of the court, that any unimmersed man shall be taken into the church? No man knows either to be true. A merry king once asked the question: "Why a tub of water, with five pounds of living fish in it, weighs no more than it does without the fish?" Immediately the whole learned fraternity proceeded to furnish cogent and elaborate reasons to account for the fact, never stopping to inquire whether or not the fact existed. Theta did not mention, formally at least, the existence of a court of equity, in his previous article; and of

course he will not claim that he proved the existence of that which he did not mention. In the second article he does mention the said court, but says not one word in proof of its existence. True, he insists that persons go to heaven without being baptized, which, with him, as with any one else, must be a *mere opinion*. From this opinion he infers, I suppose, that a court of equity must have been held "in front of the church," since, with him, no one of his class can enter heaven who has not first been in the church. This is the best that can be done for the cause he pleads. Thus it seems that I am required to take all this favored class of men into the church, and to concede to them the right of communion, upon a *compound fractional opinion*; or, more briefly, it is Theta's *opinion* that some persons go to heaven not having been baptized; it is also his *opinion* that, in that case, there must have been a court of equity held in front of the church; therefore, we must receive the said class of men into the church, etc. Now, it happens that the value of a fraction resulting from the operations indicated in a compound fraction, is always less, both in mathematical and moral reasoning, than any one of the single fractions composing the compound one.

Without attempting a discussion, *seriatim*, of the three questions propounded, I will state and examine the real point at issue.

The theory which we combat, syllogistically stated, stands thus: No one amenable to the law of the Spirit of God is received into heaven except through the church; God does receive some good men of this class, unimmersed, into heaven; therefore, they were in the church.

The major premise of this argument, though true, will not afford Theta any assistance; for if an unimmersed man is saved in heaven, it is because he tried his best to learn the duty of immersion and could not, and therefore does not belong to the class, viz.: those amenable to the laws of the Spirit of God; that is, this is not a case embraced in the major premise. This must be so, unless it be that a man who does not and can not know the law is amenable to it, which is not true. The minor premise is false; for no one is amenable to the law of the Spirit of God who could not learn it; and no one who has learned it can be good who has not been immersed. Hence, the whole is a fallacy, non-logical, under the head of undue assumption.

Or, state it thus: The principles of God's moral government in reference to induction into the church and into heaven are the same. Some good men are received into heaven who, though they had not done God's will in order to enter it, did the best they could under the circumstances; therefore, good men, those who do the best they can under the circumstances, are to be received into the church below. That this statement may avail any thing for? Theta's cause, it is nec-

essary: 1. To believe that, in heaven's chancery, the law is relaxed in favor of certain ones (which can be no more than an *opinion*). 2. To believe that the law, being relaxed at heaven's gate, will be relaxed at the gate of the church; which is not certainly true, unless the circumstances surrounding the "good man" at heaven's gate are so precisely the same as those surrounding him at the church door, that the law, being relaxed in the former case, will certainly be relaxed in the latter. Now, what *all* the circumstances in either case may be, I do not know; hence I can not say they are the same in both. The church is presided over *hymen*; heaven is not. The church is a place of *probation*; heaven is not. The church is a place where the recognition of any one as a member, not legally such, must have a most injurious influence upon the preaching of the truth, both to the man thus received and to others; heaven is not. The circumstances of the two cases present differences neither few nor small. I can not think, therefore, that, though the principles of God's moral government are the same everywhere it is established, or can be, that a relaxing in the one case established must involve that the relaxing takes place in the other.

The objections to the major premise are: 1. It is not known to be true. 2. It is most probably false. Will it be answered, that the argument concerns principles, and not the application of them. I reply, that I am concerned in this examination about the moral principles of God's dealings with man, only as to their application in receiving men into the church and into heaven. The objection to the minor is, that an *opinion* is the most that I or any one else can have in regard to it, which is no proper foundation for an argument. The whole is therefore a fallacy.

Now, if God really does hold a court of equity in front of the church, no man knows it; for it is not taught in the Bible. If there be such a court, we have no means of knowing what its decisions are, for the Bible does not tell us. But before we can recognize any one as a member of the church, and as therefore entitled to the Lord's Supper, the Bible must declare of that man that he is a member. But it may be held that *some* are admitted by this court, and that the *fact* is not revealed; or, being revealed, that the class is not particularly described; or that we, who know the law, are not concerned about it; and therefore God locks up this knowledge in his own mind. This may be Theta's view; for, in speaking of the court of equity, page 426, he says: "We have nothing to do in this high court—no seat there." Of course, I know that he is not judge, jury, witness, or lawyer in this court. Then what does he mean by having nothing to do in this court—no seat there? If this court have any existence on earth, and its decisions are that unimmersed men of a certain class are members of the church, and these things are known

to or knowable by us, then Theta has *much* to do in this court in the only sense in which it is conceivable, in any event, that he could have any thing to do with it. He has to respect its decisions by giving them full force and effect. He must recognize the persons adjudged worthy of membership as *members*. He must commune with them, etc. Now, since the claims of the Baptist orthodox to the communion are certainly as good as those of the Pedobaptist orthodox, my brother will allow that they are in the kingdom also. Let us bring all these different parties up to the same table, the long-bearded Dunkard and the blue-stocking Presbyterian, and look at them. In the language of my brother Theta: "This is a miscegenation scarcely allowable in the kingdom which we have received."

And finally, John, iii., 5, Mark, xvi., 16, etc., furnish me the law for receiving members into the Christian church, and I know of no other law for such a purpose; nor do I think that Theta has shown, or can show, any other. The number thus inducted is exactly commensurate with the number that may, or do, commune; and our effort should be so to teach, and allow secret things to remain with God; or, if we must write about them, let us speak of them as mere opinions.

ALPHA

---

A SUGGESTION. —It has been suggested to me on more occasions than one, that we have many wealthy brethren who could, by a small sum from each, render the support of the *Quarterly* sure, and enable me thereby to do with it a most important and benevolent work. These brethren, it is alleged, could just as well contribute ten or twenty dollars apiece, as to pay their regular subscription; and that all over their subscription I could devote in the way of distributing volumes of the *Quarterly* gratuitously. I should extremely like if the suggestion were generally acted upon. It might not only enable me to do much good in the way proposed, but might enable me to realize a little for my hard efforts to supply the brethren with a first-class religious *Quarterly*. It hurts me to think how hard I work for the cause of Christ and my brethren, and that at the moment when I write this my heart is aching even for a scanty support for my family. There is such a thing as positively degrading a man and utterly destroying his usefulness by the manner in which even bread and clothing are withheld from his children. This is alike hard and plain, but it is the truth. I do not ask to be placed above want, but I do above disgrace. Will any one act on the foregoing suggestion? I confess both my faith and hope are well nigh buried.

## REPLY TO KAPPA ON IMMERSION IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.

IN the last number of the *Quarterly*, Kappa treats its readers to a very clever article, of fifteen pages, in reply to a piece in the same work for March, entitled, "Baptism in one Spirit into one Body." The article is characterized by the writer's accustomed calmness of thought and excellent temper. It is, moreover, completely free from that spirit of dogmatism which, I regret to say, so often mars even religious controversy, and so frequently obstructs the entrance of light into the mind. Of the article in some other respects, I believe even Kappa himself will hardly expect me to speak so favorably. It betrays to me a spirit overly cautious, if not detrimentally timid. Kappa seems so afraid of the conclusions he opposes, that he is hardly in a condition to do the reasonings justice on which they rest. In saying this I may possibly do him injustice, but sure I am he will not pronounce it intentional. He occupies too strictly the position of an objector. His piece lacks the easy air of one who fearlessly follows the hint which leads to truth. It seems bent on refutation any how.

He occupies, moreover, an advantage in the premises, which must be taken largely into the account in estimating the force of his article. He takes the popular side of the question, or accepts the view generally, I might almost say universally, held by our brotherhood. His arguments, therefore, will be held as conclusive by many, merely because they happen to be on that side; and for precisely the opposite reason mine will be deemed false. This is the frightful obstacle which all newly discovered truths have to encounter in attempting to obtain for themselves their rightful footing.

Again: Kappa does not keep sufficiently before the mind of his reader the strictly problematic character of the positions he is opposing. The whole contents of the paper he is reviewing were avowedly published as mere "hints and suggestions." He seems, however, to treat them rather as the faith of the author than otherwise. In this he does them accidental injustice. They were put forth as questions to be tried, nothing more. True, about all was said on one side of them that could then be said, and this as earnestly as any questions of their nature can well be argued, but this alters not their character.

With these preliminaries I now proceed to notice somewhat at length the various objections, principles, and reasonings of Kappa. Some of these have a value independent of the special conclusions to which in the present case they may lead.

The passage of Scripture on which the article was in part based, which Kappa reviews, is the following: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." (1 Cor., xii., 13.)

Of this the following rendering was submitted: *For in one Spirit we were all immersed into one body, whether we were Jews or Gentiles, bond or free; and were all made to drink one Spirit.*

Now assuming, first, that this rendering is correct; and, second, that the word *we*, which it contains, includes all Christians, the position was then taken, as something actually asserted, that all Christians are immersed in the one Spirit into the one body. From this, again, if correct, it was inferred that *every Christian, even now, whether miraculously endowed or not, is immersed in the Holy Spirit.* This conclusion, it was then stated, was contingently drawn, and therefore not deemed indisputable. Besides, it was not drawn as resting wholly on the single premise now before us, but as resting on this with others.

Now to the position, that all Christians are immersed in the one Spirit into the one body, Kappa urges several objections. His first amounts to this: that, if we enter the one body by immersion in the one Spirit, then immersion in water contributes nothing to the result.

Less thought, it seems to me, than he has bestowed on single sentences in his article should have convinced him that this objection is not sound; and that if it is so, it lies equally against what he himself holds to be true. Suppose it to be said that we enter the one body by being immersed into it in the Spirit; and also that we enter it by being immersed in water. Is there here necessarily either opposition, contradiction, or inconsistency? Clearly not. Both assertions might be true, which would only imply that both acts are essential to the result. Remission of sins depends on faith; remission of sins depends on immersion. Does the one act exclude the other? The answer to this question will be a complete reply to Kappa's first objection.

His second objection is thus stated: "If it be true that the immersion in the Spirit brings us into the one body, then all proper subjects of the immersion are in the one body as soon as the immersion takes place. But Cornelius and his friends were immersed in the Spirit, and therefore into the one body, *before* they were immersed in water. This is still further proof that, on this hypothesis, immersion in water has no part in bringing us into the one body."

If immersion in Spirit necessarily excluded immersion in water from any part in the result, then Kappa's objection would be relevant and conclusive. As the case now stands, it is neither. I have not asserted that immersion alone in Spirit brings us into the one body.

The Bible does not assert that immersion alone in water brings us into it. Both assertions, therefore, neither being exclusive, may be true. Faith is necessary to remission; immersion is necessary to remission. But faith takes place before immersion. On this hypothesis, therefore, immersion has no part in the result. This is parallel to Kappa's objection in every essential feature.

But a case strictly analogous to the one to which Kappa objects may be actually adduced from the New Testament; and one, therefore, which will serve still more clearly to show the weakness of his objection. We are said to believe *into* Christ; and we are also said to be immersed *into* him. Now, 1. Because we are said to believe into Christ, does it therefore follow that immersion contributes nothing to the result? 2. Because we are said to believe into him, does it thence result that we must violate a well-known rule of criticism, and maintain that the immersion is not immersion in water, but immersion in Spirit? Kappa knows perfectly how to answer these questions, and just as perfectly that they decisively answer his objections.

His next objection is the following: "Again, the apostles on the day of Pentecost are expressly declared to have been immersed in the Holy Spirit. On your hypothesis this immersion brought them into the one body, and previous to it they were not in the body; but their immersion in water took place previously, therefore it was not this that brought them into the body of Christ."

Now, were this from the pen of one less candid than Kappa, I should conclude that he had presented it merely as an example to test the skill of his opponent in the use of logical tools; or that being in a facetious mood he was sporting a little with the credulity of his readers. Does he take the position that, the apostles entered the body of Christ by their immersion in water? If so, will he tell us the probable date of their immersion, and the person by whom, most likely, it was performed? Did John immerse persons into the body of Christ? or had Christ a church in the days of John? That Kappa was duly sober when he wrote this objection, I most firmly believe; but that he was wide awake, I would not affirm for a penny. But when did the apostles enter the body of Christ? If not in the days of John and by their immersion in water, then may they have entered it on the day of Pentecost and by their immersion in Spirit; and this might presumptively warrant the conclusion that in this way all others enter it. This objection helps us, not Kappa.

If we enter the body of Christ by being immersed in the Spirit into it, then Kappa thinks it will be difficult to show that the word immerse in the commission, and in the expression "one immersion," and in some other passages refers to immersion in water. He hardly thinks that even the rule which requires us to understand the word,

when in no way adversely qualified, as referring to immersion in water, would be sufficient to save the word from a very different reference. As offsetting the force of this rule, and as requiring the different reference of which he speaks, he propounds the following as an equally imperative rule: "When it is clearly ascertained that a certain effect is attributed to a certain cause, wherever that effect is mentioned that cause is implied, unless there is some limiting expression to indicate another cause." And this Kappa propounds to the world as a grave rule of criticism. Did he think of it before he wrote it? Surely not; or he never would, except in jest, have committed himself to it. When a certain effect is to be attributed to a certain cause, the existence of the effect certainly implies the presence of the cause. This much is intuitively clear. But Kappa adds: "*Unless there is some limiting expression to indicate another cause.*" Now, suppose there is a qualifying expression to indicate the presence of another cause, what then? Does the one cause exclude the other? Certainly not, unless the effect is known to result exclusively from one cause. A is the cause of B. Now, certainly the existence of B implies the presence of A. But a qualifying expression indicates also the presence of C, as a cause. How now shall we proceed? Clearly B is to be held as the joint effect of both A and C. Kappa's rule, therefore, taken as a whole, is utterly false. Allow that we enter the body of Christ by being immersed in the Spirit into it. It is certain we enter it by being immersed in water into it. Does the one immersion exclude the other? After what has now been said, this question needs no answer.

But how may we feel sure that the word *immerse*, in the commission, means immersion in water? By force of the rule already stated. Whenever the word *immerse* occurs without qualification, it means immersion in water. How next shall we know when it means immersion in Spirit? Whenever it is so qualified as to indicate the fact, not otherwise.,

Next, as to the sense in which we are to take the term *immersed* in the expression: *For in one Spirit were we all immersed into one body.* Kappa holds that the term is here unqualified; that, consequently, the rule just stated applies; and that, therefore, we are to understand it as referring to immersion in water, and not immersion in Spirit. He even represents me as locating the phrase, *in one Spirit*, immediately after the term for the very purpose of thus qualifying it. In this, however, he is mistaken. The phrase was located by me after the term, merely because this is the natural order of the words in an English sentence and for no other reason. I never thought of effecting a qualification, in this way. But is not the term as certainly qualified by the phrase when placed before it as when placed after it? I hold that it is; and that the question of location



is one of mere taste or natural order, and not one of sense. If I say, in water we are all immersed; or, we are all immersed in water, my meaning is precisely the same in both forms; and the qualifying force of the phrase in water is wholly unaffected by its relative position to the term immersed. So in regard to the language in hand. Whether I say, in one Spirit we are all immersed; or, we are all immersed in one Spirit, my meaning is the same. Moreover, this is true, no matter how we render the particle which the phrase contains. For if I say, by one Spirit we are all immersed; or, we are all immersed by one Spirit, my meaning in both cases is identical. Further: no matter how we render the particle or where we locate the phrase, immerse, and immerse only, is the term qualified. There is, of course, this distinction, when I say, by one Spirit we are all immersed, the act immersed proceeds from the Spirit, as the agent directing it; but when I say, in one Spirit we are all immersed, the act takes place in the Spirit, *in* expressing place. As to the position of Kappa, that the phrase in one Spirit qualifies or limits the word *we*, and not the word immersed, in accordance with some Baptist theory of which he speaks, I have nothing to say. He was dreaming when he wrote it, not that he was in Dixie, but in the region of the Green River, bucking on his gaffs to bleed some Baptist priest.

Now, in regard to the preceding criticisms, I wish distinctly to say that their sole object is to test the soundness of Kappa's arguments and objections. They are not intended as an expression of faith, nor as grounds on which to rest an ultimate inference, except in so far as they may turn out in the end to be true where now doubtful. Kappa is too sound and too pure a man to ask the public to accept an argument at his hands, unless it can abide any ordeal of fair criticism. He has but a single object in view, as has the writer of this piece—to elicit and defend the truth, and to prevent error taking root in the popular mind. To feel unconcerned about the fate of an argument or criticism, when in the hands of an opponent, requires no little discipline; yet it is precisely what the lover of truth must accustom himself to. The whole cause we plead would be the better of being subjected to a criticism such as it has never undergone. In the end both it and we would be most material gainers. I a little fear my brethren are too sensitive and not sufficiently patient to allow it.

We next proceed to the question, How shall we render the phrase, *en heni pneumati*, in the passage in hand? Shall we render it, *by one Spirit?* or, *in one Spirit?* That it is to be rendered by one or the other of these expressions is admitted on all hands; but the question is, by which one? By the former affirms Kappa; and in faultless earnestness attempts its defense. His method is concisely this, to show: 1. That facts and Scriptural statements forbid the rendering

in one Spirit. 2. That, *by one Spirit*, is an admissible rendering, and is required by the "harmony" of Scripture or the force of "unambiguous passages."

As to his facts and Scriptural statements, I hold that these have now been completely and effectually disposed of; and that they, at least, do not forbid the rendering, *in one Spirit*. We have, therefore, to determine whether he has shown affirmatively and exclusively that *by one Spirit* is the true rendering. Now, I candidly believe he has not shown it. It may be true; this, as yet, is not denied. But, if true, it is truth resting, not on his showing, but on something else.

Now, I will admit, for the sake of shortening disputation, and because I believe it to be true, that the six leading instances adduced by Kappa, and in many more besides, the particle *en* is correctly rendered *by*. But I must enumerate these instances:

1. No man speaking *en pneumatī Theou*, by the Spirit of God, calls Jesus accursed. 2. No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but *en pneumatī hagio*, by the Holy Spirit. 3. To another is given faith *en to auto pneumatī*, by the same Spirit. 4. To another is given the gift of healing *en to auto pneumatī*, by the same Spirit. 5. Jesus was led *en to pneumatī*, by the Spirit into the wilderness. 6. It is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets *en pneumatī*, by the Spirit.

I repeat, it is clear that in these six instances the particle *en* is correctly rendered *by*, as expressing agency—nay, further, that it must be so rendered. But now comes the searching and decisive question, *why is it so rendered? It is because the facts themselves imply agency, and not because the particle implies it.* The facts themselves determine how the particle is to be understood and thus decide how it is to be rendered. In the premises we have no discretion, but are pinned down to a particular course from which we can not depart. We can not, if we would, understand the facts otherwise than as expressing agency; and agency being expressed determines the rendering of the particle. This much I hold to be indisputable. But, suppose it not to be apparent that the facts themselves express agency, can agency be assumed and the particle rendered accordingly? Kappa knows perfectly that it can not; and yet this is precisely what he does. He assumes agency in the passage in hand, and so renders the particle; for agency does not appear on the face of the fact expressed. Let me cite the passage: "*For en heni pneumatī* were we all immersed into one body." Now, will even Kappa himself say that agency is here indisputably implied? He will not. The very most he can possibly say is, that it may be implied. Granted. How, then, in this case shall we proceed? Clearly we must take the particle in its literal primary meaning, since nothing is known to exist requiring it to be taken otherwise. The literal primary meaning of *en* is *in*. I leave Kappa, then, to say how we shall render it.

The strongest passage adduced by Kappa in this connection is the following: "And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor., vi., 11.)

If he cited this as one of the "unambiguous" passages of which he speaks, we must in frankness say we hardly think his citation happy. The two concluding clauses both contain the particle *en* rendered in the first *in*, in the second *by*. Kappa will not deny that it should be rendered by the same word in both clauses. If rendered *in* in the first, it must be rendered *in* in the second; if rendered *by* in the first, it must be rendered *by* in the second. Again: do each of these clauses qualify the three preceding words washed, sanctified, justified? I understand Kappa as so holding. Let us, then, render the particle *by* and see what sense results: But you are washed by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God; You are sanctified by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God; You are justified by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. Some of these combinations are certainly harsh, if not questionable as to correctness. But even allowing the one which is pertinent to Kappa's purpose to be correct, namely, "You are washed by the Spirit of our God," and this by no means requires the rendering for which he contends in the passage in hand. If *other* circumstances demand that rendering, then this case could be pleaded in defense of it, but no more. This is its sole value in the contro-

But there is still another circumstance to which I wish to call the attention of Kappa and others, a circumstance as yet not introduced into this investigation, but one having a most important bearing on it. That circumstance is this: Immersion is the word used to express the act to which the phrase *en pneumat*i relates, and which it serves in some way to qualify, no matter how we render the phrase. The fact expressed is an immersion; and this enables us to classify our case and so form an induction. Let me now collate the immersions with which the phrase is used: 1. He shall immerse you *en pneumat*i hagio, in the Holy Spirit. 2. But he shall immerse you *en pneumat*i hagio, in the Holy Spirit. 3. The same is he who immerses *en pneumat*i hagio, in the Holy Spirit. 4. Ye shall be immersed *en pneumat*i hagio, in the Holy Spirit. 5. But ye shall be immersed *en pneumat*i hagio, in the Holy Spirit. 6. For *en heni pneumat*i, in one Spirit, were we all immersed. Now, here are six mentions of immersion, with each of which the phrase, *en pneumat*i, stands closely connected as a qualifying epithet. In five of these instances Kappa boldly renders *en in*; but in the sixth he renders it *by*. This, to say the least, is striking. And, to my mind, if the two following considerations do not require it, then is it not tenable: 1. In five of the in-

stances the phrase *en pneumatā* follows the verb it qualifies; in the sixth the verb follows it. This should certainly be taken into the account; for if the phrase followed the verb, as in the other instances, I believe argument in favor of a change in the rendering of the particle would be inadmissible. 2. Most of the facts enumerated in that part of the chapter in which the passage in hand is found are facts of agency. If now the fact of the immersion named therein is to be grouped with these, then the very strong presumption is, that it also is a fact of agency, and this would settle the matter. On this single point I believe the whole issue hangs. If it can be made clear that the immersion named is a fact of agency, the question is at once decided; if not, it must, it seems to me, remain in doubt.

Kappa thinks it a serious defect in my article that I did not more particularly state my objections to *by* as a rendering of *en* in the passage in hand. In this, perhaps, he is right. I shall now, therefore, state these objections more fully:

1. To render *en by* assumes a fact of agency, which can not be done. Agency must intuitively appear on the face of the fact, or be proved. Otherwise it must be denied.

2. To render *en by* without the fact of agency being admitted or established, violates the rule which requires us to render a word by its first or literal meaning, where nothing is known to demand a change.

3. If we render *en pneumatī, by Spirit*, when standing connected with baptism, without the fact of agency being indisputably shown, how can we make out that there ever was an immersion *in Spirit*? In that case were they not all baptisms *by Spirit*, and not one an immersion *in Spirit*?

4. If we render baptism *en pneumatī*, baptism *by Spirit*, can we show indisputably that baptism *en hudatī* always means immersion in water? These were the objections to which I alluded; and some of them will strike Kappa's mind as not without force.

I now proceed to speak of the extent of immersion in Spirit; for, immersion in Spirit, as a fact, is conceded by Kappa, and by all the rest of my brethren. Here two questions present themselves: 1. What is the immersion in Spirit? 2. Who are the subjects of it? These questions I shall now consider in order:

1. What is the immersion in Spirit? This question, I confess, rings singularly in my ears; and seems about as unnecessary as any question can well be. It is unnecessary for the simple reason that it is completely answered in the very terms used in asking it. What is the immersion in Spirit? It is, of course, simply *immersion in Spirit*. One short sentence furnishes a full, exhausting answer. Neither explanation, comment, nor elaboration is necessary. This answer Kappa does not deny, but accepts as correct. On this fundamental item,

then, at least, we are agreed; as I doubt not we shall be on every other involved in this knotty question before we close it.

Again: Kappa admits that the immersion in the Holy Spirit relates immediately to the human spirit, that, in other words, the human spirit is the subject of it; and, as already said, that it consists in the one being literally immersed in the other.

Here also it may be well, perhaps, to reiterate some important distinctions in which Kappa and the writer agree. It is agreed, then, that it is the Saviour himself who performs the immersion in Spirit. The immersion is not performed by the Spirit. It takes place in the Spirit, not by it. And this agreement can not be looked upon as accidental, or as happening in mere courtesy. It is necessary. The distinction is so clearly grounded in Holy Writ, that it can not be denied.

Again: it is agreed that immersion in the Spirit is one thing, and endowment by the Spirit a different thing. That is from the Saviour immediately: this is from the Spirit immediately. That is to this as antecedent to consequent. Thus a clear distinction is established and agreed to between immersion in the Spirit and those miraculous, intellectual endowments which were consequent thereon. This distinction also is both just and necessary; and to the thoughtful and discriminating needs little else than to be stated to be agreed to.

Now, Kappa's attempt to so qualify the immersion in Spirit, which he admits to be distinct from miraculous endowment, as to enable him to draw the conclusion that none are thus immersed who are not thus endowed, strikes me as curious and a failure. His language, in approaching this conclusion, is the following:

" Now, to speak in tongues, to heal the sick, to prophesy, and to do any miracle, is an endowment conferred by the Spirit. These, of course, are distinguished from the *immersion* in the Holy Spirit. But before the Spirit conferred these powers, and in order to conferring them, he was placed in immediate contact with the human spirit, so that the latter became energized by the former. In order to justify calling it an immersion, this Divine energizing must have pervaded at least the entire intellectual nature of the human spirit; for it is the intellect that we find directly affected.

Kappa says: "In order to justify calling *it* an immersion, etc. What *it* refers to here is not perfectly clear; most likely to the" immediate contact with the human spirit. Now, in order to justify calling this contact an immersion in Spirit just one thing, and only one, is necessary—the *human spirit must be immersed in the Holy Spirit*. This done, it is, to the fullest intent and meaning of both the language and the fact, an immersion in Spirit, though not even a single effect followed therefrom; this not done, it is not an immersion in Spirit, though the intellect were endowed with the powers of Gabriel.

When, then, Kappa says: "In order to justify calling it an immersion *this Divine energizing must have pervaded* at least the entire intellectual nature of the human spirit," he asserts what the Bible does not assert, what it does not imply, what he can not prove, and what therefore we can not accept as true. Of course we are not justified in calling any thing an immersion in Spirit, until it *is* an immersion in Spirit. Now, according to Kappa, two things are necessary to complement immersion: 1. The human spirit must be immersed in the Holy Spirit. 2. The Holy Spirit must completely pervade the human spirit. Can Kappa sustain this second point? I believe he is too just to his own judgment seriously to attempt it. As a fact, it may be true; but if so, it is a fact we can never know, and therefore can never with confidence affirm. But suppose the human spirit to be literally immersed in the Holy Spirit, without the Holy completely pervading the human, and the case is conceivable, what would Kappa call the case? Would he not call it an immersion in the Spirit? If so, let him not say that the human spirit must be pervaded by the Holy, in order to being immersed in it.

Kappa holds that "the direct inspiration of the human soul was an essential part of its immersion in the Holy Spirit." Immediately after asserting this, he adds: "This being the case, no one is immersed in the Holy Spirit in whom this inspiration does not take place. But Christians in general, whatever may be said of direct operations on their *hearts*, certainly are not subjects of an immediate impact of the Holy Spirit on their *intellects*; therefore, Christians in general are not immersed in the Holy Spirit." In other words, Kappa concludes that a Christian is not immersed in the Holy Spirit unless he is inspired; and that the absence of the inspiration proves the absence of the immersion. In this conclusion he maybe right; I am not prepared to assert that he is not; but then his conclusion does not result from his premises. It is not conceded that inspiration is an inseparable accompaniment of immersion in the Spirit; neither is it proved. But unless conceded or proved, it does not warrant his conclusion. His argument, therefore, is unsound; though his conclusion may still be true—a point yet to be tested.

Here I must pause long enough to notice one item, which I think may even now be fairly set down as gained by the present discussion. Heretofore our brethren have very generally held that immersion in the Spirit is identical with miraculous endowment by it. This, I think, has now been clearly shown to be an error. Kappa concedes it, and justly so; and what in this respect he concedes will, I am persuaded, be generally conceded. At least, then, the present discussion has not been wholly in vain.

But just here another question of much importance presents itself for consideration, namely, Is immersion in Spirit, in all cases, ac-

accompanied by miraculous endowment? That it was so in the only two cases called in the Scriptures immersion in Spirit is indisputable. If, then, these were all the case that occurred, the question is settled. What, therefore, we have now to do, is to determine whether there were not other cases besides these; and if there were, whether these were all thus accompanied. But how is this to be done? By simply ascertaining what the Scriptures teach in the premises by word, by fact, and by implication. This done, if the question still remains unsettled, it is purely speculative and not worth a moment's thought. We cite first the following:

"And there went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all immersed by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey, and preached saying: There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed immerse you in water; but he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit." (Mark i., 5, 9.)

Now, to affirm that the word *you* in the expression, "I indeed immerse *you* in water," is to be limited to, and is complemented by twelve men, would be, it seems to me, without a parallel in the history of sacred criticism. But let us take the next clause. "He shall immerse *you* in the Holy Spirit." Here is the same word, used by, the same speaker, in the same connection, and applied to the same people, without one restricting or limiting circumstance. Yet Kappa holds that the word here included only the twelve apostles, or at most only them and the family and friends of Cornelius. I am positively amazed at this. If the Word of God can be thus interpreted, then may we tremblingly ask, who knows any thing about it? Have we one particle of evidence that even one of the men who subsequently became apostles was in the audience addressed by John? If we have, it is only presumptive, and that in the lowest degree. But Kappa calls John's language a prophecy, and maintains that it was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and in the family of Cornelius, and that these fulfillments impose the limitation for which he contends. Is he right in this? Candidly I can not think it.

John's language is as palpable an instance of a promise as can be found in the Scriptures. But even allowing that it is not, then is it prophecy, the interpretation of which differs not one particle from the interpretation of the very plainest narrative. When John says, "he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit," he speaks just as literally as when he says, "I indeed immerse you in water." The same rules of language apply to the one sentence, which apply to the other. Kappa, therefore, has no right in interpreting John's language to avail himself of the license allowable in prophecy in general, where the

language is, for the most part, highly figurative, and used with great latitude of sense. Hence he has no authority for unduly limiting the plain and obvious import of John's language as he does. It is far more natural and far less licentious to regard John's language as the comprehensive statement of a great future recurring series of facts, of which the case on Pentecost and that at the house of Cornelius were mere individual instances, than to regard these as the only instances included in his language, and therefore as exhausting it. John's immersion was such a series, relating to all the Jews; so is Christ's, relating to all believers; so is the immersion in fire, relating to all the wicked; yet the immersion in Spirit is to be limited to, it may be, two dozen individuals. Can even Kappa see it in this narrow light?

But to John's language again: "He that sent me to immerse in water, the same said to me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, *the same is he who immerses in the Holy Spirit.*" Now, is this the ordinary form of speech used in expressing two single facts? Rather is it not the form used in expressing habitual or oft-repeated acts? Kappa knows perfectly that it is; yet he would limit it to two. But, argues he, there are only two subsequent events named in the Scriptures immersion in Spirit, therefore these must be all. This, however, is not safe. We must not conclude that immersion in Spirit took place only twice, merely because it is not oftener named, especially when there is language in the Scripture not only implying, but even requiring us to understand that it took place often. Immersion in water is comparatively seldom mentioned; yet we can not conclude that it did not occur, because not named.

But immersion in Spirit is viewed in another light, in order to effect a limitation. Inspiration attended it in the only two named instances in the New Testament; this, it is argued, fixes the proposed limitation. If immersion in Spirit occurred for the sole purpose of effecting inspiration, or if inspiration was an invariable indication of it then certainly it can not be proved to have occurred beyond the limit of inspiration. But this is not known, neither can it be shown. Even granting that there is a presumption in its favor, still this mere presumption is not sufficient to set aside the obvious force of John's language which we have just been considering. Further, if inspiration was an indication of immersion in Spirit, then certainly immersion in Spirit took place beyond the only two named instances on record; and this would prove that the circumstance of not so naming it is no evidence that the immersion did not occur. And this we believe to be correct. For, to call the case of Cornelius an immersion in Spirit, merely because so named, and to insist that the cases of Paul and Stephen were not cases of immersion, because not so named,



strikes me as arbitrary and weak. It strongly resembles a case of unreasonable special pleading.

Here now we have reached a point which fairly involves the whole issue: Is inspiration an invariable indication of immersion in Spirit? On this point I shall say but little. My position to it is strictly a negative one. It is not my business to prove that inspiration is not such indication, but the business of him who affirms it. This much, however, I will add: If, in the fair construction of John's language, it does not require such limitation, but, on the contrary, seems to forbid it; and if the fact of inspiration does not *necessarily* imply it, then it is not warrantable to make it; for we can not restrict the plain and obvious import of language by what is purely accidental.

Now, unless a circumstance soon to be mentioned vitiates the position, there is but one thing, it seems to me, necessary to make out a case of immersion in Spirit; namely, *to show that the Spirit is given*. On Pentecost the Spirit was given; those who received it were immersed in it: in the house of Cornelius the Spirit was given; those who received it were immersed in it: in the case of Paul the Spirit was given; he was immersed in it: in the case of Stephen the Spirit was given; he was immersed in it: in the case of every Christian the Spirit is given; why then not immersed in it?

The circumstance just alluded to, is this: There may be a *measure* of the Spirit essential to immersion in it, a measure possessed by the endowed, but not by the ordinary Christian. If so, the following language may possibly contain an allusion to the fact: "He whom God hath Rent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by *measure* to him." This would seem to imply that to others the Spirit is given *by measure*. If so, the ordinary Christian may not possess it in sufficient measure to justify us in saying of him, he is immersed in it. Again: Paul uses the term twice, when it is simply certain that he has in his mind some distinction in regard to Spiritual measure, but what is not perfectly clear. It is, I think, almost certain that it is a distinction not involving the notion of greater or less quantity, so to speak, but a distinction, having exclusive reference to *kind* in the various gifts or powers of which he is speaking. But the circumstance is worthy of further consideration.

Here we shall bring these remarks to a close, commending them to the attention of the reader in so far only as they may be found, on the most careful examination, to fall within the limits of the Divine teaching. Beyond this we have a deep interest that no man shall hold any thing as matter of faith, no matter how plausible it may seem. Especially on the intricate question in hand, must we be guided solely by the Divine light. The more a subject lies beyond the tests of human experiment and human thought, the more strictly must it be subjected to the high test just named.

## THE CONTRIBUTION.

ALL institutions, so far as they look to the founder, are necessarily human or Divine. The authority which enjoins as a duty the observance of the one or the other must possess the inherent right to control the actions of men. Before a hearty submission can be rendered, not only the right to legislate must be clearly recognized, but the fact that such legislation did actually occur. In the absence of these convictions in the mind of disciples, every command of Jesus Christ, as King or Head of the church, will be either totally void in effect, or productive of a lifeless form of obedience.

In support, then, of any institution claiming to be Divine, it must be proved to have been established by no less a personage than the Lord Jesus himself, or some one acting under his sacred authority. The pages of the New Testament, as embodying the whole will of Christ concerning the church, is the only document on earth where such proof can be supposed to exist. All other testimony, come from what source it may, is to be rejected as insufficient, inappropriate, and void. Nor indeed can the inferential or deducible, as derived therefrom, be relied on as strictly conclusive. Nothing less than express command or apostolic precedent can be deemed satisfactory. Where either of these can be shown to sustain a Christian practice, the authority upon which such practice rests rises above all doubt or cavil. This is clear to the intelligent reader, if he will reflect for a moment upon the ground of assurance, which compels his acceptance of baptism, the breaking of the loaf, or the observance of the first day of the week, as ordinances of the kingdom of Christ.

Without further prefatory remarks, and with these facts before us, we submit the proposition, that: *The apostles, who were guided into all the truth by the Holy Spirit, and who regulated the action of the primitive churches in all public exercises of religious worship, did establish the contribution as one of those acts to be observed in the weekly assembly of the saints; and, consequently, that every Christian congregation should observe it weekly, as an act of acceptable worship.*

It is evident that the proposition assumes "that the apostles of Jesus Christ did establish the contribution as an act of religious worship in the primitive congregations without pretending to define what the contribution is, how to be observed, or the design for which" instituted. It simply affirms that the rite styled "the contribution" *was instituted or established by the apostles, and enjoined on the primitive congregations as an item to be observed weekly by them, among other acts of religious worship.* If what is now so plainly affirmed can be

sustained by Scripture evidence, the conclusion stated above, that "every Christian congregation should observe it weekly as an act of acceptable worship," is too obvious to be denied by any one, unless, indeed he fails to apprehend the identity of authority between this and other received institutions of the church—the necessity of uniform practice in all the Christian congregations—or recklessly assumes that it was designed only to be an occasional practice, and which, like "the washing of the saints' feet," was to cease when the necessity which caused its observance no longer existed. And lest this thoughtless assumption should find a lodgment in the mind of some forgetful one, we will here remark, that the Master said: "The poor you always have with you;" and were its existence predicated upon the continuousness of want (its true occasion) it could never

The task of sustaining the proposition just stated is by no means difficult, as the testimony is brief and pointed. The first Christian congregation established by the apostles after the ascent of Jesus to the right hand of his Father, who were fully empowered by the Holy Spirit to "disciple all nations," was at Jerusalem. Under the teachings of these inspired ambassadors they were gathered together in one body, and instructed, as newly constituted subjects of the reign of Christ, in all the mysteries of his kingdom, and in their personal relations, dependencies, and honors. True to the directions thus received, it is recorded in evidence of their fidelity, in Acts, ii., 42, that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in the contribution, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." Between the periods of the actual practice of this congregation of disciples here spoken of and that of their baptism, as mentioned in the preceding verse, there must have been some interval of time. How much the historian does not state. But enough certainly to warrant his saying they *continued* in these things; and, as if not satisfied with this mention of their practice, he adds "they continued *steadfastly*." Thus forcing the conviction on the mind of the reader that such was their fixed or constant custom. Without any ambiguity whatever, here is a distinct and well-marked instance of the very first congregation of disciples, under apostolic authority or sanction, observing and continuing to observe several items of religious worship, among which is the contribution. While, then, it must be admitted that the contribution was appointed by the apostles or under their sanction, which is the same, it will be contended that the terms "continued steadfastly" do not prove its weekly observance. Certainly they do not, but presumptively they do. For if the term "contribution" is expressive of an act at all, then continuing steadfastly in doing that act can mean but one of two things, viz, either that their whole time was occupied in doing it (which is observed as other things are said to have been done by

them), or that it was done periodically. And if periodically, we are certainly justified in giving all the weight of probability in behalf of the first day of the week, inasmuch as this day was commemorative of the resurrection of their Saviour, and was the day on which they assembled together to break the loaf, and consequently the most opportune time.

Not wishing, however, to transcend the positive teaching of the Scriptures on this point, we quote the first and second verses of the sixteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians, as translated by Drs. McKnight, Campbell, and others: "Now concerning the collection which is for the saints, as I ordered the congregations of Galatia, so also do you. On the first day of every week let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury; that when I come there may be then no collections." We have no special object in presenting this translation other than its definiteness and avouched accuracy. Prominent in this, as in the common version of the same passage, stands the fact that Paul orders the church at Corinth, as he had also ordered the churches of Galatia, "to lay somewhat by; itself, putting it into the treasury," and this to be done on *every first day of the week*. The question now occurs: Is this the contribution in which it is stated the Jerusalem congregation "continued steadfastly?" If so, that portion of our proposition which affirms a weekly observance of the contribution is proved beyond a doubt. In the settlement of this question, let us turn to the apostle's second letter to the same church, supposed to be written more than one year after the one from which is the above quotation. In the ninth chapter and first and second verses he says: "But indeed concerning the *ministry which is for the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you*. For I know your willingness, of which I boasted on your behalf to the Macedonians, that Achaia was prepared since the last year; and your zeal has stirred up the multitude." In the same chapter, twelfth and thirteenth verses, he says: "For the *ministry of this public service* not only fills up completely the wants of the saints, but also abounds in thanksgivings to God. They, through the proof of this *ministry*, glorify God for your avowed subjection to the Gospel of Christ, and for the liberality of your contribution for them, and for all."

Let us now inquire: What does the apostle mean by the expression in the first of these quotations "the ministry which is for the saints," and in the second, "the ministry of this public service?" Certainly the very same thing, when he writes them "concerning the collection for the saints," in his first epistle, and enjoins it as a "*service*" to be observed on the first day of the week—a day on which they all assembled together, and thus made that service "public."

Speaking of the same thing in the thirteenth verse, as above, he styles it

"their *contribution* for them" (the poor saints in Jerusalem), "and for all" other poor saints. Here the term "contribution" represents what is called the "ministry of the saints," in the second epistle, and also that which is identical with it, "the collection for the saints," in the first epistle; while it is itself the same unqualified term used in Acts, ii., 42. But if this be not enough to establish identity between the practice of the Jerusalem church as represented by the term "contribution," and the practice of the Corinthian church, as ordered by Paul in the sixteenth chapter of his first letter, as the "collection for the saints," we have only to refer to his Epistle to the Romans, xv., 26, to make this practice complete in identity; so far as the same word is the representative of the same thing, when used by the inspired penman: "For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia (Corinth) to make a certain *contribution* for the poor saints which are at Jerusa-

From these premises we conclude that the apostles did establish the contribution as an act of religious worship, to be observed in the weekly assembly of the saints, and consequently that every Christian congregation should observe it weekly as an act of acceptable worship. To the same end, historic testimony of a reliable character could be adduced plainly attesting this uniform practice in the earlier Christian congregations. But it is deemed unnecessary.

Thus far, it will be seen that we have anticipated any direct effort to correctly understand what is meant by the term "contribution," though using it to indicate a joint participation of worldly goods, in giving and receiving. We are aware that such understanding of the word is at variance with that entertained by some New Testament critics, whose intelligence and piety we both admire and esteem. Among whom must be ranked our estimable brother McGarvey, author of "Commentary on Acts of Apostles." We prefer an agreement with our brethren, even in matters of opinion; but where that opinion does not serve to estrange or alienate our feelings, it does not provoke a single regret.

It is generally conceded that the original term *koinonia*, used twenty times in the Acts of Apostles and in the epistles, always embraces the idea of sharing, or joint participation. This leading idea seems to be as fixedly associated with it as is the idea of light or heat with the word sun, whenever used. The difficulty lies exclusively in determining what is the thing to be shared, in the absence of a positive statement, or some qualifying term or terms, as is the case in Acts, ii., 42. If, in a number of cases in the Scriptures, it is used with some qualifying word or phrase, determining the thing participated in, and in the remaining cases is without any such qualification whatever, it is clear that the sacred writer must, in every such case of independent use, have employed it in some well-known ordinary

sense. And if in one case of such separate use its meaning may, by the context or otherwise, be certainly ascertained, we may reasonably infer the same meaning in every case of like occurrence. If we try the word *koinonia* by this rule, we will find it to be qualified fifteen times by such distinctive expression as the *koinonia* "of his son," "of the blood," "of his sufferings," etc. In the remaining five instances it is used independently, except in Romans, xv., 26, in which Paul says they made a certain contribution, understood by some to mean a specific one in amount. Acts, ii., 42; 2 Cor., viii., 4; ix., 13, and Heb., xiii., 16, contain the other instances. Several of these passages have been quoted in full. The one from 2 Cor., ix., 13, clearly defines the ordinary use of this word. For, he says, the liberality of their *contribution* filled up completely the want of the saints. Confirmatory, also, of the fact that the term *koinonia*, in New Testament use, when standing independently, means *joint participation in giving and receiving treasure ONLY*, is the passage in Heb., xiii., 16: "But to do good and *contribute*, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." From these it is certainly safe to conclude that it has the same meaning in second of Acts. It may not be amiss, however, to venture a single argument in corroboration of this view, to wit: To meet every rational conception of the case, there must be a divinely authorized order of worship, and this order must be uniformly the same in all the congregations of Christ. What has been discovered to constitute this act of religious worship of weekly observance in the church at Corinth, under apostolic authority, must consequently have its counterpart in the worship of the Jerusalem congregation under apostolic authority. This correspondence can be with no other act of religious worship in the Jerusalem church but the contribution, and hence must be with that. This is too clear to be denied, and must possess its full force in determining the meaning of the term, as used to represent the practice of the first congregation of disciples.

Nor can we see that this meaning of the word should be regarded as "limited," or "restricted." That it is an appropriate use we do not deny, but appropriated by divinely inspired writers. Hence, we can not agree with the author of the Commentary on Acts, that it means in Acts, ii., 42, a "common participation of religious enjoyments, including contributions for the poor." For had its meaning been so comprehensive as to include all religious enjoyments, it would have been useless, to say the least, for the historian Luke to add that they continued steadfastly in "the breaking of bread and in prayers;" inasmuch as these are evidently "religious enjoyments."

In harmony, then, with Dr. McKnight and A. Campbell, we must conclude that a special act of worship is represented by this word *koinonia*, which consisted in contributing to the relief of the suffer-

ing saints somewhat of those worldly effects with which God had blessed them.

If the foregoing views be correct, we may presume to find some law regulating the observance of this duty, and the object for which done. Many subordinate objects may have influenced the Divine purpose in the appointment of this institution; but the chief one is, the relief of the saints—the poor saints—from the distress and sufferings of poverty. Was there ever a better object to which a Christian could devote a portion of his worldly riches? We answer emphatically no! though all the colleges in the land go unendowed, and even Christian missions unsustained. There is not a human society claiming the regard and esteem of any intelligent man that has not incorporated in its constitution this benevolent feature, and because of which, more than any other, is commended and appreciated by society. Under every antecedent dispensation God has made the most ample provision for the poor of his people, by special enactment, and has ever approbated the principal of benevolence, as among the most honorable and godlike that can be entertained or cherished. While under the Christian dispensation, one essentially of love and mercy, he has made the most enlarged provisions for the relief of the destitute of his children by and through the exercise of that faith which says: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," and that "brotherly love which beareth all things," and "is kind;" furnishing an exhibition by which all men shall know that they are the disciples of Christ. Thus intending the church to feel, and the world to see, an illustration of the "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." Paul could say of himself, that, in conference with the apostles, whom he visited at Jerusalem seventeen years after his conversion, they added nothing to him; but would that he should "remember the poor," the same which he also "was forward to do." For he had learned in his eventful life how to be abased and how abound, to be hungry and to be full, and had in his deep poverty experienced the blessedness of having that which "was lacking to him" supplied once and again by the brethren who came from Macedonia. That he had labored with his own hands day and night that he might not be chargeable to the brethren, and might have to give to others. Would that all Christians could say the same. What Buffering would cease, and what honor redound to the praise and glory of God's great name, and what fruit abound to the Christian's everlasting account!

But we have strayed beyond our purpose in considering the object or design of this institution. In resuming our investigations of the law regulating its observance, we learn from the portions of Scripture already cited certain distinct facts: 1. That it was to be done on

the first day of every week 2. That the amount thus obtained was to be put into the treasury of the church. 3. That each ought to give as he was prospered of the Lord, and "according as he purposeth in his own heart." The first of these rules has been considered in the preceding writing, and demands no further notice here, except to answer an objection sometimes raised on the words, "*that when I come there be then no collections.*" It is inferred by the objector that this paragraph teaches the non-continuance of the contribution, after the arrival of the apostle at Corinth. To accept such an inference is equivalent to affirming that the charities of the church are only occasional and spasmodic, without energy or continuous life; a conclusion too incredible to claim one grain of honest belief. The meaning of the apostle is easily reached by reference to his second letter, ninth chapter, verses three and four: "Yet I have sent the brethren, that our boasting concerning you may not be rendered false in this particular; but that as I said you may be prepared. Lest, perhaps, if the Macedonians come with me, and find you unprepared, we" (that we say not you) "should be put to shame by this confidence." From this, as well as the facts of the case which it is not necessary to state, it is clear that the expression only means, that they should be ready with their gift when he arrived at Corinth.

As to the law of giving, the apostle affirms that there should be "first, a willing mind," and then it is accepted "according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not." The amount given by each is therefore to be in some proportion to the amount relatively possessed by each, in order that "equality" be obtained, or that "one be not burdened and another eased." This rule accords with the general law of Christian responsibility in other respects, requiring little where little is given, and much where much is given. Many believe, however, that the expression "as the Lord hath prospered them" implies that a certain percentage of their weekly gains is to be separated and devoted to this purpose; and on account of the difficulty, to say nothing of the impossibility, in many secular pursuits, of estimating such weekly gains, and determining the required percentage, declare the whole matter of contribution impracticable, and hence unbinding. With such we can not agree, believing that no exact ratio between the amount given and the aggregate amount possessed is designed by the use of the word "as," nor that so sordid an idea possessed Paul's mind, as to confine the term "prosperity" to worldly gains only. In this belief we feel sustained, because no mention is made anywhere what that ratio should be, nor yet a single intimation requiring on the part of any disciple rigid conformity to a statutory provision. But, on the contrary, it is affirmed in the seventh verse of the next chapter, that "every one, according as he purposeth in his heart, ought to give; not with



regret, nor by constraint, for God loves a cheerful giver." Without this freedom of action, no more room would be given to the exercise of benevolence on the part of the giver, nor any higher exhibition of it furnished the world than could be found in the case of the Jew, who by legal enactment paid a tithe annually of what he possessed to the Lord.

But it will be asked if temporal gains or worldly riches do not constitute the full measure of the prosperity here spoken of, what else does enter into it? We answer: Every temporal and spiritual blessing of which God is the giver, and which is necessary to the successful prosecution of any secular or religious pursuit whatever. The term prospered does not admit into its meaning any quality, expressive of, or belonging to, a thing completed or terminated, but only relates to such actions or means as favor the proposed end. Hence in any estimate of how God has prospered us we must take into the account every benefaction of his, by which is enhanced our capacity of doing good to others, and the securement of our own personal and eternal happiness. Thus directed to the Source of all blessing, we are impelled, by every principle of gratitude, to give as we have received, and to bless as we are blessed. For though the poor presents the occasion for benevolence, God's goodness to us furnishes the consideration which prompts to action. Human sympathy is a noble passion; but, undirected by a lofty sentiment, has at best its moods and persons, and seldom acts except in the present tense of seeing or bearing. We love the soul that can be moved by pity to relieve the distress and sufferings of frail mortality; but we admire in a purer and higher sense him whose benevolence is not enkindled by a carnal impulse, but springs from a just and sublime conception of obligations to Him who redeemeth his life from destruction, and who crowneth him with loving kindness and tender mercies.

Every Christian should, therefore, possessing a "willing mind," and knowing that "the Lord loveth a cheerful giver," give "according as he purposeth in his own heart," and as "of the ability which God giveth," ever remembering that it is written, that "God is able to make every blessing abound to you; that in every thing having all sufficiency, you may abound in every good work."

Of the many blissful effects resulting from the practice of this systematic and Divine plan of Christian beneficence much might be written; but the present length of this article precludes more than the bare mention of a few of these as they appear on the surface of the apostolic writings, and strike the reader as obviously and essentially true.

In relation to the giver, it cultivates the habit of beneficence—leads to a contemplation of God's goodness—reminds him of the grace of Christ—assures him as a "cheerful giver" of God's love—of

fruit which shall abound to his account, in the form of personal blessings and a service acceptable to God. In relation to the receiver, it supplieth his want. Is productive of thanksgiving to God, and induces prayers for, and love to, the giver.

While in relation to the world, it is an evidence of discipleship. For the Saviour has said: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

A few words of kindly admonition to the reader, and we are done. The church has long languished in the neglect of this department of her usefulness and honor. As a consequence, the praise she should have has been accorded to human institutions. That some system of active benevolence should be uniformly adopted in the congregations is not only demanded by these facts, but by the voice of pleading humanity, as it recounts its privations, griefs, and woes, endured even in the bosom of the church. What shall we say to our Master, who, having told us that a cup of cold water given to one of these little ones in the name of a disciple shall not lose its reward, shall thrust home the accusation: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not?" Silent as the grave will be our own lips, while He who is now our advocate will then have ceased to plead in our behalf forever. Fearful, indeed, is the responsibility of those to whom, as tenants at will, He has said: "Occupy till I come."

PHILIAN.

OUR DELAY. —We beg the brethren to overlook our unavoidable delay in getting out the present number. We have done our best. For the future we hope to be prompt.

Once more we ask the attention of the brethren to the claims of the *Quarterly*. We have a profound wish to sustain it. Already it has done good. Shall we have the material aid necessary to enable it to do still more? We might just as well have five thousand subscribers as one thousand. The cause demands this, our brotherhood need it; and even the most partial effort on the part of those who receive this number would procure the names.

For the Gospel in its purity the *Quarterly* will constantly lift high its voice, and ever plead for peace on earth and good-will among men. A faith faultlessly pure, practice without an innovation, a fervent love among the children of God—these shall be its themes.

## TRANSLATIONS AND REVISIONS.

FOR the last fifteen years the popular mind in America has been much excited on the subject of revising and translating the Holy Scriptures. As is usual in such cases, the excitement has run strongly in very opposite directions — strongly for and strongly against the work. Many have favored it because they conscientiously believed it a necessary work, and for precisely the opposite reason many have opposed it. The discussion has been protracted and deeply interesting. On the right side, it has generally been temperate and dignified; on the wrong side, mostly bitter, frequently scurrilous, and sometimes vulgar. Nothing could be in worse taste than the style in which some Baptist and a few Pedobaptist journals have conducted their opposition. Still, even here we should deem it indelicate, if not unjust, to question the uprightness of motives; for great rudeness in manner is quite consistent with the utmost purity of purpose. That a vast amount of light has been elicited by the discussion, none the least acquainted with its history can deny; and in the end great good must result from it. The simple concession by any considerable portion of those who speak English that a revision is needed is itself an end worthy of no mean effort. This much, then, at least has been achieved. Again: it is something even to familiarize men with the theme, so that they shall be in a mood to discuss it calmly. A proposition to revise the Scriptures is felt by many, however unjustly, to be a proposition to alter the Scriptures. From the shock occasioned by a proposition so understood men must have time to recover before they can give it the consideration its importance demands. Moreover, with obvious defects and errors in our existing translation many have been made acquainted. The acquaintance has led to a highly discriminating reading of the Holy Scriptures, and has ripened the wish to separate what is from what is not Divine in the sacred volume. This also must be set down as a gain. The consequence from all of which has been that a belief of great strength and great extent has been created that we need at this time a thorough revision of the Holy Scriptures. But on this subject we do not propose further and specially to write now. One thing more may here be added:

The question of a *new translation* has not yet been very formally and very distinctly submitted to the American people. In fact it has been so merged in that of revision that it has been almost wholly lost sight of. Now, however, it is the only question before the people. For the samples of revision with which we have been fa-

vored up to this date deserve to bear no name save that of translations; that is to say, they are translations in the only sense in which the term will apply at present to any version in English; for all versions in English now are little more than mere compilations. This, however, we do not mean to urge as an objection to these versions, for the question with us is not, What we shall call them? But, Do they express the sense of the sacred original? Whether we shall regard them as translations or revisions we hold to be a very minor

Four questions merit special answers in discussing the present subject, namely, 1. What is a translation? 2. What principle or rules shall govern the making of one? 3. Is the age in which we live prepared for it? 4. Who shall make it?

These questions we shall now proceed to consider. Some of them, however, can not be treated at any very great length, not because they lack importance, but because thereby the length of this piece would become too great.

What, then, is a translation? To many the question will seem very unnecessary; for who, it will be asked, needs to be told what a translation is? Many people certainly do not need to be told what a translation is, for many know. But that all, even of those who pretend to know, really do know what one is would require, I am persuaded, some degree of boldness to affirm; and certain I am that no amount of labor or degree of skill could make the assertion good.

The word *translate* is from the Latin, and literally means *to carry across*. When applied to the Holy Scriptures it means with us to take the sense of the sacred Greek and express it in English. This definition is about as brief and clear as one can well be made. A translation hence has, or should have, exclusive reference to thought, to meaning. One which has primary regard to any thing else than the sense is false in a most vital point. For example, and we shall pursue the illustration to some length, an assemblage of Greek words is before us in the Greek New Testament forming a sentence. By the study of these words separately and conjointly, together with such aid as the context or subject-matter affords, the mind collects or aims to collect the full or exact meaning of this sentence. And this, by the way, is the great and difficult work of the translator. On it depends more than on every other work he performs or process he conducts. It is the master-work of this most important of workers. The skill, the patience, and the learning necessary to this work in the degree in which it merits to be done, fall, in our judgment, to but few of the children of men. Indeed, we feel that we utter only sober truth when we express the belief that the skill necessary to an accomplished, and successful translator is as much a special gift as is the inspiration of the poet. Anybody **can** make rhymes, a genius

alone can produce poetry; and almost any one can make imitations, but a genius alone can translate. The marvelous intuition which perceives at a glance the meaning of a sentence in a foreign tongue, and which yet can give no account of itself, which is the law of the mental perception in the case, and its action—this we say is no heritage of common men. Vanity and superstition may fancy themselves called to this delicate work, and incompetence may laud the result; but the grace and power and clearness of the genuine translator are not there. But the sense of a sentence once perceived, fully, clearly perceived, the expression thereof becomes comparatively an easy task. Men blunder not so much in efforts to express Divine meaning as they do in attempts to discover it. What we know well ourselves we find little difficulty in making others understand well. Hence, we repeat, the great first work of the translator is to know well the mind of Christ. Whatever means and rules will lead him to discover this should be his special, his chief concern. A work on this topic is the most imperious want of the present age—that is, a work which shall lay down or distinctly enounce the laws by which alone the sense of the Divine Greek is and can be discovered. Can no one in our ranks produce the work? Will not some thoughtful mind, clear and strong in its workings, wealthy in powers of originality and intuition, direct its energies to the task? The meaning of the Greek *is discovered*, to a certain extent at least. This the heart feels; it is the universal faith of mankind. Not a doubt hangs over the discovery. Now this discovery is made not by accident. If it be made not by law, still it is made according to law. Can not this law, or these laws, be detected and articulated? How is it that the mind discovers the meaning of a word, a second word, a third word, a sentence, discovers it so clearly that it even can not doubt, if it would, that its discovery is correct—how is it that all men make the same discovery or perceive the same identical meaning? The answer to this question will suggest the starting point or initial law of the work to which we allude. Translation would then become a science, a science whose laws would be as indisputable as those of logic, and whose results would be ultimate or final. It would no longer be the questionable and doubtful thing it now is. Men would be compelled to submit to it, to assent to it, as they now do to the conclusion of a syllogism in Barbara, whose premises are admitted to be true. Dr. Campbell makes his translation, and it is not accepted Gave in part; Conybeare makes his; Taylor makes his; and so on through a hundred names, and yet no one is final. Now, would it not be infinitely better for these men to agree first what a translation is, and second to determine the laws according to which it must be made, and thus put an end to translating? All must answer yes. But is any bold enough to say that such laws do not

exist, and therefore are indeterminable? We flatly deny it. And although we may be utterly incapable of discovering and stating these laws, we yet feel and see enough to justify our confident denial. Why, if no such laws exist, do we in soul feel that one translation is better than another? That we do feel it is a fact of which we are indisputably conscious; but why do we feel it? We feel that the one is truer to the sense of the original than the other; but what causes this feeling? To say that it is natural is true, but too vague. The truth is there are laws and principles according to which the mind half unconsciously works in discovering the sense in question, and it is the more exact conformity of one of these translations than the other to these laws, a conformity which is felt because these laws are themselves felt, that causes the feeling. If no such laws exist then must the discovery of the Divine sense be purely accidental, and one translation can plead little claim to superiority over another. Yet we can not repress the faith that this is false; and I hence conclude that these laws really exist.

In the preceding remarks we do not mean to say that unless we have a genius to make it, we should have no translation. Certainly not. We are an advocate for the best we can get, when we can not get the best that can be made. We have never yet seen a translation which did not possess some merit; and many now extant possess very high merit. Yet not one of these is final as a translation. Where a new translation improves some existing one in one respect, the misfortune is that it is inferior to it in others; and thus the question of their relative value remains unsettled. We hence insist that as a preliminary of first importance we shall elaborate, or have elaborated, a code of laws which shall determine the standard of excellence for translations, and by the application of which we may, for the present at least, end the work of translating in our own tongue. But we have been wandering and now return to our example, which by this time, perhaps, is well-nigh forgotten.

An assemblage, then, of Greek words is before us in the Greek New Testament forming a sentence. How now shall we proceed with it? Assuming the sense to be discovered, to express it of course; but how shall this be done. The following rule, which is at this moment guiding the work of the American Bible Union, professes to supply the answer:

"The exact meaning of the inspired text, as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were first written, must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, so far as they can be found, in the vernacular tongue of those for whom the version is designed, with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness."

On this rule we now propose to comment somewhat at length, as

falling directly in with the objects of this piece, and as bringing us to the second of the four questions previously asked. The rule, even when faithfully followed, is the sole guarantee the Bible Union gives us that its work will be worthy of our confidence. Above it its employees can not rise; below it they may fall. Let us, then, know what we have a right to expect from it. The character of the rule will determine the character of the work its application is to give us.

1. "The exact meaning of the inspired text, *as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were first written.*" Where now or what, we ask, is the advantage of the long clause we have here placed in italics? The answer is none. The exact meaning of the inspired text is certainly what we want, and all we want; and to give us any thing else is not to give us a translation, but to deceive us; and this exact meaning we want absolutely or without regard to the manner in which it may have been expressed or understood anciently. How the inspired text expressed its exact meaning to those who understood the text is a fact deeply affecting them, but in no sense affecting us. Did the inspired text express to them more than its exact meaning? Then we want its exact meaning, and not the meaning which it then expressed. Or did it express less, or any thing different? Then the same. This clause clearly is superfluous. It serves neither to define the exact meaning of the sacred text, though doubtless so meant, nor to give perspicuity to the rule.

But what means have those who work under the rule of knowing what meaning the inspired text expressed anciently? None, certainly, save the means by which they learn what meaning it expresses now. If the inspired text expressed one meaning to the ancients, but a different one to us—that exact, this not, sure I am that those who work for the Bible Union will never be enabled to discover and state the difference between the two. The sense of the rule would have been just as good had it read thus: The exact meaning of the inspired text as that text expresses it to us of the present day. The truth is the inspired text expresses but one meaning, which is always its exact meaning; and this meaning it expresses to every man of every age, to whom it expresses any meaning at all. If it express any meaning whatever, it must be its exact meaning; for an inexact meaning is not its true meaning, but a falsehood. Such a meaning it never expresses. What some men say it expresses and what it does express may be very different things. This we well know; but this affects not our position. The rule we think ill conceived, and very clumsily expressed. It is the obvious product of a mind working hastily and immaturity. By omitting altogether the wordy clause on which we have been commenting, we greatly im-

prove the rule, thus: The exact meaning of the inspired text must be translated, etc. This is precisely what we want, and all we want.

But other features in the rule merit notice. Its language is: "The exact meaning of the inspired text *must be translated*." This is imperious, and admits of no relaxation. Not only *must* the exact meaning *be translated*, but no other meaning may be; for the meaning to be translated is *the* exact meaning. Now, since *the* exact meaning, and that only, *must be translated*, of course the Bible Union will never have the front to offer us any thing in its translations save *the* exact meaning. We wish we possessed the evidence that these its high pretensions will ever be realized. Such an event could have no other effect than to make us wild with joy. The exact meaning of the inspired text in happy English, placed in the hands of all who speak the language, would be an event falling just one degree behind the actual presence of the Saviour. We should shout over the one only less than we should shout over the other. Still, if we can not get the translation for which the rule pretends to make provision, we shall bless God for the one which comes nearest to it.

But the most objectionable feature of the rule yet remains to be noticed. It says, omitting the superfluous clause: "The exact meaning of the inspired text must be translated *by corresponding words and phrases*, so far as they can be found," etc. "*By corresponding words and phrases*." The principle implied in these words has to a greater or less extent domineered over and proved the curse of almost every translation yet made into English. How a thoughtful mind could ever have conceived it; or how it happens that a thoughtful one has ever approved it, or consented to work under it, is a mystery we have no means of explaining. The friends of the Bible Union have accepted it as though it were a Divine oracle, not a man of them, nor a paper among them, that we know of, ever having subjected it to a moment's criticism, or questioned even by implication its soundness. Had it been an intuitive truth, hardly could it have been held in higher favor, or carried a weightier authority.

But what means the language "*by corresponding words and phrases*?" Certainly not that words and phrases of the Greek must be translated by words and phrases of the English *corresponding in sound*. This we know to be not the import of the language. Does it then mean that words and phrases of the one tongue shall be translated by words and phrases of the other, corresponding in *meaning*? If so, the rule is sheer nonsense; for we know perfectly that words and phrases of one language can not be translated by words and phrases of another, which do not correspond in sense or bear the same meaning. In this view the rule amounts to this: that words and phrases of the Greek shall be translated by words and phrases of the English,



which can translate them; which again, when reduced to its simplest form, comes to this: that words and phrases of the Greek *shall be translated*—a thing that, of course, no one denies, but which, to be sure, it is silly enough to put forth in the form of a grave rule to govern the work of translating the Holy Scriptures. Or does the language mean, and this it most likely does mean, that nouns of the one language shall be translated by nouns of the other, verbs of the one by verbs of the other, phrases of the one by phrases of the other, and so on? If so, the rule is useless; for this is precisely what a translator is sure to do any how, as far as he can, and quite as sure to do it without the rule as with it. The truth is, that the rule while it strikes the mind of the careless and superficial reader as very clear, very fine, and indisputably true, is nevertheless a mere jumble of words either without sense or with a bad sense.

But we hold that the rule, in the particular now under consideration, is vicious and bad. It is bad because it prescribes a principle which in translation is unsound, and, as the rule itself admits, is at times impracticable or impossible. Whether the sense of a sentence in one language shall be translated by corresponding words and phrases of another is a circumstance which can never in the least enhance the excellency of a translation, but may very seriously injure it. As a proof that it may injure a translation by obscuring the sense, we cite the following Scriptures which are instances of a strict compliance with the rule:

1. "Then Peter said to them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*"

2. "And (Christ) being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, *but wait for the promise of the Father*, which, said he, you have heard of me."

We have here placed in italics the parts to which attention is to be specially directed. In the first passage the thing which Peter promisee is clearly *the gift* of the Spirit. This implies that the Spirit is one thing, and the gift of the Spirit a different thing; and that it is the gift and not the Spirit which is promised. Such is obviously both the proper construction and proper meaning of the language. That this, moreover, is the view of the common English reader, and necessarily so, as well as of many preachers, is a well-known fact. And if any other view be taken it must be learned not from the language itself, but from some other source. Now the simple truth in the case is that the Spirit and the gift are the same, or rather the Spirit itself is the gift. Hence the clause should read: and you shall receive the Holy Spirit as a gift; or, to present the whole thought in the briefest and purest form, thus: *and the Holy Spirit shall be given you*. But the age in which we live is not prepared for such a trans-

lation as this last, and we feel that we run some risk in suggesting it.

In the second passage, the Saviour commands the apostles to "*wait for the promise of the Father.*" This implies that at some future time the Father would make them a promise, and they are enjoined not to leave Jerusalem till they receive it. A more complete misconception of the truth it would be difficult to imagine. What they are required to wait for is not a promise, but the thing promised, which is the Holy Spirit. The following presents the true view: And collecting them together he said, Leave not Jerusalem, but wait for the Holy Spirit which the Father has promised, of which you have heard me speak.

Now, of these two passages, as they stand in our common version, it is not enough to say merely that they obscure the sense; they actually eclipse it. Yet they are both instances of a translation made "by corresponding words and phrases." And what is more, those who work for the Bible Union under the rule dare not alter them. For the language of the rule is: "The exact meaning of the inspired text *must be translated by corresponding words and phrases*, so far as they can be found." Here they can be found; hence the rule admits of no relaxation. Our only hope of having these, and very many similar passages improved by the Bible Union is, that its employees will work not by the rule, but above it, and regardless of it. If they do not thus work, we have little to expect; if they do, then is the rule of no effect.

But the rule shows itself to be faulty in another respect. It says: "The exact meaning of the inspired text must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, *so far as they can be found.*" The rule admits, then, that corresponding words and phrases can not always be found; but whether they are the rule or the exception we are not told; but the presumption is that they are assumed to be the former. Suppose we take the cases in which corresponding words and phrases can not be found. Is the translation worse here than in the cases in which they can be found? Of course not; for these cases have an exact meaning no less than the others, and the rule does not allow any other than the exact meaning to be translated. Now, of two passages, both of which give the exact meaning, neither more nor less, it is difficult to say that the one is worse than the other. And if one be not worse than the other, wherefore the rule? If the exact meaning of one passage can be translated without the aid of corresponding words and phrases, then can the exact meaning of all others be; and this would prove the rule to be cumbrous, worthless, and nonsensical, which is precisely what we believe it to be. No translation made in strict accordance with this rule will ever be worthy of the attention of the American, or any other people. We

do not, of course, mean to say that corresponding words and phrases should never be used; nor that they are, merely because of this trait, to be avoided. What we mean is, that they should never be used except when they can produce a more exact translation than any other words; and then they should be used for this sole reason, and never merely because they happen to correspond. The excellence of a translation does not consist in its being made in corresponding words and phrases, but in the exactitude with which it expresses the sense; and where such words and phrases contribute nothing to this end, to use them would be as weak and foolish as it would be criminal needlessly to avoid them.

But suppose the rule to be strictly followed, and a translation to be made in corresponding words and phrases, how many of the millions into whose hands a translation is expected to go would be sensible of the fact, and what would be the resulting advantage therefrom to them? None but scholars, of course, could know the fact, and to scholars a translation so made would possess not even one merit over one not so made. The rest could never know the fact; and even if they could, they could derive no benefit whatever from it.

With the preceding remarks and criticisms we now dismiss this exceedingly loose and unwieldy rule. We hope in time to come it will be seldom read, and never followed by any hand that may engage in the work of translating. Even with the men of the Bible Union, who, by their course, have so shaken our faith, we trust it stands as an obsolete statute.

The following is the first of Archbishop Newcome's rules. Let us see in what respect, if any, it is an improvement on that of the Bible

*"RULE I. —The translation should express every word in the original by a literal rendering, where the English idiom admits of it; and where not only purity, but perspicuity and dignity of expression can be pre-*

Here we have to enter the same complaint as in the case of the Bible Union's rule. The present rule merely directs how the sense of the original shall be expressed, but makes no provision for discovering it. Hence again the most difficult and most important work of the translator is left to be performed without rule or by mere chance. True, it may be said, a rule in the case is unnecessary since we have works treating specially on that very subject. Certainly we have works treating on the subject, as *Ernesti's*, and a few besides, some of them containing very excellent advice to be sure, but not one of them satisfactory and final. This is evinced by the small demand which exists for them, and the very little use made of them where known. Men have little use and seldom ask for books which are of no value to them.

The archbishop's rule we confess we think no great improvement on that of the Bible Union. It is briefer, and not so authoritative—points on which we shall certainly lay little stress. It may not be subject to the same kind of criticism, but it is hardly subject to less of a different kind. In one chief respect the Bible Union rule has very decidedly the advantage of it. The archbishop says: "The translator should express every word in the original," etc.; the Bible Union, that "*the exact meaning* of the inspired text must be translated," etc. The exact meaning of the sacred text is certainly the thing to be translated. In this particular, therefore, we think the Bible Union rule the better; and when we have said this of it we have stated, we candidly think, its sole excellence. Neither on the other rules of the Bible Union, nor on the others of Archbishop Newcome, is it the purpose of this piece to comment. Of them the intelligent reader will form his own estimate on simply seeing them.

Now, as a substitute for both these rules, and for all others we have yet seen on the same subject, we modestly submit the following:

*The exact sense of the sacred Greek should be expressed in the fewest English words that will adequately convey it to the mind.*

On this rule we feel it to be an act of simple justice to offer a few comments. That even a child can understand it none will venture to question; and although intelligibility in a rule should never be pleaded as a merit, still the want of it is certainly a great blemish. The rule asserts that *the exact sense* should be translated, and this implies that nothing else should be. From the correctness of this we can have no dissent. No matter how the sense may be expressed in sacred Greek, whether in few words or many, in simple words or compound, in phrases or not, that sense, and that only, should be translated. With this sense the translator must not interfere; in no case, nor on any account, must he presume to change it. His business is to express in terms of one language a Divine sense already expressed in terms of another. As to the sense he has no discretion; he must not even dare to think what should or what should not be said. This is the high province of the Redeemer, to be profoundly respected by man, but never to be usurped by him. There is, however, this to be added in regard to the sense, that a turn of thought or shade of meaning which arises strictly from a mode of expression peculiar to, or from some mere verbal peculiarity of, the Greek language should be carefully excluded. Such turn, or shade, is a purely lingual circumstance, and therefore not to be transmitted with the thought. It requires, to be sure, a very sound judgment and accurate discrimination to detect and eliminate such circumstances. The work is not one for a loose or careless hand. Its importance, however, fully justifies all the skill and pains necessary to effect it.

It may be proper here to remark that rhetorical beauties of the Greek, where they would in like manner be beauties in the English, and where they can be adequately represented, should be preserved. By rhetorical beauties we mean tropes, metaphors, comparisons, contrasts, antitheses, etc. These, however, it is often very difficult to retain pure, and where this can not be done, or where the retention would have the slightest effect to obscure the sense, clearly they should be disregarded. Mere ornament in style, no matter how exquisite, can never compensate for even the least obscuration of the

The rule further requires the exact sense of the sacred Greek to be expressed in the *fewest English words*. The importance of this limitation few will question, and yet not one translator in a hundred scrupulously heeds it. For the presence of even one superfluous word in a translation no justification whatever can be pleaded. The fewer the words in which a thought finds utterance, the greater is its force and the more intense its light. No trait in composition is more generally admired than brevity; and since this is perfectly consistent with both fullness and clearness, it should never be lost sight of. To clog a Divine thought by redundant words is both criminal and weak. Clothe a thought in thin verbiage if you want it to dart into the mind as if by inspiration. The practice of some translators of literally stuffing their translations until every sentence lies on the page like a bloated thing can not be too severely reprehended. With such every *kai*, and *de*, and *men*, and *ho* must have some corresponding representative. Thus the ease and perspicuity of the English are lost in clumsy attempts to make it walk on Grecian stilts. We sincerely wish that these remarks lay with no just pressure against the translations we have seen from the Bible Union press. A tame plethoric literalism mars almost every sentence that institution has yet given to the world. Indeed this trait, together with an inordinate rage for authorities, may not untruly be set down as its characteristic and its mania. An alteration on which even an intelligent school-boy could venture with perfect safety must yet be backed by a list of learned names of which few know any thing, and which weigh but little even with those that do. The passion evinced for an array of authorities on even the most trivial occasions is so pedantic as to be painfully offensive. Inherent and obvious excellence is what marks a translation for currency, and this neither asks nor can it receive abetment from authority. Make a translation what it ought to be, and then cite an authority to sustain it, is as ridiculous as it would be to state that things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another, and then cite Euclid to prove it. Of all the things that shock us an affectation of learning, or a display over the sacred Word of God, takes the lead.

But a translation made in *the fewest English words* is not even necessarily good, to say nothing of the best. No translation, certainly, is what it ought to be without it, though one is not necessarily what it should be with it. Hence the rule requires that the exact sense of the sacred Greek shall be expressed in the fewest English words *that will adequately convey it to the mind*. By adequately conveying the sense is meant conveying it without enlargement or diminution, conveying it precisely, and it only. Clearly, the nearer a translation approaches this the nearer it approaches perfection. It is proper to add, that the requisition in a certain view of it is rather theoretic than practical. The sense of a passage often has its accidents or accompanying shades of meaning which are not translatable; and even if they were, it would not be allowable to translate them. These in the original language enter into and compose a part of its gross meaning; yet it must be confessed that they rather have their origin in the use of the imperfect instrument of thought which language is than belong to the thought itself as a part of it before it is expressed. They can hardly, however, be said in strictness to fall within the meaning of the expression "exact sense;" and it is only with reference to these that the requisition can be pronounced theoretic. The rule may hence be held as good in the highest sense, and as liable to few, if any, objections. To many it may be thought to require still the word *readily* or *aptly* to render it perfect. The clause in hand would then stand—the fewest English words that will adequately and readily or aptly convey it to the mind. This, however, is not necessary. For the fair presumption is, that whatever words will adequately convey the sense to the mind will also most readily convey it. In practice we know that this is not always the case, but its being so generally warrants the presumption. Were this rule, which it will at once be perceived has reference merely to the expression of the sense, and not to the discovery of it, strictly followed, it would give us a translation very far superior to any we now have, or seem likely soon to have. Such a translation, though it should cost millions of dollars and lifetime labors, would still be cheap; and indisputably it would be the crowning glory and blessing of the nineteenth century. How devoutly we pray for it, and how ready are we to work for it!

Next we ask, is the age in which we live prepared for such a translation as we have been speaking of, and as our rule makes provision for? We are free to confess we doubt it; and yet we believe the translation should be made. Indeed such a translation itself is about the only thing that can prepare the world to receive it; and if the world is not prepared in this way, we have little hope of its being prepared in any. Sure we are that a bad or defective translation can never have this effect; for a defective translation, instead of pre-

paring the world to receive a good one, in fact takes the place of a good one, and prepares the world to reject it and not receive it. Even the blemishes and errors of a bad translation are not known and felt to be such by the great mass of those who use the Bible, hence the great mass with difficulty get their consent to abandon them. And when they do abandon them they act with hesitancy, being half suspicious that after all they may be giving up the truth and not merely error. With honest scholars the case is otherwise. They read the Bible chiefly in the original tongues. They hence have no particular veneration for a mere translation, especially they have none for the errors of a translation. Consequently it costs them no trouble to part from these errors, but rather gives them real pleasure. Hence the difficulties we encounter in giving the world a new translation lie mostly with those who are least competent to form a judgment in the case, and because incompetent, distrustful, and therefore the hardest to set right in the premises. When truth and error become bound up in a bundle together in a book claiming to be the Word of God, it is exceedingly difficult for a plain unlettered man to hand over, with implicit confidence, his Bible to his neighbor that it may undergo a revision at his hands, or perhaps that his neighbor may burn it, and in its stead hand back to him a strange new Bible never before seen or read by him. Few persons, without actual experience in the case, can form a just estimate of the effort it requires.

We have many reasons for regarding the age in which we live as not in a condition to receive the translation we need. Some of these we shall now enumerate:

1. It can hardly be said that we are agreed as to what must be the character of a final translation. Heretofore discussions have been confined, for the most part, to the question, Shall we have a translation? and to pointing out defects in our existing one. But little, comparatively, has been said on the kind of work we need. True, all are agreed that it should be perfect if possible; but if not, then as near perfect as we can at present make it. But then comes the question, What shall constitute the required perfection? Shall the work be literal or free? Shall it be made in "corresponding words and phrases," or simply in such as will truly express the sense? Shall it in its moods and tenses and other verbal features conform to our best modern English standards? Or shall it weakly and whimsically follow the stiff and antiquated forms of the king's version? These and other similar questions can not be said to be completely settled at present; and until settled, I submit it, whether we are in a condition to receive a translation which may be liable to endless objections growing out of each of them? It seems to me that in order to receive a translation as final, we must first be agreed on these two points: That the sense of the sacred Greek shall be expressed simply

and with no other qualification in the fewest necessary English words; and that, in all cases and in every respect, it shall strictly conform to our best modern English standards.

2. It can not be denied by us at least that sectarianism is, at this time, fearfully in the ascendant even in Protestant countries. Few of us can claim to be wholly free from its influences; and until such is the case, let us not boast of our condition to receive a perfect translation of the Word of God. Sectarianism and a perfect translation occupy opposite and hostile positions to one another. Give the world this and you administer death to that. Hence sectarianism always will, with the frightful energy of a dying struggle, oppose a perfect translation. This, however, is no reason why we should not have such a translation; it is only a reason why we will not receive it. But perhaps the reason why we will not receive it is the very best reason why we should have it. Such a translation would itself be more successful than any thing else in removing this let to its reception. Nothing would more certainly and more immediately tend to induce confidence in it than the translation itself; and precisely as such confidence should be induced, the power of sectarianism over the popular mind would be weakened. This, then, is no reason why we should not have the translation, but rather a reason why we should have it; but still a reason which would clearly operate against its reception. Especially is the Pedobaptist section of Protestants unprepared for an accurate new translation. Every such translation must contain the word "immerse" instead of the word "baptize." To this Pedobaptists never will consent. Oppose it they will, no matter by what authority it is backed. They are in no frame of mind even to discuss the subject profitably, much less are they in a mood to have it decided against them, as it always must be, whenever decided at all. In discussing the question in hand, then, I set it down as something not to be denied that the whole Pedobaptist world is to be excluded as in no condition to receive a correct translation. To this remark would be found, no doubt, many individual exceptions; but in comparison with the great mass of the party, they would certainly be few. Of the rest of the sectarian world, while something better may be said, still enough is known to keep our hopes from running high. Even Baptists have with no satisfactory unanimity spoken out in favor of revision. Many have with cold indifference allowed the work to gain a footing without offering it open, hostile opposition; but it must be confessed that it has greatly lacked heart-warm encouragement by them. And had the proposition at first respected a new translation, we are of the opinion that, with hardly a dissenting voice, it would have been rejected. To-day it is doubtful whether a majority of them, at heart, favor revision. With the present version, as a general rule, they certainly seem well contented. True,



with the word "baptism" they have a little quarrel; but then they have succeeded in making the act it expresses of so little account, that the mode thereof, as they are pleased to phrase some whim which they hold in common with the sprinkling sects of the day, is of very small moment indeed. Besides, the Baptists are so anxious to be accounted orthodox and to be hugged and kissed by their Pedobaptist neighbors that they can not consent to offend them or forfeit their good opinion by lifting a bold manful voice in favor of an out an out new version. The countenance they give it must be pronounced cold, and the voice they utter for it feeble.

3. The power of the king's version over the common English mind is confessedly great, very great. How to set the common mind wholly free from this power I confess I see not, without a degree of intelligence in matters of Biblical criticism, which it is well known the common people do not possess. They may be ready to admit the existence of possible errors in the Bible they read; but they know not specifically what these errors are or where they are, and until they do know, how can they be induced to give up their old friend which after all may not be worse than the new? The old book has illumined their minds and filled their hearts with the hope of immortality and eternal life; it has fitted their friends and kin for death, and shed its holy and comforting light along the ways of the last Jordan, and what could even the most perfect new version do more than this? These and similar questions, while daring scholars can readily dispose of them, will long remain without satisfactory answers with the common people. That they render the great mass of people at present unfit to accept readily and to any great extent a new translation, I think simply certain.

4. While the efforts of many who have acted in the interests of the Bible Union have not been without large beneficial results, still the great disappointment which that institution has caused has not set even the American mind in the least forward in the matter of working for and receiving a new translation. Indeed, it is not going too far to say that we are now many degrees further back than we were ten years ago; and that ten years of faithful labor from this date will be insufficient to work the American mind up to the point of liberality and confidence from which the Bible Union has caused it to lapse. It is mournful to record these utterances, but the truth in the premises should be spoken; and where the confidence of a great and liberal people has been abused, as in our case, the world should know the fact. The result is, that if in time to come we should appeal to the people to pour out their money to pay for a new version, they will reply, We did this once to pay for a boasted revision; and what have we now for all we paid? If we say, You have the revision; then the people will respond, And a flimsy shallow thing it is. Against this

caustic and contemptuous criticism we confess we should feel neither the ability nor the inclination to make a very robust defense. The destruction, then, of public confidence, which has resulted from the unsatisfactory course of the Bible Union, must be set down as seriously unfitting the present age for the translation we need.

Now, although the preceding reasons go to show a state of things far from favorable to the reception of a satisfactory new translation; still we believe that, in the teeth of these reasons and despite of them, the translation should be made. On this conclusion we shall not at present enlarge. To amplify it must be the work of another piece at a different time,

In the last place, we approach the question, By whom shall the translation be made? Certainly, if we could get one, it would matter little from whom it came. But since it seems doubtful whether we are to have one at all or not, it becomes a serious question, To what source can we look with the best-grounded hope of success? Now we believe it will be agreed that we are to look for it either from the State, or from a combination of Protestant parties, or from some single party, or from some individual. If from some one of these sources we fail to get it, then shall we never have it.

First, then, may we expect it from the State? We unhesitatingly answer no. Yet we know that much can be said, and said with force, in favor of the State undertaking such a work. That it is perfectly competent for the State to undertake such a work we do not for a moment question. Besides, the State has the money—a most essential item. It could then certainly command the necessary talent and learning to do the work. But then States are managed by men, who at best are but men. These are always partisans and politicians, and frequently as corrupt as they can well become. That they would, without partisan bias and independently of dangerous outside influences, select the best men to make a translation, pure men, men who should be influenced neither by sectarian nor pecuniary motives to undertake the work, is with me about as unlikely as it is that politicians will cease to be tricksters, and Pedobaptists cease to pervert the truth to sustain infant rantism. The State would certainly do as King James did, give us a partisan and a sectarian translation. From this quarter, then, we have no hope.

But, second, can not a combination of Protestant parties give us the work? What such a combination could do and what it would do may be very different things. Of one thing we feel assured: it would never give us the translation we need. Such combination would embody an amount of jealousy which would prove fatal to the task assigned it. Or, if not interfered with by jealousy, the concessions which one party would have to make to the others, together with the mutual compromises which would have to be agreed to,

would certainly render the work loose, evasive, and false to the sacred sense. Marked by these defects, no one would have any confidence in it, and consequently no one would receive it. The only party that would accept it, if any would, would be the party which had wielded the most decisive influence in the combination, and which had so far succeeded in sectarianizing the work as to make it speak its own peculiar faith and tenets. The rest would certainly reject it. Such combination would give expression only to the general teachings of the sacred text; on details and special points it would completely fail. Its labors would never possess the sharpness and precision of the original. Clearness, directness, definiteness, with bold individuality of parts—most essential traits in a translation, because most obvious features in the original, would never characterize its work. We have no faith in such a combination, and consequently never expect from it a translation worthy of the name.

But what, in the third place, may we expect from the single party? If not a translation such as we ought to have, then may we never expect it, in my judgment, from any source. Not, of course, that we expect a party as such, or a denomination in its denominational capacity to make a translation. This it can do only through its individual members. As a party it can do nothing. But then, in order to success, it is absolutely necessary that no two parties shall be mingled together in the work, or be as parties represented in it by members amenable to them. Whoever makes a translation what it ought to be, must be completely independent. No responsibility must be felt to any one save God and a just competent public opinion. This can never be the case with parties working together. The single party alone can feel the independence essential to success. With it no compromises are to be made; its action is wholly uninterfered with by compeers who have an equal right with itself to speak and be heard. And although there is always danger that a single party will make its translation partisan; still, if its sense of duty to God, to truth, and to man does not restrain it and prevent this, then this will never be prevented. Again: the tenets of a party may be right. They are not necessarily wrong because held by a party. In this case of course the translation would be wrong, if not so far, in the estimation of others, partisan. But then, in this case, the party holding the tenets would be, in fact, no party at all, in the true sense of that word, but the church of Christ. Hence to apply the word party to it, except in a loose popular sense, would not be admissible. When men are engaged in the work of translating, the more completely they can be kept free from untoward foreign influences, which might in any case control or modify their action, and the more directly they can be rendered amenable to some tribunal whose judgment and views they would feel bound in duty and in affection to respect,

the more certain do we render it that their work will be what it should be—at least an approximation to perfection. Let now a party, in this view of the case, select from its members those who are to make for it a translation. These men are neither by agreement nor in courtesy bound to yield any thing to the claims of any other party. They are, moreover, directly responsible to their brethren, by whose preference they have been selected, and by whose money they are paid, for the faithful performance of the grave duty assigned them. If, in this case, they fail, I see not how we may expect success. Moreover, when men of the same party are working together, they are free from jealousies one of another. There is here, therefore, a real co-operation, such as no other condition of affairs can secure. Besides, there is a degree of mental concentration and a singleness of purpose most essential in so momentous a work. When we add to this that neither the talent, the learning, nor the piety required for such a work necessarily exists in a less degree in the single party than in a larger number, the conclusion that a single party can best do the work, becomes, it seems to me, established.

Fourth, as to the position that any single individual will or can produce a translation which the present age will or ought to accept, I think it not necessary to say much. The history of individual translations, to go no further, is decisive of the point. Of the innumerable highly respectable ones that have been made in the last two hundred years, not one is now a general favorite. This will be the fate of all similar efforts. Had a man the genius of Pascal, and the learning of Selden, he would not be likely to produce a translation in which sharp reviewers would not detect errors. As soon as these errors began to be pointed out, symptoms of public dissatisfaction would show themselves. Confidence in the work would at once decline. Soon it would take its place on the shelf beside its fellows, there to remain, except as curiosity or interest might prompt to an occasional consultation of it. This has been the history of individual translations heretofore; and enormous must be his vanity who concludes that his work will be an exception to the rule. Were the age in which we live less exacting than it is, such might not be the case. But since there is little chance of altering the age in this respect, we must content ourselves to respect its inexorable demands, especially since the evidence is not before us that these demands are wrong. The chances that a translation will come from the hands of a single man, free from errors, rather than from ten of the same party, allowing them to be equal in fitness for the work, are as ten to one. Hence, where a party embraces only ten men of respectable average ability, it is always far safer to intrust the work of making a translation to the ten than to any one of them. There are few parties in this day that do not boast so many as ten respectable scholars, and since

the party undertaking it is supposed to have a deep interest in having its translation correct, why not adopt the course which is most likely to insure it? To do this is not more a dictate of common prudence than it is a stern demand by the solemn interests of truth.

In conclusion, I have a few things to say to my brethren. That we will never accept and introduce into universal circulation among us a translation made by a sectarian party, has for me the force and conclusiveness of an intuition. We do not believe such a party capable of making the translation we need. Yet we feel that the demand for it is imperious and urgent. We must have it; and not a day should be lost in taking steps to get it. We have the men that can make it; and we have the liberality to pay for making it. My voice, then, is lifted high for the initial steps to bring out the work. Let us make it; and when made, let us introduce it into our families, into our Sunday schools, and let us exclusively imbue the minds of our children and the minds of all others whom we can reach, with its Divine light and power. Whenever our brethren are ready to take the first step in the sublime task, we have a plan for doing the work, which we wish to submit; and which we believe will completely succeed. Here, then, for the present, we rest in hope.

---

A YEAR'S LABOR. —It is difficult to speak of our own labors without appearing to be influenced by a vain desire for notoriety. Still where we possess a conscious knowledge that we are not so influenced, to speak of those labors as well, since thereby others are made glad and informed. The noble and hard-working saint takes courage when he learns how the cause moves on in the hands of others.

From April, 1863, to April, 1864, I preached about three hundred and seventy discourses. These averaged one hour and fifteen minutes each in length; that is, I stood in the pulpit four hundred and sixty-two hours in a year. The result of this labor was about three hundred and fifty confessions, besides strengthening and cementing still more closely together, in a day of high passion and great trial, near fifty churches in the State of Kentucky. To this is still to be added, writing for the *Quarterly*, correcting proof, traveling, and heavy domestic duties. For the strength to do all this we bless God and promise fidelity in time to come. It is impossible to compute the good one true man can do in a lifetime, if laborious and faithful to Christ.

## REVIEW OF SIGMA ON THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

IT will be remembered by the readers of the *Quarterly* that in the March number of the work appeared an article entitled: *Spiritual influence as it relates to the Christian*. To this article Sigma's piece is designed to be a reply: and although the fact is not avowed in the piece, it is yet true, as intimated in a private note from Sigma himself. His piece would certainly have been more pertinent, and, we believe read with a deeper interest had the object for which it was written been expressly avowed. We consequently regret that such was not the case. Still, we claim no right to prescribe to Sigma how he shall reply to our article—whether directly and by name, or in the method he adopts. We only think the method we suggest the one the nature of the case demanded. The reader would, in that event, have turned to the article replied to, and read the two together; he would have examined positions, weighed and compared arguments, and thus have drawn his conclusions from a more comprehensive, as well as a more minute knowledge of all the premises than, in our opinion, he possessed. All this was surely demanded by the nature of the grave subject in hand. An accurate scriptural view of Spiritual influence is something not hastily acquired. It requires not a little reading, much thought, and unusual care to avoid falling into error. The most thorough investigation is not too sure to lead to the truth; while any thing less is almost sure to miss it. To have read the two articles side by side would have intensified thought, whetted the mental faculties, and increased very much the chances of a just final conclusion. We feel that in every view of the case Sigma's piece should have been an avowed direct reply to our article.

Besides, the article replied to contains arguments and criticisms which, if false, should not have been allowed to pass unnoticed. These should first have been thoroughly dissected and refuted. An open field would then have lain before Sigma, which he could have entered without difficulty and permanently occupied. As the case now stands he subjects himself to the suspicion of having deemed it an act of prudence to pass those arguments and criticisms without any entangling interference with them. We can not refrain from thinking that he found it much easier to construct in silence an elaborate countervailing theory than to show, outright and directly, the one to be false, which, with shrewd indirection, he yet means to undermine. The falsity of our article will never be inferred from what Sigma has said in defense of his. Yet, unless it were simply certain that this would be done, he should never have given the grounds of our article

the silent go-by with which he has passed them. In all this we admire the tact of Sigma, but yet think that his cause, if just, has suffered by the very tact which he displays in setting it forth. Of this, however, he may say we have no right to complain. We respectfully beg to differ. If we hold the error, and he knows it, to us he owes, on the highest score, the frank out and out refutation. On the other hand, if he holds the truth then to the truth is it due that it shall be so presented as to be free from all suspicion. It does not need to be brought adroitly forward; and no false argument or unsound position should be left lying unrefuted over against it which might hinder its reception. It is not enough to eradicate error from the human mind that truth shall simply confront it in scowling antithesis; the error must first be grubbed up, and then the truth planted in its stead. We hence still insist that the refutation of our arguments and criticisms was first in order, and then the presentation of Sigma's theory.

In the outset of this review we wish to say that we are far from dissenting from all the article to be reviewed contains. Many of its positions, subordinate ones it is true, are sound; while some of its reasonings and distinctions are excellent. But from its main position we dissent in the most unqualified terms. That position is, *That the Holy Spirit does not dwell in Christians, but merely among them.* This we believe to be untrue in every line and feature of it. Not only do we believe it to be untrue in fact, but also contradictory of the Word of God in some of its clearest teachings. We hence regard the position, to the full extent of Sigma's ability to give it currency, as dangerous, and that not in a small degree. True, we have, as we conceive, one sure guarantee against its evil tendency—but few persons will accept it as true. Were this not the case, we should not conceal our alarm at the appearance of such a position in our ranks, and from so respectable a writer as Sigma. The article in which it appears as its characteristic feature is well written. Though far too lengthy for the matter it contains, it is yet smooth and thoughtful; and although we can not pronounce it eminently cautious, we can certainly pronounce it eminently calm and respectful. In an article possessed of these excellencies, and from one whom we so sincerely respect as Sigma, we can not repress a deep regret to find a position taken from which we feel in duty bound to dissent so decidedly. Were the contents of the article put forth as a mere theory, as problematic, and for the sake of having them searched by criticism or tested by the Word of God, we should have delighted in their appearance. Even as matters of opinion we should have felt them to be comparatively innocent. But they are neither a theory nor an opinion—they are a faith. They hence wear no problematic air, but come to us dressed in the sober, chaste, and confident dialect of truth. Still, in one view, we are

glad of the appearance of this article. It affords one more opportunity of speaking in defense of the truth, and in the end will reveal how naked and defenseless error is, no matter how decently dressed or shrewdly argued.

That we correctly represent Sigma's main position will clearly appear by the following question and reply extracted from his piece: "Do the Scriptures, then, affirm unequivocally that the Holy Spirit *literally or personally dwells in the Christian*? We are fully persuaded that they do not; but that, on the contrary, they teach that the Holy Spirit as a person and in person *literally dwells with and among Christians, or in the church*, when contemplated as a temple."

Such, then, is certainly Sigma's position. For the elaboration, defense, and illustration of it, we must refer the reader to Sigma's own article, and we sincerely wish he would turn to it and give it a careful second reading. It can be found in the June number of the *Quarterly*, and will well repay the attention we ask for it.

The first passage Sigma cites in proof of his position and on which he offers his first criticism is the following: "I will not leave you as orphans," but "I will pray the Father, and he will give you *another comforter*, that he may abide *with you forever*" (*mene meth' humon*), "the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive because *it seeth him not*, neither knoweth him; but you know him, because he dwelleth with you" (*par' humin menei*), "and shall be *in you*" (*en humin*). On which Sigma thus comments: "In this passage there are three distinct words used to express the relation which the Spirit should sustain to the disciples. The first is *meta* with the genitive, and signifies that the persons are associated together, in the company of each other. The second is *para* with the dative, and has essentially the same signification in English. It places the persons at the side of each other, as two walk together in company. The last is *en* with the dative, which places the Spirit *among* the disciples. When used to express the relation between persons, it can have no other meaning than with or among. The first two indicate what must be the meaning of the third; and in harmony with their meaning we translate the preposition *en*, *among*."

From this criticism two errors glare on us in naked deformity; and although the number is not great, still it is great enough to spoil effectually the tranquil paragraph in which it occurs. These errors are: 1. In translating without warrant the particle *en*, *among*. 2. In assuming that *meta* and *para* determine the meaning of *en*. Now, by the aid of one unwarrantable translation and one assumption, even a man of far less ingenuity than Sigma is known to possess ought to be able to reach almost any conclusion, no matter how groundless. We should certainly, then, not be astonished that Sigma reaches his with so much facility. How it happened that these two errors did



not occur to him, I see not; and sure I am that had they occurred, he would have spoken of them, for he is a candid man and above concealing a known weakness. So it is, however, they stand in his piece to mar it completely.

That the first and usual meaning of *en* is *in*, no one knows better than Sigma himself; and that we are to translate the particle by this meaning, unless a change is clearly demanded, he knows equally well. These positions are indisputable. Now, has he shown that a departure from this first sense of the particle is necessary in the passage in hand? He has not. True, he says that *en* places the Spirit among the disciples; and, in effect, that *meta* and *para* so determine. But this is merely asserted, not proved. Again: he says of the particle, that "when used to express the relation between persons, it can have no other meaning than *with* or *among*." Granted, when spoken of men; denied, when spoken of the Spirit. The literal meaning of *en* is *in*. Why now, when used of men, must we render it *with* or *among*? Because the nature of the case so demands. This we know, know it by our senses. It is knowledge here, therefore, which enables us to determine the precise meaning of the particle. Not so, however, in the case of the Holy Spirit. Here we have no knowledge. How the Holy Spirit dwells, we can not, of ourselves, say. We hence have no means within ourselves of determining the sense in which a term is used, when used in asserting of the Spirit a mode of dwelling. Certainly the Spirit can dwell in the Christian, if it so determines. Now, we happen to have no knowledge which will enable us to deny the fact that it does so dwell, especially when the fact is asserted by one who can know, and certainly does know, as is the case with the Saviour, that he asserts truly. Where we have knowledge, certain knowledge, we are the less under the necessity of taking terms in their known current sense; but where we have no knowledge we are absolutely under such necessity, and can not shrink from it. Now here is a case in which we have no knowledge, a case in which the Saviour asserts of the Spirit that it shall be *en* us, the fact is not impossible, there is present no qualifying epithet or other circumstance to modify the sense of the particle; on what ground, then, I ask, does Sigma render it *with* or *among*? I boldly answer, none. His criticism is unsound, utterly so. The passage, then, should stand, in this particular, as it stands in the common version; and in this version it says, "the Spirit shall be *in* you." This we accept as the truth. The real or actual indwelling of the Holy Spirit is then "unequivocally" asserted, and asserted for all Christians. Hence my article, in which this position is taken, is right; and Sigma's, in which it is denied, is wrong.

It is proper to add, that there is nothing inconsistent with this conclusion in the three several expressions used by the Saviour in **the**

passage, to indicate the presence of the Spirit and its mode of dwelling. The Spirit may be both *with us* and *in us*. Certainly we know nothing to the contrary; and where the Scriptures so assert, it is delightful so to believe. And to me, I am frank to say, they seem as clearly to assert it as they do the resurrection of the dead.

On the following passage in Sigma's article it may be well to bestow some notice: "On the meaning of this preposition (*en*), the doctrine of the personal or literal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Christian is based. Small and narrow as the foundation is, it is nevertheless true, that men have built on it the doctrine which contradicts the moral constitution of man, does violence to the beauty and symmetry of the remedial system, and nullifies the great power of God in the salvation of men."

1. The doctrine in question—that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the Christian—"contradicts the moral constitution of man." If so, of one thing I am sure, either that Christ is not the author of man, or that he is not the author of the doctrine. But is Sigma's assertion true? He speaks of the moral constitution of man as if he were an oracle. On it I believe he may well afford to be modest. At least, unless he knows more of the moral constitution of man than falls to the lot of common men, I confess I am in no condition to hear him base on the little he does know an argument to set aside the plain declarations of Holy Writ. The Saviour says to the disciples: *The Spirit shall he in you*. It is not true, says Sigma. It "contradicts the moral constitution of man;" therefore, it is false. Reader, judge you.

2. But the doctrine "does violence to the beauty and symmetry of the remedial system." If it be a part of that system, it does not; if it be not a part thereof, then it may. Is it a part thereof? This is a question of fact, who shall settle it? Paul says: "Know ye not that your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit which dwells within you." Not true! It "does violence to the beauty and symmetry of the remedial system." Reader, judge you.

3. The doctrine "nullifies the great power of God in the salvation of men." If so, it is false, and should be repudiated by all men who do not prefer a myth to the truth. But does it so nullify? Then is it no more a feature in the Gospel of Christ than are the sinuities of the Nile. Again we ask, does it so nullify? "That goodly treasure," says Paul, "which is committed to thy charge, guard by the Holy Spirit, *who dwelleth in us*." He does not dwell in us! It can not be true! It "nullifies the great power of God in the salvation of men." Reader, judge you.

But "small and narrow is the foundation" (*en*) on which the doctrine rests. Yes, and straight and narrow is the path that leads to life, and few there be that find it. Yet, though "straight and nar-

row," it *does* lead to life; and though "small and narrow the foundation" on which the doctrine rests, it may rest on it. If Christ and Holy Writ there place it, then is the foundation, though "small and narrow," large enough and wide enough. I confess I was not prepared to expect from Sigma the use of "small and narrow" he has seen fit to make. Does the force of a word depend on its length, or is its capacity to carry thought determined by the number of letters it counts? To the doctrine I have not been bred. When the Saviour says: "The rich man also died; and *in* hell he lifted up his eyes, being *in* torments;" the first *in* as decisively locates him in hades, and the second in torments, as though they were as long as the Atlantic cable. Nor could the thought be more clearly or more definitely expressed, were it expressed in as many words as Sigma's article contains. A "multiplicity" of words does not always keep thought clear.

Here I propose to call the reader's attention to several general points in Sigma's article, which I believe should not be passed in silence. And, 1. "The providential work of the Spirit." On this he thus speaks: "The providential work of the Spirit, however, embraces the care of all the interests of Christ's cause on earth. Wherever these interests call him, there is the Spirit found, laboring for Christ. He works not for himself—he speaks not for himself; all he does is for the honor and glory of Christ. Sometimes he labors for the conversion of men, sometimes for their instruction, and sometimes for their preservation from evil, and always, and everywhere, and in all ages, for the general and special welfare of the church at large, and every church and disciple in particular."

We here enter our protest against the expression "providential work of the Spirit;" especially against elaborating the thought contained in it into a sort of sub-scheme of redemption as the preceding extract appears to do. The expression is not scriptural; and it seems to smack of a readiness to introduce a sort of new theology of the Holy Spirit. We distrust it and repudiate it. All authority in heaven and on earth is in Christ's hands; and both the Holy Spirit and angels act under him as agents in the work of salvation. The Spirit was to speak nothing of its own accord; only what it heard was it to speak. It was sent to do Christ's will, not its own. And however august it may be as an agent, and we are incapable of speaking so as to lower it, still it is not right in speaking of its work to introduce a dialect wholly unsanctioned by the Bible. We have no more authority for speaking of the "providential work of the Spirit" than of the providential work of angels. A small departure in a beginning may lead to a great error in the end.

2. Sigma evinces a dangerous fondness for analogical reasoning. Now, while such reasoning is not, without qualification, to be con-

demned; it is yet to be used with extreme caution. Of all the types and forms of reasoning known to men, it is the most specious and the most fallacious. I never yet knew an analogical reasoner that could be trusted. They are so fascinated, and so fascinate their hearers with parallels, exact resemblances, and points of similarity, that genuine logic is wholly lost sight of. Brilliant and luminous analogy seems almost inconsistent with sober dexterous reasoning. The man that handles the tools of the latter well, completely distrusts the flashes of the former. God walked *among* the children of Israel: the Spirit dwells *among* Christians. God dwelt *in* the ancient tabernacle: the Spirit dwells *in* the Christian temple. God did not dwell *in* the ancient Israelites; he merely walked *among* them. The Spirit does not dwell *in* Christians; he merely dwells *among* them. The relation of Christ to the disciples was *personal*: the relation of the Spirit to the disciples is *personal*. One person does not dwell *in* another, but *with* him; therefore the Spirit does not dwell *in* Christians, but *with* them. These and other analogies run all through Sigma's article. They are the matter of his theory, and the law of his criticisms. They shape his paragraphs, shape his sentences, shape his modes of thought, and even his fallacious conclusions. His whole piece has been cast in an analogical crucible, and now wears its deceptive conformations and sports its delusive lettering. I call not now to mind another piece, the product of a sound well-balanced head, which has so obviously, as that of Sigma's, been ground out under the inexorable supervision of a theory. Had such not been the case we should never have been called upon to dissent, as we now do, from the product of his pen.

3. Nothing could be more unjust than to accuse Sigma of bowing intentionally at the shrine of rationalism, or of wishing to follow its dubious light. Neither do I mean even by possible implication to do so. Still, to me, I confess his piece throughout seems strongly marked with rationalistic features. I see not what else than rationalism could have given it birth. Sure I am that the view he elaborates is not the one which most naturally occurs to the reader of the New Testament, whose mind is uninfluenced by that theory. As evidence of the truth of what is here said, I cite the following from Sigma:

"If what is here affirmed be true" (see pp. 353, 354), "and we are fully persuaded that it is, then there can be no reason why the Holy Spirit should dwell *in the heart*. We acknowledge that a failure of our reason to perceive its necessity and propriety is not absolutely conclusive; nor to be put in opposition to the Word of God—not for a moment. But when the language of Scripture is doubtful, then our reason must be called into requisition. And when our reason has come to perceive and appreciate the beauty and symmetry of such a

Divine system as Christianity is, it then does become a power which can be rightfully and advantageously used in determining whether or not a certain theory is consistent with the teachings of the Divine record. And when it perceives that a certain view is not consistent with the beauty and symmetry of the Divine system, it is justified in pronouncing the view false." Again, on page 365, Sigma thus speaks: "In view of the great *system* presented to us in the Holy Scriptures, the mind can discover no reason why the Holy Spirit should *dwell in Christians*—can not see what can be gained by such an 'indwelling', more than is, or can be, enjoyed by his personal association with Christians, or his personal dwelling among or with them."

In these two extracts I greatly fear Sigma is holding the candle which lights us into the chambers of his mind from which his article emanated, and that he is making us acquainted with the secret source of the thoughts and reasonings he has woven into his piece. If so, while we shall acquit him of being conscious of the fact, we hesitate not to pronounce his article of the very essence of rationalism. "The mind can discover no reason why the Holy Spirit should *dwell in Christians*." "There can be no reason why the Holy Spirit should *dwell in the heart*," etc. If, then, the mind can discover no reason for the doctrine, it is not true! If there be no reason for the indwelling, that is, of course, no reason discoverable by us, then the indwelling is false! So Sigma talks. If this be not rationalism, I know not the meaning of the term. True, "a failure of our reason to perceive its (the indwelling's) necessity and propriety, is not absolutely conclusive." Of course not; it is only sufficiently so to justify us in converting the plainest Scriptures, if they assert the indwelling, into figurative language, and to make them mean that the Spirit does *not* dwell in us—that is all. Nor is "a failure of our reason to perceive the necessity and propriety of the indwelling to be put in opposition to the Word of God—no, not for a moment. But when the language of Scripture is doubtful, then our reason must be called into requisition." Aye, in this lies the rub. "When the language of Scripture is doubtful I" Now to the rationalist the Scripture is always doubtful when it contracts his theory. This is precisely what makes him rationalist—he will not let the Word of God speak for itself, it must speak as by his reason. His reason determines, not what *is* said, but what *can not* be said, because his reason perceives not "its necessity and propriety." It is this, we repeat, which makes him rationalist. Of the Spirit the Saviour says: *it shall be in you*. Is this doubtful? Tell me, Sigma. If so, for consistency's sake never pronounce another passage clear. But it must be doubtful; not because it is not clear, for human speech is incapable of being more so, but because Sigma's reason "perceives not the

necessity and propriety" of it. Alas for the truth when it falls a prey to such a test! That the Word of God asserts a thing is a point of which human reason may judge, nay, must judge; but not of the nature of the thing so asserted, nor whether it is necessary and proper or not. To determine these points is the high province of the Saviour. Not that we are to receive a thing which is contradictory of reason. This, of course, we can not do. But certainly we may receive a thing which is above it, as we indisputably do, in receiving many things in revelation. That the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian is not contradictive of reason. It is only above it, and, therefore not to be judged of by it. Hence no view which reason can take of the indwelling of the Spirit, if the Word of God asserts it, can justify the rejection of it. Of course not, Sigma himself will say; but then he denies that the Word of God does assert it. Certainly so, but why does he deny it? Because his reason does not perceive the necessity of it. Hence his reason is controlling his laws of criticism and exegesis. Now the proper course is to determine, first, that his laws of criticism are sound, that they lead to true results. Next to apply these laws to the assertion that the Spirit dwells in us or shall be in us. Then, though the result may be above reason, if it be not contrary to reason, we have no discretion—we must accept it. Had Sigma done this, the expressions "the Spirit dwells *among* you," "the Spirit shall be *among* you," would never have appeared in his piece to give us grief as they have done.

We come now to speak more particularly and critically of certain words and phrases used in the New Testament in expressing the doctrine in question. If these words and phrases justify the conclusion that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian we shall abide thereby, and leave Sigma's article to its fate in the hands of the Bible student.

1. The Saviour's expression: "*the Spirit shall be in you.*" That the language of this expression is plain, I might even add, inimitably plain, can not be questioned. Not only is each individual term in itself clear, but the whole collocation is perfectly so. It parts from its meaning to the mind with as much facility as if its meaning were a simple intuition. As to its being a correct translation, not even one legitimate doubt can exist. The original, both in its collective form and in its individual words, is as clear as is the English. Neither the subject-matter nor the context requires a single word in the expression to be taken in any other than in its most obvious and usual sense. Now, since Sigma himself admits that the expression speaks for all Christians, I hence decide that it asserts for every follower of Jesus Christ that the Spirit *shall be in him*, in him actually, in him literally, in him in the severest and simplest sense of the words. Bold **and** confident, Sigma will say. So it is, and so it ought to be.

2 The expression: the *Holy Spirit that dwells in us*. The verb *enoikeo*, here rendered dwells, means more than simply to dwell. It means to *dwell in*. Hence the simple word "dwells" does not give its full force. It is derived from *oikos*, a house, and when combined with *en*, as in the present case, originally meant to dwell in a house or inhabit it. From this it easily and soon came to mean to dwell in or inhabit any thing. No verb in the Greek language has a clearer or more determinate meaning than it has. Its derivation is obvious, its structure simple, and its meaning indisputable. Now, not only have we *enoikeo* in the expression in hand, which of itself would be quite sufficient to express the simple idea of dwelling in, but we have it followed by *en*—the strongest and most precise form of speech in the Greek language to express *dwelling within*. To this let it be added, that this combination is used to express a fact which in itself is not impossible—a fact of which we know nothing requiring us to take the words in any other than in' their usual and current sense; and the fact, that the Spirit dwells within us, becomes, it seems to me, established by the most cogent form of proof a verbal question can admit of. I confess I see not how even the most subtle and skeptical ingenuity can resist its force.

Let us for a moment suppose it to have been the Saviour's intention to express the fact that the Spirit should be in us or dwell within us, what more definite and appropriate form of speech could he have used than he has? Certainly I shall not undertake to say he could have used none; but, allowing he could, sure I am that Sigma will not be able soon to point it out. Now, since he has used the very form of speech which, as far as we can see, he most likely would have used had such been his intention; and since it is the precise form necessary to express the notion of being within or dwelling within, the fair inference is that this is the notion he intended to express and has expressed by it.

3. The language: "*You are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you.*" Even Sigma himself admits that the form of speech here used, *oikei en humin*, means to dwell in, not, however, in the saints as individuals, but only in the church as a temple. This is his favorite analogy, and on that account deserves special attention. The church at Corinth is here called a temple. In this temple the Spirit is said to have dwelt. So far all is easy and conceded. Now, that the word "temple" is used figuratively none will deny. What, however, is its counterpart, or the real thing which answers to it—its true literal meaning? That this is the church is certain. But what constituted the church? Simply the saints in Corinth. There was not one thing there represented by the word "temple," and a different thing by the word "church," nor any thing called the church differing from the saints. The temple, the church, and the saints

were one. Hence, since the Spirit dwelt *in* the temple, it therefore dwelt *in* the saints. The Spirit dwelt literally in the saints; and the saints are figuratively called a temple; but calling them a temple in no sense modifies the import of the language used to express the indwelling. Hence this language must be taken "literally. Further, the Spirit is not said to have dwelt in the saints *as* a temple. This false view and faulty form of speech run all through Sigma's article. I believe it deceives even him, and sure I am that it deceives others. The Spirit dwelt absolutely in the saints in Corinth, or in them literally, and as a fact. This is the true view. "The Spirit *dwells in you*," is Paul's language, not in you *as* a temple, nor *as* any thing else, but in you simply. It was this very fact, that the Spirit did dwell in them, that led Paul to speak of them as a temple; and unless the fact had been real, the language would never have been used in expressing it which has. Difficult would it be, indeed, to combine language, so as to make it more completely refute Sigma, than the language now in hand does.

4. The expression: *They were all filled with the Holy Spirit*. On this and similar expressions Sigma does not venture to furnish his readers with even a single criticism. Why he has not done so, we can not positively say. His silence is suggestive, to say the least. He is perfectly familiar with the expression, knows well the sense in which it is usually taken; yet he makes no effort to show that the popular construction of it is wrong, or how it can be construed in harmony with his theory. We have a just right to complain of this. Omitting all notice of this and some other expressions, which he knew stood in his way, and knew to be the very expressions most confidently relied on to establish the doctrine of the indwelling, imparts to his effort much of the air of a special plea. The omission looks as if he were determined to establish his theory at all hazards, even though the Word of God might be against it; and that he felt it prudent in his effort to ignore altogether the Scriptures which seemed to disfavor him. Intentionally he is utterly incapable of what is here said. We only think that in this case his bad theory has had the effect of setting him in a bad light.

That the verb *pletho* means to fill in the truest and severest sense of the word can not be denied. And that it is usually followed by the genitive of that, be it what it may—matter or spirit, used in effecting the filling, is equally undeniable. The truth of what is here said will be conclusively established by a few examples:

1. "And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and *filled* it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink." In this case the vinegar was *in* the sponge, and the sponge was filled with it. The vinegar was not with the sponge, nor among it, but in it. This even the commonest reader can clearly see.



2. "And all they, in the synagogue, when, they heard these things, were *filled* with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city." That the wrath was in those who were filled with it, even Sigma will not deny. It was not merely with them nor among them, but actually and literally in them. Not more certainly were their hearts in their bosoms than was the bad passion in them with which they were filled.

8. "And they came, and *filled* both the ships, so that they began to sink." How now were these ships filled with fishes? By having the fishes literally put in them. The fishes were not with the ships, nor among them, but absolutely in them.

Now where, in the light of these examples, was the Holy Spirit with which the disciples were filled, in Acts, ii., 4, and iv., 31? We have the disciples, the parties filled; *the* verb *pletho*, to express the act; and the Holy Spirit, that with which they were filled. But where was the Spirit? The answer is, *in* them, in them literally, in them as literally as was the vinegar in the sponge, the wrath in the people, and the fishes in the ship. This is absolutely decisive. It would, I believe, be impossible to make a case of verbal proof more complete. To say that the Spirit was merely with or among those that were, in these instances, filled with it, would be so gross a departure from sound philology and sound sense that I feel assured even Sigma would rise up to condemn it. At all events I shall so persuade myself till I know better.

5. The language: "*In whom you also*" (the saints in Ephesus) "*are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit.*" The word here rendered "habitation" is a strong, definite word, with a single meaning. It means simply a place to dwell in or to inhabit, and has no other signification. This habitation the saints in Ephesus composed; and in it God dwelt. He did not dwell *in* the habitation and *among* the saints, but *in* the habitation and *in* the saints. The sense and mode in which he dwelt in the one are the sense and mode in which he dwelt in the other; for the habitation and the saints were one. But in what sense and mode did he dwell in the habitation? Not in person, but representatively; that is, he dwelt in it in or by the Spirit. But if the Spirit itself did not dwell in the saints, how did God dwell in them by the Spirit? Sigma will never satisfactorily answer this question. It is decisive and final. The simple truth is, that the Spirit dwelt in the saints in Ephesus, and by it, as representing him, God dwelt in them. This view and construction of the passage seem so obvious and natural as to need neither comment nor criticism to defend them. I shall therefore add nothing in their favor.

6. The expression: "*He that ministereth to you the Spirit.*" The word here translated ministereth means to supply, furnish, or give a

thing. Paul furnished or gave the Spirit to the Galatians, and the Galatians received it. But if the Spirit merely dwelt among them and not in them, in what conceivable sense can Paul be said to have supplied it to them, or they to have received it. Absolutely none. When a man supplies me with information, or imparts light to my soul, as happy an illustration, perhaps, of ministering the Spirit to a saint as we can well imagine, the information or the light is communicated to me, I receive it, or it enters into me, and dwells in my mind. So Paul communicated the Spirit to the Galatians, and the Galatians received it, received it in the act of its entering into them, where it dwelt as in its appropriate temple, and strengthened them with strength in the inner man or spirit. Such we conceive to be the comforting import of this fine passage; and how cheerfully it contrasts with the cold rationalistic theory of Sigma!

7. The promise: "*And you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" Of much that Sigma says on the phrase "gift of the Holy Spirit" we heartily approve. Certainly the gift of the Spirit is the Spirit itself given. The common version of the passage is very faulty, faulty in as much as it completely hides the true sense from the common reader. Render it as follows and all is clear: *And the Holy Spirit shall be given to you.* A child can understand this; and it expresses the exact import of the original. But what did Peter mean in saying, "the Spirit shall be given to you," or, if any prefer the expression, "you shall receive the Spirit as a gift?" The Spirit, according to Sigma, was already among them and with them in the only sense in which he allows it ever to be present. This, then, could not have been Peter's meaning. Putting, now, all that has been said together, and taking the passage in its easiest and most natural import, and we conclude its meaning to be this: You shall receive the Holy Spirit as a gift; it shall enter into you, and hence *be in you*, according to the Master's promise; it shall *dwell in* you as its fitting earthly temple; to which let us add, as consequences, it shall comfort you, so that you shall not evermore carry in your hearts the lonely, disconsolate feeling of orphans; it shall strengthen you with strength in the feeble inner-man; it shall intercede for you in sighs which no human speech can express, to procure for you such things as you know not how to pray for as you should—such shall be the gift of the Spirit in you, and such it shall be to you.

We here conclude our review of what we deem the chief points in Sigma's article, with the expressed earnest hope that one so calm and just as we know him to be, may, on further consideration of the subject, have cause wholly to abandon the views he entertains, which we have no hesitancy in pronouncing groundless, and injurious to the truth.

## SOLOMON'S CONFESSION.

BE not startled, gentle reader, at the mention of Solomon's confession; my speech is not fiction, but sober truth. Yet think not that I speak of the great king who wore and rendered illustrious the name here used. Such is not the case. I speak now of no king; neither of the hollowness and vanity of courtly pretensions to religion. I speak of a far humbler Solomon than was, perhaps, suggested to your mind on seeing the caption to this modest piece; still I speak of one whose deeds may not be wholly unworthy of the mention which herein follows. To courts and kings and the other great, as a general rule, we go when our object is to study plots and tricks and schemes for power, plunder, and other selfish ends; but to the obscure and lowly walks of life, and to those that move therein, when we wish to learn what constitutes faith and trust in Christ and a sublime obedience to his will. Into one of these obscure walks you will hereby be led; and, it may be, introduced to a man to whom you would do little more than toss a cold highway nod if you passed him in life's bustle, but who may still in a thing or two serve to hold the lamp which may light you into the better way.

The two little incidents to which chiefly your attention is here invited transpired, as well as memory now avouches, about fourteen years ago—transpired in and near Haynesville, a noticeable place, afore this mentioned in the pages of the *Quarterly*. The town at the time of which we write was in its pride. In it and around it, in the circumjacent country, was as true and as happy a band of saints as it ever falls to the lot of neighborhood to be blessed with. Among them were men who would have gone to the stake with all the calm heroism of a primitive martyr—men who, I am ashamed to say, would since then have sent, if they have not sent, even their brethren to their last account for a very different cause from that which kept them in check and filled them with hope and love and gentleness then. Philip Gill, who was the best croaker I ever knew, was still in the vicinage, and spent six days in the week in blustering and pouting, but the "Sabbath" piously devoted to the humane task of gibbeting "Campbellism." Philip was never regarded as a very artistic workman, but few that knew him will fail to give him credit for faultless swagger and bravado while engaged in his chosen work. In eminent coparceny with Philip stood George Huffaker, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. George was famous chiefly for his large pretensions to mental wealth, and small assets when the balance-sheet was struck. He was a quiet man, without glaring faults or

striking virtues. Never did mortal struggle harder to put on the clergyman than he; never did mortal more signally fail. The white necktie, to be sure, wore a most celestial air, and was very apt to inspire a peculiar awe, especially in spirits like my own; but then it lay in ludicrous contrast beneath the tame dull face above it. George's preaching was a platitude, unrelieved by the semblance of variety, and as desolate and destitute of interest as the sands of Sahara. But to sketch his portrait is not the object of this paper.

Fourteen years from this writing will carry us back to a time when Allen Wright was in his prime, and doing a great work in Missouri. He was present and acted his noble part in the meeting where Solomon made his confession. Dear man! we almost envy him his quiet sleep in the little wood which hides him now. Since his time what changes have taken place! The war-storm sweeps over the country he loved, and its children slaughter each other at present. And when, Lord, when will the angel of death, who has lowered on it his fatal wing—when will he float away and leave it resting from the throes that convulse it to-day? Besides, his brethren for whose prosperity he so faithfully toiled, and for whose perpetual union in faith, in heart, and in practice, he ever so fervently prayed, have cooled toward one another, and, in heart at least, will never be one again. I am thankful that our Heavenly Father did not let him stay to witness and mourn over the Bight: Almost am I made to wish at times that I slept in companionship with him. But a high sense of duty and noble impulses of heart bid as toil on; for still is there harvest to gather, and it is ripe.

The meeting in which Solomon made his confession was held in August. It was intensely warm, and the farmers were enjoying a season of leisure. For some time previous the country had been looking forward to the meeting with not a little interest—the brethren with uncommon anxiety. The Devil and Philip Gill, *et id genus omne*, all combined to defeat it. Almost as soon as the meeting commenced, the strife began to rage. High and still higher arose the opposition. The scene was sublime. The struggle was between the ancient Gospel—the truth as it is in Christ, and sectarianism wrought up to a white heat and wearing its most malignant front. From two to four preachers attended the meeting daily, mingled with the crowd, and were fiercest and foremost in the opposition. Lies flew through the air like rockets; and misrepresentations stalked through the streets like exorcised demons. Allen Wright was in his glory. To stand unflinchingly by the cause of Christ through a scene like this was one of his finest characteristics. He neither shrank from opposition, nor refused to assume responsibilities. He cowered before no adversary, nor suffered a human lip to malign the cause of his Master. Not slow to see an advantage, laborious and faithful, he sat

gracefully at the helm through such a storm; and little had the ship to fear while he guarded its fate. The crowd in attendance was large, while the interest obviously increased from day to day. Ten, fifteen, and even twenty miles the people came to attend the meeting, and some of these almost nightly. That famous old flock meeting at Mount Gilead attended almost to a man. Many of its members sang well, and all with heart. They gave the meeting their undivided attention, and prayed for its success with a fervor indicative of the truest devotion to the cause of Christ. When assembled the audience was silent as the graves in the rear of the house, and began early to show signs of deep interest and fine feeling. It can not be said of the excitement that it was uncommonly high. Indeed, it had depth rather than height. It was the excitement of thought more than of feeling. It was within, not without—the motion of a hidden fire kindling in the inner man, not the frothings and boilings of the flesh. The breathless stillness of the great crowd was at times oppressive and painful. You felt as if you wanted to see the crowd move, wanted some sign of outer bustling life — any thing, in a word, to relieve the petrified scene before you. Had you entered a room in some buried city where a whole audience had perished in an instant, where the spirits had left the bodies fresh as in life, with the hue on the cheek, the sparke in the eye, and the thought on the brow, little more could you have felt the awe-inspiring stillness than in the silent audience before you. Only on one occasion did the emotion rise so high as to be overpowering. At the close of one of the exhortations even Mason Summers was mute. He could not sing a word. Several tried, but all failed. So overwhelming was the feeling that every tongue and note was hushed. Here and there a deep-drawn breath or bursting sigh was all that could be heard. Men stood and looked like statues weeping. First one and then another would arise and come forward to confess his faith in Christ, until twelve strong men sat on the front seat. Such a sight I have never seen before; I have not seen it since. Glad hearts were in that audience that night, but far too full to talk. Men thought, but thought in silence; felt, but never spoke. Even after the crowd adjourned, they glided over the roads homeward through the deep shadows of primitive woods, noiselessly as if they had been troops of spectres marching to their last doom. Even Gill for the time ceased to bray, while Huffaker was mute and walked clerically. The sects grew sullen, bigots gnashed, even the wizard spirit of Collet Haynes was dumb, and it is believed that any rake in the neighborhood might, for the time, have climbed one of Andy Fuller's saplings without the fear of a presentment to the grand jury.

It was about the time of this meeting that my old friend and brother, Dr. J. W. Cox, settled in Haynesville—the keenest and

brightest wit that ever sparked through its streets, with a taste for the sublime and beautiful faultlessly pure, and an eye for the ludicrous which even Swift might have envied. I shall not soon forget the Doctor's war with Gill. It was on the temperance question. Gill took the side of swill; the Doctor stood against it. Gill puffed, and raged, and wrote, but neither fought nor swore. The Doctor kept cool, while that supple, caustic pen clipped, and skinned, and minced his victim, who, Fallstaff-like, was daily growing grayer and growing larger.

Long after this occurred the Doctor's tilt with Elder Bird, who, after Redman, assumed to be the first shanghai in the ranks of the Methodists in the West. Bird, like Gill, had been called (whence or by whom I decline to affirm dogmatically) to a special task—that of blaspheming the ancient Gospel under the vulgar name of "Campbellism." Bird was a pedagogue, a preacher, a wag, a mountebank, a killer of Campbellites, and a politician. The last calling suited him best. He was a fit subject for *tics* of any kind, especially politics—a word which in his case meant many ties. Never have I known a more admirable compound of *tics* and clerical pretensions than he. Like some preachers of the present day—he looked *tic*y, talked *tic*y, acted *tic*y, preached *tic*y; in a word, he was generically, specifically, essentially, differentially, and professionally a *tic*y man, with innumerable cognates and counterparts in the year of grace, the present. Now I love to see a man whole-hearted in every thing; and this trait alone raised Bird above contempt. Even when he acted the hypocrite he did it so coolly and so thoroughly as to leave you admiring the completeness of the thing. You never thought of finding fault with the man for any deficiency. He rounded up his part, and never left it incomplete.

Bird spent most of his time in coining vulgar epithets for immersion—that holy rite to which Christ himself submitted, and which he subsequently appointed to be obeyed by all the believing and the pure in heart, and in supplying his audiences with obscene representations thereof. I shall give him some credit for distinction in his calling. It was upon one of these occasions, an occasion of maligning immersion, that the Doctor felt it to be his duty to call him to account. Of the occasion, and the mode of handling his subject I do not here propose to treat. But a dozen pages of the *Quarterly* are at the Doctor's command, if he sees fit to preserve the memory of the incident. It would be a fine relief, when finished by his racy pen, to some of the austere themes herein, from time to time, discussed. True, a few will object to such subjects, but what of that? Men objected to John when he neither ate nor drank; they objected to the Saviour when he did both. My recollection now is that Bird seldom or never appeared in Haynesville after passing through the Doctor's fingers. But I have been wandering.

During the meeting could constantly be seen moving about among the crowd a modest, aged, black man, now about eighty, who showed obvious signs of a deep interest in what was going on. As he had but few years of life left, and appeared deeply concerned, the brethren took uncommon pains to converse with him often, as to his state of mind and intentions. His views seemed so just, his conversation so sensible, that, added to his shrewd mother-wit, they soon attracted much attention. Solomon was clearly no common man. He was decidedly an original negro, original in his thoughts, original in his talk—especially original in his striking, ready replies. I mention a single instance: Several years after the date of the meeting of which I am now speaking, I met Solomon in the road. At first he did not recognize me, as his eye was now dim; hence his replies to general questions were rather dry. At last I began to question him about his religious state and prospects. In an instant he spoke my name and gave me a long, warm, tender shake of the hand. We were alone in a forest, and I remained and spoke much with him about the future. There, amid the solitude of dark woods, I read to him the Word of God, and bowed and prayed with him. When we parted he wept like a child. I felt that I left on the banks of the Jordan. During our conversation I said to him: "Solomon, how does John get on religiously these times?" He replied: "Why, sir, John now-a-days *takes a long step out and a short one back.*" That struck me as about the happiest description of a certain class of professors I had ever, up to that time, heard, and I still think I never heard a better.

But the meeting was moving grandly on, and Solomon began to exhibit signs of an interest which clearly must have vent ere long. He was now the object of much prayerful solicitude. We all felt that if the present meeting closed and left him still in the world, there in all probability he would end his days, and be lost. Day after day passed away, and each day the old man drew a little nearer to the stand. At length, at the close of one of Bro. Wright's best and most powerful exhortations (and these were no tame efforts), Solomon arose and walked calmly forward. The song closed, and the audience seated, he accosted us thus:

"Gentlemen:—I have come forward to be examined by you. I have been hearing you preach for a number of days, and you seem to me to preach the truth. At least your preaching sounds much like my Bible reads. (He read the Bible well.) I wish to be simply a Christian, gentlemen. I am unwilling to be any thing more, and I am afraid to be any thing less. I am an old man, you see, and can not carry much; and am afraid to take on any thing more than Christianity, lest I should not be able to get along with it; and then I am afraid to start with any thing less, lest I should not get through

with it. You see what I want. I hear the people talk much about the Baptists, and the Methodists, and the Presbyterians, and the Reformers—they are all very good people, I have no doubt, and I love them very much, but my Bible says nothing about them, and I am afraid to go with them. They may be right; they may be wrong; don't know. But to be just a Christian will do me. Believe I should be satisfied with that; can't say about any thing else. Think that would let me in, should not like to risk anything besides. It might do; then it might not. Solomon would not like to try any thing else, gentlemen. You see what I want."

"This talk seemed to me so sensible and so pertinent that I had no inclination to stop it, and so let the old man go on till he ended of his own accord. I then said to him: "Solomon, you have hemmed in my path and made it very narrow and very straight. After what you have now said, I can ask you no questions except such as the Bible will warrant, and do with you nothing except what it will sanction." He replied: "That seems to me about right, sir. I can risk the Bible; am afraid of every thing else." Requesting him to stand up, I put the question to him: "Solomon, do you believe with your whole heart that Jesus<sup>1</sup> is the Christ the Son of the living God?" He dropped his head as if in deep thought, paused a little, clasped his hands, and said: "*I believe with my whole heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God.*" All this was said in the most solemn and measured manner. I had never heard the good confession so made before; I wish I could never hear it made otherwise.

Of the good confession I wish here, in passing, to say one thing: it is extremely desirable that all our preachers in taking it should be uniform in their procedure. We all claim that the Bible, and that alone, furnishes us the matter of our faith, and that it and it only is the rule of our conduct. How is it, then, that there is even a verbal difference in taking the confession? The thing to be believed confessedly is, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. This is to be believed with all the heart, or from the whole heart (we a little prefer the latter). Hence the confession, it seems to me clear, should be taken thus: Do you believe from your whole heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. This is necessary, and more than this is not. To Bay: Do you believe on the testimony of the apostles and prophets; or, do you believe on the authority of the Holy Scriptures, is unsanctioned by the New Testament, and a clear innovation on the simplicity and power of the ancient confession. Brethren, meditate on these things. Uniformity here, as in all other important items, is highly desirable. How is it, our opponents wilt say, unless we are uniform, that you profess to take your faith and your practice from the Bible, to speak of its teachings and its duties in its own terms, and yet in so simple and clear a matter as



that of the confession you are not one? We can not say that it is untaught, discretionary, and that therefore uniformity is not required. And if taught, especially if practiced by the primitive saints, then let us teach and practice it precisely as did they, without addition, variation, or change. I confess I feel scrupulous in these matters. A simple and faultless conformity to the usages of the New Testament, with an utterance of its truths in its own terms, is an end to be intensely desired and to be labored for with all pains and perseverance by every one who seeks to be true to the Master. Except in the State of Missouri, I have never known even general uniformity among our brethren in taking the confession. In Kentucky they are far from uniform. Each man varies the procedure a little, where not even the slightest difference should exist. If the New Testament supplies a form, let us determine it and follow it. If it supplies none, then let us agree on some discretionary one, and use it always and everywhere. My voice is for union in heart, agreement in speech, and sameness in practice among the children of God. This is lovely and good.

But the next day after Solomon made the confession was appointed for the immersion. A number were to bow in that sacred rite to Christ. Many had already done so, and the work was daily repeated. The place selected was a clear little pool, mostly supplied, at that particular season, by a spring once owned by my poor mother, and from which her own faithful hands had lifted many a pail of water. As I visited that pool daily, melancholy were the feelings of my heart, and mournful the recollections of the past. Here, in that same pool, in other days I had fished, a listless boy. Now I stood there to bury, or to see buried, such as avowed their faith in Christ. I realized the transition, and yet it seemed half a dream.

That day Bro. Wright did the immersing; for we immersed alternately, he on one day, I on the next. A song was sung, and an appropriate prayer offered. Several were led down into the water, after the ancient custom, and immersed. The crowd on the banks was large and profoundly respectful. Slowly at length Solomon descended into the stream. The proper depth of water was reached, and Bro. Wright was preparing to immerse him, when he said: "Mr. Wright, may I pray?" "Certainly, Solomon," gently and kindly replied this amiable man. Solomon folded his hands, raised his eyes to heaven, and uttered this prayer in the identical words here repeated: "*O Lord, have mercy on me, and help me to serve you faithfully the balance of my days. Amen.*" When that prayer closed not a dry eye stood on that bank as far as I could see. Many and touching have been the little incidents I have known to happen at immersions. This in power and effect exceeded them all. It brought to my mind afresh, and never had it struck me with so much force before, the language of Ananias to Saul: "Arise, and be immersed, and wash away your sins, *calling*

on the name of the Lord." Here was the act in all its original simplicity, with its power to move the heart wholly unabated. Would that all who, in this holy rite, consecrate themselves to Jesus, could in the act thus invoke the Divine blessing and commit themselves to the service of the Saviour. Never is the truth so powerful as when pleaded in its purity; never are the ordinances of Christ so sure to touch the heart as when administered precisely as he ordained them; and never will his people move the world as they could move it, until they accept that and do these just as they stand in his Holy Word.

**THE BIBLE UNION ANNIVERSARY.**—The Fifteenth Anniversary of the American Bible Union was held in the First Baptist Church, New York, on Wednesday and Thursday, October 26th and 27th. A business meeting was held at half-past nine. Rev. Dr. Armitage, President of the Union, occupied the chair. The third chapter of Ephesians was read in the revised version. After religious exercises, Committees were appointed and officers elected. The officers of the Society for the ensuing year are the same as last, with the addition of the following new managers chosen: Rev. R. McGonegal, Rev. A. F. Mason, Wm. J. Coombs; to fill vacancies, and for three years, Rev. J. B. Thomas, Eld. A. N. Gilbert, Rev. A. Harris, Rev. J. L. Hodge, D. D., Rev. B. W. Bliss, Rev. W. H. Pendleton, Rev. W. D. Wright, George A. Merwin, and J. H. Townsend.

The report of the Treasurer, Dr. Eleazar Parmly, showed a total of receipts amounting to 920, 187, and of expenses amounting to \$21, 348, showing a deficit of \$1, 160, including a deficit last year of \$159.

The New Testament, in full, revised by the Final Committee, was announced to the Union.

From an abstract of the Annual report, we learn that "The work of distribution has been steadily prosecuted. Already 67, 000, 000 pages of the Sacred Scriptures, in various languages, have been circulated. The Union has now completed and published new and greatly improved versions of the New Testament, in the Spanish, Italian, and English languages. In the Old Testament it is making good progress, as well as in the French and German. The Board sees much to encourage in the future, as the merits of its work come into the possession of the millions who are sought to be benefited. It is distinctly stated that the work must go on; that no errors will be allowed in the version it adopts; that measures will be adopted to collect and weigh all valuable criticisms, both with regard to the purity of the original text, and the fidelity of the translation, so that the version shall in the end stand forth to the world as a monument of faithfulness, accuracy, clearness and elegance, unsurpassed and unequalled."

During the Anniversary, the following resolutions were adopted:

*Resolved*, That we heartily approve of the suggestion in the Annual Report in reference to holding a semi-annual meeting in May next, in the city of St. Louis, and we request the Board to arrange for said meeting, and also for similar meetings to be held about the same time at Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, and Cleveland. [Moved by Eld. J. Stevens.]

The regular time fixed by the Constitution for holding the Anniversary is the first Wednesday in October. For important reasons, the Union has for two years past met at the close of the month. To avoid conflict with the meetings of other bodies, it was first resolved to change the time to the first Thursday in October. But on reconsideration, it was

*Resolved*, That the Board be requested to make inquiries in reference to the best time for holding the Anniversary, to fix the time for the next annual meeting as near as practicable to that fixed in the Constitution, and to recommend such change as they may deem best (if any), so as to accommodate as far as possible all our friends.

# LARD'S QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1865.

No. 2

---

## THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

No theme of the Bible possesses for the Christian a deeper interest than the kingdom of heaven. It was a subject of prophecy before Christ; it has been matter of history since. Whether viewed from the former point or from the latter, its importance remains undiminished. To understand it in its fullness, no amount of labor nor length of time should be spared; and after all, we may well afford to be modest in our conclusions. That the subject needs a thorough reconsideration at our hands, as a people, I firmly believe. Though often discussed by our preachers in the pulpit, many a time, we regret to know, in a very loose style, and not seldom appearing in our periodicals, still, with safety it may be said, that the subject is not too well understood. Besides, now and then, of late years, a man rises up who is bent on self-distinction, if not by what is true, yet by what is false, and to him the kingdom of heaven especially presents many striking points for the display of empiricism and novel views. On several grounds, then, it may be well to bestow on it the attention proposed in this paper. The prominence given the subject in the New Testament and the obvious importance there attached to it, should lead us to the most careful examination of it. Views at once Scriptural and clear of the kingdom of heaven could not well be valued too highly. These may not be attained by a single effort to reach them. If not, let the effort be repeated and still repeated until it shall be crowned with

We shall treat the subject of the kingdom of heaven under the following concise and simple heads: 1. What is it? 2. When did it begin? 3. How is it entered? 4. How long will it continue?

I. — *What is the kingdom of heaven?* Or, to vary the question, for what does the expression stand in the word of God? Clearly, in general terms, so far as it is known to affect us at present, or to embrace us, it is something having its existence in time, and is confined to the earth we inhabit. Not that it is of the earth or of the world; for it is not. In the world it is, though not of it, nor like it, but distinct from

it, and unlike it. "My kingdom is not of this world" is a saying of the Master, as pregnant with meaning as true. That the kingdom of heaven and the church, taking this last term in the widest sense sanctioned by Holy Writ, are the same is conceded on all hands. Christ has not one thing on earth called the church, and a different thing called the kingdom. Neither can a person be in the church and not in the kingdom; nor in the kingdom and not in the church. He who is in the one is in the other; he who is out of the one is out of the other. The acts which introduce into the one, also introduce into the other; for there are not two sets of acts, the one of which introduces into the church but not into the kingdom, the other of which, into the kingdom but not into the church. The same set of acts introduces into both. Now, although we may be unable, with absolute certainty, to infer the identity of the church and the kingdom, in the absence of express Scriptural testimony to that effect, from the fact that the same set of acts introduces into both, yet we may feel assured that the distinction between them, if any exists, is to us immaterial and of no importance. Two circles may be tangent to each other at a certain point, and the same secant which enters the one may also enter the other; yet the circles may not be identical, for the one may be included in the other. So of the church and the kingdom. They may be identical to a certain extent, and that a wide extent; hence the same set of acts would introduce into both at the same time; yet conceivably they may be different, for the one may include the other. But if so, the difference is of no consequence to us. The points in which the church and the kingdom interest us are the points in which they certainly agree, and not the points in which they possibly differ. Hence, to determine what the church is, is to determine what the kingdom is, to all intents and purposes in which we are concerned.

Again: that the body of Christ on earth and the church are one is not matter of inference, but, since actually asserted in Holy Writ, is matter of certainty. Hence the mode in which we become a member of that body is the mode in which we enter the church, and consequently the mode in which we enter the kingdom. The body, the church, and the kingdom are one. They are not three different things, but the same thing wearing three different names, accordingly as it is represented under this, that, or the other of three different conceptions. The kingdom may be viewed either as a kingdom, as a church, or as a body; and all that is true of it in any one of these views is true of it in either of the other two, only under different forms of speech or modes of representation. Hence, an accurate view of the body, and a consequent accurate definition of it, necessarily embrace an accurate view and definition of the church, and therefore of the kingdom. Of course, each separate view has its own cognate, included, or appropriate subordinate views constituting in Hic aggregate

one perfect whole, with its corresponding proper forms of speech. To keep all these separate, so that the subordinate views of one conception shall not blend with those of another, and thereby induce confusion, requires certainly some degree of skill and not a little thought. Still the work is practicable, and verily most necessary.

Now, that the body of Christ on earth is composed of all the individual Christians now living, and that have lived since the first formation of that body to the present, is, we believe, indisputable. At least, we have met no good thinker as yet, nor seen any author of high authority, that denies it. We shall hence treat it as true. The fact that some of these members sleep sunders not the tie that unites them to the great spiritual heart that beats with boundless life in that mystic body. No. Whether they sleep in peace or toil in tears, they are one; and their life is bound up in a bundle with the life of Christ. The Spirit that strengthens the poor heart that indites this hovers over the unknown urn of Paul, and awaits but the beck of the Master to kindle that silent dust into life again. Through every frail member of that wondrous body it sends the subtle energy which keeps even the dead alive to God; while from that imperial Head, that sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high, descends the law which insures unity, and the bread of which if a man eat he shall never die. Death breaks no tie that unites the living branch to its glorious living vine. To be absent from the body and present with the Lord is not to part the member from him as its great quickening fountain. Such are the component members of the body of Christ on earth. These members, viewed with reference to Christ as their head, are the body; viewed in their collective capacity as an assembly or congregation, they are the church; but when viewed as subjects and under law to Christ as King, then are they the kingdom. Of course, the term kingdom as here used is understood to embrace specifically the notion of Christ as King, the saints as those over whom he bears rule, and his expressed will as their supreme regulating law. Such, in the absence of divine aid, is the best conception we can form of the kingdom of heaven. When we speak of divine aid let us be understood. We do not mean that the Scriptures furnish no aid in forming the true conception of the kingdom; neither do we mean to imply that the subject is involved in real darkness. We only mean that the Scriptures furnish no formal definition of the kingdom; and that in the absence of one, we must form, first, the conception of the kingdom for ourselves, from such material as we have at hand, and then express it in our own style. Much, of course, that is necessary to a complete conception of it has yet to be said. What, however, has now been said, will answer for the present.

II. — *When did the kingdom begin?* There is not known to me another question suggested by the Bible about which a greater diversity

of opinion exists among professed Christians than this. Whether this diversity is well or ill founded, and whether it has no higher grounds for its existence than sectarian reasons or not, are questions which it is not proposed to consider here. The existence of the diversity is a well-known fact, and beyond this, for the present, we make no inquiry.

Now let it be noted, in the outset, that the Scriptures nowhere tell us, in so many terms, when the kingdom of heaven began. Formally or expressly they do not decide the question; by circumstances we think they do. Hence our ultimate conclusion can not, as resting on grounds not wholly indisputable, rise above the degree of the highly probable. Up to that height we believe it can be carried, but not beyond it. And it is most necessary that the reader should know, in many cases, the character, as to trustworthiness, of the conclusion he is expecting. Otherwise his disappointment may be painful and injurious.

Now, in regard to the beginning of the kingdom, one thing may be said in perfect confidence—beyond the days of John the immerser we need not go to find it. This side of those days it must certainly fall. So far, then, we feel safe. That it was in John's time still future is certain. How far future we are not yet ready to say. John's language touching the subject is: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This and kindred language we must now carefully

The word *engus*, from which comes *engizo*, rendered in the passage just cited, *is at hand*, means near, close by, at hand. In strict agreement with this, the verb means to be near, be at hand, draw near, approach. Both words are used in reference to places, times, and events, and have the same general meaning. When used of places, they express nearness to them; as, "When they came *nigh* to Jerusalem;" and, "John was baptizing in Enon, *near* to Salem." When used of times the sense is the same; as, "Ye know that summer is *nigh*;" and, "When the time of the fruit *drew near*." And so of events; as, "The Passover, a feast of the Jews, *was nigh*;" and, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof *is nigh*." These examples will be sufficient to give the reader a very just conception of the meaning of the terms. They may, and certainly sometimes do, denote greater remoteness than is implied in any of the examples just cited; but the examples unquestionably give their usual or current meaning with great clearness.

Now when John says, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," two things, it appears to me, are settled; 1. That the kingdom was then future, and not present. 2. That it was not far distant, but just at hand. If these two things are not settled, human speech has no reliable meaning; and the clearest perceptions of the human mind are not to be trusted. When it is said, "The Passover, a feast of the

Jews, was nigh," the mind with overwhelming force, feels that, at the time alluded to, the Passover was not present, but future and close by. Nor less powerfully does, it feel, when John says, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," that the kingdom was, at the time of speaking, not present, but future and very near. Not only was the kingdom future, it was all future; the whole thing was future, and none of it was present. Not more certainly does the whole of summer lie ahead of spring than did the whole of the kingdom lie ahead of the moment in which John spoke of it. Now if these positions be correct, and false they can not be; and if the church and the kingdom be the same, and a difference- between them can not be shown, then what becomes of the doctrine that the church existed in the days of Abraham? The question almost makes me scream—murder. But merely to refute some doctrines, falsely so called, is not enough; you must literally crucify them; and even then they will not be abandoned.

It may be well to cite here an important rule bearing on the language of John, and also on that of the Saviour, in regard to the kingdom. The rule is this: when an event is future, and certain to come; when, as we sometimes say, it is fated or decreed, it may be, for the sake of a vivid effect, and often is in Holy Writ, represented as present; but when an event is already present, it is never, for any purpose, or on any account, represented as being future. To this rule an exception does not exist. Now, since both John and the Saviour, during John's day, spoke of the kingdom as future, but just at hand, we conclude, that at that time it *was future*, and neither past nor present. And this conclusion covers the whole period of John's public ministry—a period reaching, according to the computation of some, through three and a half years. So that we have certainly to look on this side of John's day to find the beginning of the kingdom. And not only so; it must be sought this side of the transfiguration, and even this side of the sending out of the seventy. For at the occurrence of the last named of these two events, the same language—"the kingdom of heaven is come nigh to you," is used, implying that the kingdom was then still future. This will bring us down a long way into the personal ministry of the Saviour; so that the commencement of the kingdom unquestionably falls this side of even that time.

Again: the identity of the church and the kingdom being assumed, the language of the Saviour in Cesarea Philippi is to the same effect—"Upon this rock, I will build my church." That the church of Christ was not in existence at the time of uttering this language, is as clear an implication as human speech can contain, and therefore true. The thing denoted by the expression, "this rock," we firmly hold to be the grand truth that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God*. Up to this time, nothing rested on that truth as a foundation—neither church nor kingdom. On it the church now stands; on it then the church

did not stand; but on it was, at the time, to be, in some future day, built. When I point my neighbor to a foundation just laid, just completed, and say: On this foundation I will build my house, all human minds that understand English, instantly collect, that at the time of speaking my house is not built, but that it is going to be built at some period then future. This inference the mind makes at once, and by constraint; it could make no other if it would. Hence, again, we must look this side of the interview in Cesarea for the beginning of the kingdom.

But now, without in the least raising the difficult question of ancient dates, let us go forward to the time when Paul wrote his letter to the Colossians. Was the kingdom in existence then? The following language cited from the letter settles the question: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Col. i., 13, 14.) At the time, then, of writing this letter the kingdom was certainly in existence, in existence in fact, in reality; in existence here on earth; not in existence in some metaphorical sense, or merely in some seer's eye. Not only so; into this kingdom Paul and the saints in Colosse had actually been translated. Hence, they were in it, living in it as citizens of it, and rejoicing in its honors. They were not out of it, and looking forward to it as something thereafter to come, and thereafter to be entered. They had already entered it. The term here rendered translated is a clear, strong word, and means to move or be removed from one place to another; and with *ek* and *eis*, from or out of one place into another. In the present instance it, together with the other term used with it, means that Paul and the saints had been removed from or out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of God's beloved Son. This, of course, they could not have been had the kingdom not then been in existence. Further, the tense used, denotes that, at the time of writing, the act of removal or transplacement was completed, and in the past. Hence, they were then wholly and completely within the kingdom. No conclusion can be more clear or better founded than this.

Now that delivering the parties here named out of the power of darkness, and translating them into the kingdom, are the two parts of one and the same process, will stand undenied. Farther, that this process took place when, and found its consummation in the acts in which, the parties became Christians, is simply certain. They were not delivered and translated at one time, and at another became Christians; neither were they made Christians first, and afterward delivered and translated. If delivered and translated, but still not Christians, what were they, and where? We know that they were in the kingdom; for so the passage asserts. They must, then, have been born again; for otherwise into that kingdom they could not have entered. Were they



still not Christians? This can not be. Or were they first made Christians, and afterward delivered and translated? If so, then were they Christians while still under the power of Satan, and before born again. Neither can this be. The moment in which a man is delivered from Satan, and is placed under the authority of Christ, is the moment of his Christianization, the moment of remission. Hence, if we can find when these parties became Christians, we can also find when they entered the kingdom; and this will give us another period at which the kingdom was certainly in existence. Now, since it is certain that some of them, at least, became Christians long before the writing of this letter, it is, therefore, certain that long before the writing of this letter the kingdom must have begun. Hence, in order to find this beginning we must now commence to look back, not from the time of writing the letter, but from a time long antedating it: namely, from the time when those named in it became Christians. We are now, therefore, looking back from a point of time when we know the kingdom did exist, to another late point in the life of the Saviour when we know it did not exist, but was then future and at hand. Between these two points its beginning must fall. Beyond them, on that side, it can not fall; beyond them, on this side, it can not. Between them, and them only, then, can we successfully seek it.

But what was true of Paul and of the saints in Colosse, simply as Christians, was certainly true of all other saints, simply as Christians. No difference existed among them as saints; neither had they in one place become Christians in one way, but in another place in a different way. In the case of each and every one, the moment of deliverance from the power of Satan was the moment of translation into the kingdom, and therefore the moment of Christianization. Not only were the saints themselves the same, with no difference; but the acts which had constituted them Christians were the same, and so were their consequences. The acts neither differed nor varied, neither did their results. Hence, since the instant of deliverance and translation was the instant of Christianization, of course the instant of Christianization was the instant of deliverance and translation. Therefore, whenever we determine the time when a person became a Christian, we also determine the time when he entered the kingdom; and, consequently, of course, that the kingdom was, at that time, actually existent. This conclusion seems to me to be absolutely incapable of being denied. Can a person be a Christian, in the true Scriptural sense of the term, and not be in the kingdom? It is impossible. As truly could we affirm of a man that, though in the kingdom, he is not born again, as of the Christian that he is not in the kingdom. If this be correct, then is our task easy. To find the beginning of the kingdom, we have simply to find when men first began to become Christians, and the work is done. Let us now test the probable correctness of this.

For this purpose we shall select the case of the eunuch. That this man was a Christian when he parted from Philip and went on his way rejoicing, no one who believes the Bible will deny. He was, then, at that time, delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom. Here, therefore, was the kingdom in actual existence, and an instance of entering it. But let us, for a moment, suppose a denial of any one of these positions, and what results? If the eunuch were not a Christian when he and Philip parted, then are Christians mere myths. There are no such beings. But if the eunuch was a Christian, yet still undelivered from the power of Satan and untranslated into the kingdom, then he became a Christian while out of the kingdom, and still under the Devil, which is a contradiction to thought, and in fact, and consequently is not true. I hence conclude that whenever a case occurs of a person becoming a Christian, we have a case of entering the kingdom; and, therefore, of course, the kingdom itself present. From Paul, then, as an instance of entering the kingdom, we recede to that of the eunuch; from him to the Samaritans: from these to the Pentecostans, and here pause. That the Pentecostans were Christians is above doubt. They were, then, delivered from Satan and translated into the kingdom. Here again, therefore, we have the kingdom, have it present, present as a reality, and being entered. Now surely there existed no difference between the Pentecostans when saved, and the saints in Colosse when Paul wrote to them his letter. In the case of both, the distinction between Jew and Greek had ceased, as also that between male and female. They were consequently all *one* in Christ. But when Paul wrote his letter, the saints in Colosse are asserted to have been in the kingdom; therefore, the Pentecostans, when saved, must have been in it; for, otherwise, a difference existed, and they were not one. Hence we can trace the kingdom, by the clearest necessary implication, as far back as to the day of Pentecost. But beyond this we lose all trace of it as actually existing, for the reason that all the marks disappear by which we were enabled to trace it to this point. On this day, then, it certainly existed, and was actually entered. This side of that day, therefore, it could not have commenced. We shall, consequently, now select this day as the most remote period from us, in which the kingdom is certainly known to have been in existence. We shall next go forward to the period nearest to us when it is known to have been future. Between these two periods its beginning must be sought.

Selecting now the point of time nearest to us in which the kingdom is known to have been future—say the time of sending out the seventy, and we shall pause long enough to ascertain and name the items and circumstances which must guide us in our immediately succeeding labors. These items are three: 1. The time when most likely Christ

became King. 2. The time when probably Peter used those keys. 3. The time when the first birth of water and Spirit occurred. It is not likely that Christ sat long on the throne before his kingdom began; and it is very certain that it did not begin until he sat on it. Nor is it likely that the kingdom had been long founded before Peter used those keys; and we may rest assured that he did not use them before it was founded. Neither can we think it long after the kingdom began before men commenced being born into it; and sure I am that none were born into it before. If, then, we can ascertain the probable date of the concurrent happening of all three of these items, we shall feel that we have thereby determined to a high degree of certainty the precise time when the kingdom began. About the time when Christ took his seat on the throne, must his kingdom have been inaugurated. Thereon, we conclude, Peter used those keys in opening it; and that then immediately men began to be born into it. So, at least, do we arrange these events as in the order which seems to us the most natural.

Now, that Christ was not constituted King till he took his seat at the right hand of the Majesty on high is something we shall take for granted. At that time he became Lord of all, and then began his reign. Not only so; he then began to be priest—a thing he could not be while on earth. Thus these, his two grand offices, had the same beginning, as they will also have the same ending. The crowning of Christ could not have preceded the day of Pentecost, at the very most, more than ten days, if it did even so much as one. Taking, then, the day of Pentecost, the most remote period from us to which we can with certainty trace the kingdom, as one point, and the day of ascension, beyond which it could not have commenced, as another, and allowing these to have stood ten days apart, and it is almost certain that they stood less, and we have now to seek the beginning of the kingdom between these two closely approaching points. On this side of this point we know it did not happen; on that side of that it could not. Between them we shall find it.

That the keys of the kingdom in Peter's hands denoted the possession and use of the authority with which the Saviour subsequently invested him, is agreed to on all hands. This authority he used in loosing and in binding; in other words, he used it in laying down the terms which commit or bind men to Christ, which constitute them the subjects of his reign, and which at the same time serve to set them free from the dominion of Satan. Both the loosing and the binding have respect to persons, and mean, in our judgment, to release from Satan and unite to Christ. With this authority Peter was certainly never invested until the day of Pentecost. On that day the Spirit descended upon him; and then and there the authority. At that time, therefore, he received the keys. Hence, since up to that day the keys

had not been received, and therefore, of coarse, not used, it follows that up to that day the kingdom had not been opened; and presumptively that it had no existence. To the day of Pentecost, therefore, are we compelled to look for the beginning of the kingdom. On that day, for the first time, was the Saviour officially proclaimed to earth to be both Lord and Christ; on that day, therefore, to us and for as he first became King. On that day, first, the Spirit descended to clothe with power his high functionaries, the apostles, to the world. On that day Peter performed his first act which can answer to the use of the keys, because an act pertaining to sinners, and having the effect to release them from Satan and bind them to Christ. On that day, for the first time, were men added to the church, for the reason that then for the first time did one exist, and the church and the kingdom are the same. But to my mind a still more conclusive proof, if possible, than any even of the preceding, that on that day the kingdom began, is to be found in the fact, that, on that day occurred the first birth of water and the Spirit, and hence the first instance of entering the kingdom. Men are born of water and the Spirit into the kingdom; and can not be so born where the kingdom is not. On we day of Pentecost, then, *the kingdom certainly existed*. Now it is not likely that it existed long, not even so much as a day, before men began to be born into it. Consequently, since none were so born before that day, the fairest conclusion—the conclusion encumbered with the fewest difficulties—seems to be *that on that day the kingdom of heaven began*. Such, at least, is the conclusion on which, as being in our judgment the true one, and therefore the final one, we settle down.

But now, in opposition to all this, and notwithstanding it, there are some, even of the present day, who persist in affirming that the kingdom of heaven has never yet been established, and consequently that it is still future. This they affirm, shall I say, in defiance of reason, and of Holy Writ so clear that even the most corrupt and skeptical ingenuity would seem to be incapable of starting over it a doubt. Those who thus hold generally connect with their idolized hobby the delicious tenet that man is wholly, within and without, bodily and spiritually, as material as a hog, and that when he dies, he dies and rots precisely like a goat, leaving nothing behind in the form of a conscious intelligent spirit. We marvel that all the world is not frantic in its hot pursuit of the precious doctrine. Along with this, as a part of the contents of the same box, goes the jolly theory that the wicked are never to be punished—certainly not, they are merely to be annihilated, that is all. Hell with such people is a mere phantom in the brain of old women and fools, and serves no other purpose than to scare destructible urchins and keep them from material tricks. We never knew a man of this school with whom reason weighed an ounce; and as for Scripture, it is just as cheap and unauthoritative as the

stale recipes of an obsolete almanac. Whenever we meet a man of the aforementioned creed we at once grow inanimate and as mute as an Indian bat.

Still there is a future kingdom into which the saints have not yet entered; and as this may serve to confuse somewhat the popular mind in regard to the kingdom of which we have been speaking, it may be well to bestow on it a little attention. The following language of Peter will set the matter in the proper light before the reader: "Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fail. For so an entrance shall be administered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Those whom Peter here addresses had certainly entered the now existing kingdom, and were therefore, at the time of writing, in it. Yet here is another kingdom then future, a kingdom into which they had not entered, but into which they are promised a contingent entrance in time to come. This kingdom is denominated the everlasting kingdom, not merely because it will last forever, but because when once established it will thereafter undergo no mutations, be subject to no changes. It is certainly distinct from the present kingdom; though not, as we conceive, an absolutely original kingdom, having no relation to the present one. That kingdom will consist of the present kingdom delivered up to the Father, immediately on being perfected both in itself and as to its subjects. Christ reigns over this, and will be the accomplisher of that. Hence it is called his. The subjects of that will be composed of the subjects of this, advanced to their glorified state. In this they wear fleshly bodies; in that they will wear spiritual bodies. Such, in brief, will be that future kingdom; into which may God grant us, gentle reader, a sure entrance. But it is not the purpose of this piece to treat of it further.

III. —*How is the kingdom of heaven entered?* On this subject, fortunately for us, we can speak with a precision which gives complete satisfaction, for the reason that it admits of not so much as even a single cavil. Nothing here is left to be decided by inference or implication. All is clear, dogmatic, and final. We have no points of time standing wide apart between which the truth may be found; between which it may be missed. On the contrary, we have now to speak directly to a single point, and that a point pronounced upon by no less an authority than that of the blessed Saviour. The following language is, for the present, both our faith and our rule:

"Verily, verily, I say to thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

It would be difficult, indeed in our judgment impossible, to exaggerate this solemn decision. When the Saviour says, "He that believes not shall be damned," not more certainly does he doom the

unbeliever than does he here shut the kingdom of heaven, except on certain named contingencies, against the whole human family. Into that kingdom no man can go except on the conditions laid down. Let men not be deceived; let them not deceive themselves. With some things they may sport, not with this. Alas for the man who with impious daring ventures to mutilate or change this decision, or to coerce it to utter a sense not in it! Better for him that his eye had never rested on the sacred page. But to the language itself, and not merely to be speaking about it.

What is it to be born again? Indisputably to be born of water and of the Spirit. To be born again is the generic conception, to be born of water and of the Spirit the specific included parts. If, then, we can ascertain what it is, 1. To be born of water; 2. To be born of the Spirit, clearly we shall know what it is to be born again, and consequently what is necessary to entrance into the kingdom. On these two items, then, must be bestowed the most minute and careful

But first let it be distinctly noted, that these two items are not independent one of the other. Distinct they certainly are, and to each belongs a meaning and a value peculiarly its own; but independent they are not. They stand to one another as the two component parts of one and the same indivisible whole; that is to say, indivisible except to thought, or in a theoretic light, or, assumptively, for the time being, for the sake of the more minute examination. To part them is as if we parted an artery; though the parts remain the whole itself is destroyed. To be born again is something not susceptible of partition except in the sense now said; a whole of two halves permanently united; a process of two parts not separable; a brief chain of two ever interfastened links. This whole is complete neither in the one half nor in the other, but only in the two. To be born of water is not enough; to be quickened by the Spirit is not enough. That without this is of no value; this without that will perish in its subject. Emphasize this with a whole heart; insist on that with an iron will. No more compromise on the one or on the other than you would on the power that is to bring your buried kin to life. To be born again is a whole thing, a process, which we will not consent to divide; we can not do it; we dare not do it. What the fingers of Jesus have knit together, what his own high, all-binding will has made one, forbid, kind Father, that I should ever be found picking to pieces. To be born of water, to be born of the Spirit—these are the conditions inscribed by the Saviour's own uplifted hand on the arch which overhangs the way into the kingdom; and never can I so far forget my fealty to that Saviour, or my duty to his God, as to void the one or deface the other. I defend both, because in each I still hear the lingering accents of the Master's lips. In each alike my touch detects,

like the bounding pulse of an endless life, the throbbings of that grand will which is the life and the law to the spirits of all flesh. My cheek is covered with shame, and my soul is in amazement, when I reflect on the trickery of corrupt sectarian priestlings in their efforts to shroud in night one of these conditions, and to render of as little effect the other as the parings of an idiot's nails. The Lord save his truth from the smut of their fingers! We repeat, to be born again is one, and not even conceivably divisible, except as counter and still united and dependent parts of the same process, and then only temporarily, and for the sake of allowing the utmost minuteness in investigation. Of these parts we now proceed to treat in order, but in the reverse order to that in which they are arranged in the preceding passage. For this we have no high or special reason. The sensitive state of the public mind may perhaps both demand it and justify it; if not, then have we no defense to make in its favor.

1. *To be born of the Spirit—what is it?* Few questions, we venture to say, could excite in the mind of the general reader a more lively interest than this; while by some even the asking of it will be thought to border on profanity. For, with not a few, the very mist in which the answer is concealed from the common mind is felt to be a holy thing; and all efforts to penetrate it are looked upon as impious and daring. We trust, however, we do not forfeit all claim to be considered something above the rank of the barbarian, when we express our utter lack of respect for every type and species of mysticism, saving that only which possibly may hover over a few passages of Holy Writ; and we confess to a veneration for even the shadows of the Bible. The grave nature of the question, however, involving as it does one of the conditions of entering into the kingdom, will warrant, in the judgment of the just in thought, almost any effort to understand it. We crave the pardon of the mystic doctor, but we must think the subject not half so mysterious as he has been accustomed to affirm; nay more, we think it not simply intelligible, but even plain; and that all the obscurity which lies on it is in his brain and exegesis, and not in the subject itself. To me it seems incredible that the merciful Saviour should shut, forever shut, the kingdom against the whole human race, except on certain named conditions, and at the same time so involve those conditions in darkness that they should not be intelligible to all. Let him believe it who can; I do not. We shall, consequently, cherish the faith that it is not difficult to understand what it is even to be born of the Spirit. In order to this end, the first thing necessary is to ascertain the subject in which the change denoted by the language takes place. On this point we cite the following:

"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." In this passage the term spirit occurs twice. The first occurrence, represented by the

phrase, the Spirit, is universally, so far as I know, allowed to refer to the Holy Spirit. But to what does the second refer? Not certainly to something merely spiritual, as is so often said, but to spirit — spirit in the truest and strictest sense of the word. Now clearly the reference is not to spirit universally, that is, to all spirit, but only to spirit in man, the subject of the new birth. But spirit in man can mean nothing else than the human spirit considered as a rational intelligence. To this, then, we conclude the second occurrence of the term refers. Further, that the term born, in the passage, expresses a change, of what nature or kind we say not yet, is conceded by all. This change is an effect of which the Holy Spirit is the agent. Hence, to be born, in the passage, has immediate reference to the human spirit, and denotes a change in it, of which the Holy Spirit is the agent. Accordingly we arrange the items thus: the Holy Spirit, agent; the human spirit, subject; being born, a change effected in it. Incidentally we may remark that being born is not the expression we should here have. Being begotten is better, and besides is required by the nature of the analogy used to set forth the change it denotes.

Now, that to be begotten by God and to be begotten by the Holy Spirit are two expressions denoting the same change in the same subject will not be denied. The only conceivable difference between them is this: that God is the remote author, the Holy Spirit the more immediate agent. God is father to the change, or the author of it, but effects it through the Spirit as agent.

But what more particularly does this change consist in? This question must now for a while engage our thought. The term change is a general term expressive of no particular change; yet clearly the change in question is particular and not general. We repeat, what does it consist in? The following may serve to guide us to the an-

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born [begotten] of God; and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." (1 John v., 1.)

Here, now, it is actually asserted that every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten by God; and this begetting we assume to be identical with that effected by the Spirit. From this, one of two things necessarily follows: either that being begotten by the Spirit is identical with belief, or that belief includes it. If the belief include it, then whatever effects the belief also effects the begetting; for, in that view, an angle without including sides is as inconceivable as the belief without the begetting. A distinction, therefore, between them is, if not inconceivable, at least incapable of being drawn. But if the belief and the begetting be the same, and this we hold to be the case, then to determine what the belief is, is to determine what the



begetting is. Now we shall certainly presume so far on the intelligence of the reader as to treat a definition of belief as unnecessary here. Of its existence he is conscious, and also that it is within him—a state of his mind, or an effect produced upon it. Of it this much,

But now of the immediate instrumental cause of belief or faith; for the two terms denote one and the same thing, or have one and the same sense, without so much as even the shadow of a difference between them. They are the representatives of one and the same word in the original—a word having one uniform meaning and no more; and for the necessary reason that things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another, must faith and belief be held to be one. Now that the word of God is the immediate instrumental cause of faith is dogmatically asserted in Holy Writ: *faith comes by hearing, the word of God being the thing heard*. So at least we shall be bold enough to render the passage. To the word of God, then, in this its effect, belief, must we ascribe, unless the preceding premises and inferences be false, the begetting of which the inner man is the subject. But fortunately we are not left wholly to inference here. The New Testament asserts the precise point we are in quest of. *Of his own will God begat us with the word of truth*. This is from James, and enough. It tallies, moreover, with preceding conclusions. Belief is the immediate effect of hearing the word of God; and we are-begotten with the word of truth according to James—by it according to Peter. Hence belief and begetting are the same—an effect which is a change in the inner man, and results immediately from hearing the truth. I see not how any skill or cunning of man can evade this conclusion. If it be not indisputable, then may we well question whether the Bible teaches any thing that may not be doubted.

Consequently, from all that has now been said, it appears that to be begotten by the Spirit is simply to have effected in us through the truth the belief that Jesus is the Christ. Of course it is understood that this belief is real, heart-warm, and controlling in its results. Yet we wish to add that we distrust the propriety and feel the danger of using any epithets whatever in speaking of belief. Nothing of the kind is really required. Belief itself is a clear grand reality, felt to be such in the soul; and no epithets we can use in regard to it can serve to render it either the more intelligible or the more appreciable, or prevent its being confused when handled by dishonest cunning.

As a corollary from the foregoing, it appears that, sure enough, there is nothing so very mysterious, nothing so very marvelous, in being begotten by the Spirit. At least, that it is not more so than is every thing else relating to and bound up in the operations and states of the mind. No matter what the subject under consideration may be, if it stand connected with the inner man, we have not to follow

it far in that direction before we pass the bounds of the scrutable and appreciable, and land in the regions of the speculative and the doubtful. To this dangerous limit is the subject of being begotten by the Spirit almost universally pushed among the self-styled orthodox parties of the day. They seem determined that it shall never lie on the intelligible side of the line. By their course the subject has suffered much; yet nothing like so much as have those of the human family who have come under the influence of their teaching. They have led the honest in heart, who were seeking rest for their troubled spirits, to look for secret impulses and miraculous, hidden emotions, when they should have commanded them to believe and pointed them to the means thereof. They have turned away attention from the truth, both the matter and the cause of belief, to inscrutable agencies having no existence save in their hollow theories. They have taught the sinner to await the operation of occult causes, when all he needed was to be informed in what his duty consisted. They have so bewildered the popular mind, and so crooked and entangled the path into the kingdom, that thousands do not know it when pointed out, and can not believe even the Holy Scriptures when speaking of it. Many, under the influence of their teaching, have sought the way of life, sought it with a whole earnest heart, sought it till the energies of the mind have been broken, till hope has perished within them, and then with bitter soul have turned into infidelity and there ended in ruin. While thousands of others have mistaken the mere blubberings of the flesh, or the temporary tranquillity which follows high mental excitement and great spiritual exhaustion, as proofs of a hidden irresistible work of some unknown power they call grace, ending in conversion, and so have settled down in hopeless ignorance and incurable bigotry. Such are some of the mournful results which have followed the mystification of a fine intelligible passage of God's word. The clerks among these parties, who are the genuine blind guides of Scripture, the veritable shepherds who are herding their flocks for the ditch, superciliously claim to be mysteriously called to their work; and their looks, and lives and preaching are in strange harmony with their silly pretensions. With them no passage is to be so much distrusted as the one which speaks plain common sense; none to be so much lauded as the one that lies countless leagues out in the fog. They pander to the superstitious in man; and deem his religion at no time so glorious as when it is an enigma alike to himself and to his neighbors. If all one side of his experience lies far within a world reigned over by spectres and perpetual night, and all the other is a compound of vulgar fables and dreams having a studied origin, then is it certainly from heaven; if otherwise, then is it from Beelzebub. With them true religion is the antithesis of reason and common sense; false religion their essence and offspring. And all this from the per-

version of the truth and the consequent perversion of the human intellect resulting therefrom. But we come now to consider what yet remains to be spoken of in the general conception of being born again.

2. *To be born of water—what is it?* We venture to say that next to the trouble which it has cost Pedobaptists to defend infant sprinkling, no other question suggested by the Bible has so grieved them as the one here asked. We conscientiously believe that the question and the thought which it involves are literally odious to many of them. The very mention of the subject seems to give them offense. They avoid it as if it were a vile thing to be literally detested and shunned by the lover of truth. So inveterate is the animosity of many of them toward it, that now, at this late day, we believe them wholly incapable of investigating it with even an approach to fairness. They are determined that the truth couched in it shall never have their sanction. Their opposition at times positively resembles a mania. It is not only astonishing, it is frightful. But their course only proves that when men once get their consent to abandon the truth, their whole after-life becomes unnatural and perplexed. The unjust mind is rendered eccentric even by the truth.

In what sense now shall we take the language of the question in hand? Shall we take it literally or figuratively? In the latter sense, shouts every opponent of immersion. But why in the latter sense? I am curious to know what inclines him to the latter sense, or what put the notion in his mind. A figurative sense is not intuitively clear on inspecting the language; and I am certain that no laws of exegesis or of thought can elicit it. Is it possible that this opponent has come to the passage which supplies the language with a predetermination that he *will not* see in it a literal sense, and that it shall speak figuratively? We tremble to believe that this question falls not far from the truth in the case of many. If the language is to be taken literally, no living man will deny that immersion is the thing it denotes; and if immersion is the thing it denotes, then without immersion the kingdom of heaven can never be entered; and this shuts millions out of it who now claim to be in it. Is not this the reason why the language must be compelled to speak figuratively?

But is the language figurative? Suppose we grant it; still we insist on knowing what it means. To affirm that a given sentence is figurative is not to extinguish all meaning in it; though many seem so to think. If a man affirm of a given combination of words that it is figurative—this implies that he knows what it means, and devolves on him the duty of pointing the meaning out. If he can not point it out, he subjects himself to the suspicion of having made his affirmation hastily or from unworthy motives. Figurative language has meaning no less than literal; only the figurative meaning is not so obvious as the literal. Still it no less certainly exists; and whenever

it is affirmed to exist, then must it be shown. Now of one thing I feel certain—allowing the language in question to be figurative, the opponents of immersion will never succeed in discovering its meaning. From them at least, nay, we may add from all others, is it forever hidden. Then it follows that the Saviour has closed the kingdom of heaven against the whole human race, except on certain conditions, and at the same time rendered it impossible to discover what one of these is. Such is the unnatural conclusion to which men in their mad opposition to the truth would drive us. The guidance, however, of all such we must, injustice to God and to conscience, decline.

In the passage in hand occurs one figurative word, no more. That is the word *born*. Every other word is strictly literal; and can not, without an outrage on reason and sacred criticism, be construed figuratively. To feel convinced of this, we have only to repeat the whole passage, and then count and inspect each word separately. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Here now are nineteen words. Let each of these be examined by itself. We take the word *except*, the word *a*, the word *man*, the word *be*, can any one of these be taken figuratively? It is absolutely impossible. We could not so take it if we would. We are bound down to a single alternative; we are left without choice. Next, omitting the word *born*, and we have the word *of*, the word *water*, the word *and*, the word *of*, the word *the*, the word *Spirit*, the word *he*, the words *can not*, the word *enter*, and so on to the last. On what ground, I ask, dare we construe even one of these as figurative? The reply is none. To do so is arbitrary in the extreme. It is high-handed and daring, if not reckless and criminal. No man ever yet attempted it on sound principles of criticism. To say that the word *water* is figurative is to assert what no living man can sustain. As well might we say that the word *Spirit* is figurative, or the word *enter*, or the word *kingdom*, or even the word *God*. We can not thus proceed without destroying the whole framework of thought, and rendering the word of God the most capricious and unreliable of books.

But the word *born* is unquestionably figurative. This we know; know it from the ordinary meaning of the word, and from the meaning of the other words with which it is here used, or from the nature of the case. *Men are not literally born of water*. This we know. Yet there is a conceivable and obvious sense in which the word may be used in connection with water—a sense closely analogous to its literal and current meaning. When a man is, in the inner man, begotten by the Spirit, when, in other words, he has undergone the change denoted by the language, he is dead to sin, and in a condition to be buried, or conceived in the water; *and when buried in it, he emerges from it, or rises out of it—and this is being born of it*. To the eye this is striking and intelligible; to the reason it is just and significant. No other ex-

egesis of the passage ever yet gave to a human heart even one emotion of satisfaction. This, and only this, leaves not a doubt behind. But to be buried in the water and to rise out of it *is immersion*. Such, then, we conclude, is the meaning of the expression, born of water. We shall add a few considerations in further confirmation of this, and for the present dismiss it.

1. If to be born of water is not to be immersed, then has the expression no discoverable meaning by the human mind. It is an eternal enigma. Hence, whether in the kingdom or out of the kingdom is a question never to be settled in this life. It is folly to shrink from this conclusion. No other is left us.

2. Water is never present in any ordinance of Jesus Christ except baptism. In baptism it is always present, and from it never absent. This all men admit. Now, in the expression "born of water," water is present. This is indisputable. Hence, of necessity, it is in baptism that it is present. Consequently, the expression "born of water" must refer to baptism, there being nothing else to which it can refer. This we hold to be conclusive and decisive.

3. The soundest thinkers and most candid critics admit that to be born of water is to be immersed. Further, this admission is often made by men who are practically no friends to immersion, by men who lack neither the inclination to deny it if they could, nor the ability to sustain the denial if it were tenable. If, then, any confidence is to be reposed in the best human authority, to be born of water is to be immersed.

Consequently, from all the premises now before us I conclude, and feel the conclusion to be both necessary and just, that to be begotten by the Spirit is to believe in Jesus as the Christ, and to be born of water, to be immersed. Hence the Saviour's teaching amounts to this: *except a man believe in him and be immersed, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven*. This we believe to be true in every line and feature. Now from this it follows, and let us not shrink from stating the whole truth, that no man is in the kingdom over which Jesus reigns unless he is a believer and has been immersed. The bare possibility that this conclusion may be true should wake the world from a long fatal dream; while its probable truth should make it simply frantic. Pause long, gentle reader, over these conclusions, and weigh them well before you dash them from you.

IV. —*How long will the kingdom of heaven or present kingdom continue?* On this fourth and last question we can say but little; and even of that little some is conjectural. In a sense, we are more than ready to grant, it is to stand forever; still in another sense, it is certainly to come to an end. Hereafter it is to undergo changes, at least, as we conceive, in the following respects:

1. Its subjects are to be changed. This we know. The saints,

both those that sleep and those that shall never sleep, must all be clothed in spiritual bodies, which will be incorruptible and free from all subsequent mutations and changes. Man will then be in his perfect state—perfect in mind, perfect in body. Being free from temptation, he will be free from sin; and being free from sin, he will be free from pain and grief and tears. Being perfect, his joy will stand always up at its utmost height; it will be evermore complete. Such are not the subjects of the present kingdom; such will they be when it ends. Now, as this change in the saints is to take place, according to our best conception, at the commencement of the millennium or at the first resurrection, at that time we should feel inclined, were we reasoning from a single premise, to place the end of the kingdom. But we think its end will not be then. We place it still ahead.

2. The present gospel will cease to be preached; its ordinances to be administered; the sprinkling of its glorious blood will end; its proud songs will go unchanted; its faith will vanish in knowledge; and its enrapturing hopes be merged in the full fruition of endless life. Clearly the present kingdom can not end till all these events transpire. They are bound up in it, and compose many of its most essential elements and features. Indeed it can not end, as we conceive, till the time comes when it can end in a state forever afterward fixed and permanent. Until then Christ will not have completed his work, and until this is done he will not deliver it up to his Father.

3. Christ will not fight his last battle till the close of the millennium. Until that time his great foe will not be entirely subdued. In that conflict, however, his last enemy must fall. His victory over every form and kind of opposition will then be complete. Now surely his reign will not, until then, be brought to a close.

4. Christ's reign as King is inseparably bound up with his high function as Judge of all in the last day. Before that day redemption and victory will have been completed, but not judgment. In that day only will his right to rule all be fully vindicated. Then only will the sin of disobedience to him be set before the assembled universe in its true light. Hardly, therefore, before that time, will he rest from his labor, and become himself a subject.

5. The fitting up of the new heavens and the new earth will clearly be the work of his own hands. "I go to prepare a place for you," is decisive of this. Again: not until after the new heavens and the new earth appear, is he made to say, in the vision of John: "It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." That is to say: I began the work of redemption, and here amid these splendors, changeless now forever, do I end it.

Here, therefore, we place the end of the present kingdom, the present church. Then and there will it be, in its completed state, completed in itself, completed in its subjects, completed in its accidents,

delivered up to the Father. Thenceforward it becomes the everlasting kingdom, a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. After this it stands forever without a mutation or a change. God now accepts it, and once more becomes supreme over all; time folds his wings, for his flight is ended; the last sand drops from the glass, and Christ and the redeemed bound into eternity. Lord, account us worthy, and number us in that company!

---

A MONUMENT TO WALTER SCOTT. —Of late several articles have appeared in the *A. G. Review*, touching the erection of a monument to the memory of this estimable man. We strongly wish to see this merited tribute paid to his noble heart. We have not yet met the man of earth we loved more tenderly than gentle Walter Scott. He was himself a poem, great and small, sublime and tame; but with a spirit as pure and aims as high as ever fall to the lot of men. With a mind singularly formed for large generalization, he yet combined traits strangely weak, while with an utterance rich even up to gorgeousness, he would still mingle sayings insipid as those of a housemaid. In two respects only did Walter Scott never become a common man—in profound, exhausting admiration for the Saviour, and in the love of truth. Here he will never be excelled. In thought he was strong, eccentric, and not always safe; in expression, antithetic and unnatural, but at times tender and sweet as the genius of Burns. As a preacher, he was generally to a high degree instructive and pleasing; at times positively enchanting; then again common-place as a plodding field-hand. He affected new modes of combining old truths, and new forms of speech for familiar thoughts to an extent that lent a frequent charm to oratory, which, otherwise, would have been pronounced inelegant. As a writer, we must in candor say we think Bro. Scott simply a failure. Such, at least, is the opinion we have felt compelled to form of the work which he evidently intended to be his master-piece—*The Great Demonstration*. As a book, it is too common for the learned reader, and too learned for the common reader. It clearly disappointed both its author and the brotherhood. Still the memory of Walter Scott is a cherished memory, and more than deserves the memento, which we, in common with others, ask for it. Let his monument, we would suggest, be simple, but exquisitely chaste and pure. Let it wear an expression of warmth, frailty, and innocence—in a word, seem a thing half divine, wreathed in shadows and tears. No other monument is fit to stand over the dust of Walter Scott. A costly or showy thing would ill beseem the scanty purse he bore through life, and still more ill beseem his own love of the unadorned, and true in the religion of his great Master. My voice is for the monument.

## MISSIONARY SOCIETIES AND OUR HYMN BOOK.

FOR several years past the subject of Missionary Societies has engrossed not a little attention in our ranks. It has been discussed at length, and by all who felt the inclination to speak on it. With us, therefore, it is not a subject just now for the first time submitted for consideration; neither is it one on which we can be said to lack information. It has been before us in a theoretic light; and we know something of it practically. True, our experience is neither large nor varied, yet it is not contemptible. That we have seen enough, and know enough, of these societies to warrant some conclusions on which we may rely with much confidence, I think certain. Of some of these we now propose to speak.

1. That Missionary Societies are not in themselves wrong. To my mind, I confess, this proposition seems incapable of being seriously doubted. I shall certainly not, however, deny that candid men can call it in question; only I see not on what ground they can do so. That Missionary Societies are unknown in the New Testament, and therefore unprovided for by it, is what no one acquainted with its teachings will deny. If, then, right, it is because they are so in themselves, and not because they are made so by Holy Writ. Beyond all question, they are purely optional in their origin; that is, they originate in the will of men; and we may or may not have them, just as we see fit. They can plead no authority for their existence, above the joint assent of those who create them; and this assent is as human as the fingers which write their by-laws. Still, for all this, they are not wrong; nay, though all this be true, they may be, and are, as we believe, right. Certainly they are not necessarily wrong, because originating in human will; but neither are they necessarily right. Whether right or wrong, therefore, is a question to be determined by something else besides the source in which they take their rise. The fact, however, that they originate in human will, should make us slow to create them, and cautious and delicate in their management, even up to the point of extreme timidity.

2 That they are not absolutely necessary. This proposition we think as obviously true as the preceding. If necessary at all, then are they only contingently so, and that, in our judgment, in a low degree. Comparatively or relatively they may be necessary, but absolutely they are not. That the first Christians preached the gospel with unparalleled success without the aid of Missionary Societies is indisputable. While the fact that they never formed such societies, spoke of them, or even by implication provided for them, and that, too, in a



day when the church was in its initial and formative state, must be conceded to He with tremendous force against the assumption that they are even in any sense necessary. That these societies could have been formed then as well as they can be now, no one will doubt. Moreover, if any real necessity exists for them now, that necessity existed for them then. Why, then, were they not created? Or did this necessity exist, but did the apostles not see it? This will not do. Or if it existed, and they saw it, did they still feel that it existed in so low a degree as not to justify the creation of a Missionary Society? If so, how can we justify the creation of one now? But the same necessity existed for these societies then that exists for them now; I will not say in a higher degree than now, for this can hardly be. They had the heathen then, to whom they owed it as a duty, as much as in them lay, to preach to them the gospel; we have only the heathen now. They had their countrymen and kin; we have the same. They had the gospel, for the proclamation of which they were under obligation to provide; we have no less. Yet they created no Missionary Societies; we do. There is a difference; whether against them and for us, or against us and for them, we shall not venture to decide.

Again: in the outcast of the Reformation, for which we plead, and even long afterward, our preachers certainly labored with eminent success. Indeed, in proportion to the men then in the field, our success has never exceeded, at any period in our history, the success of those days, if it has even equaled it. Yet the men of those days formed no Missionary Societies; they neither worked for them nor worked under them. This is a fact deeply significant, and to be taken largely into the account when discussing the necessity for these institutions. But if to this it be replied, that still these men could have worked, and would have worked, much more successfully with these societies than without them, we then say that this is purely conjectural, it may be true; it may be false. We shall certainly not deny it; yet we lack the evidence of its truth.

But it may be asked: Is not the church bound to cause the gospel to be preached, and can not the church more successfully cause the gospel to be preached through Missionary Societies than through any other agencies, and does not this show a necessity for them? We answer: The church is certainly bound to see that the gospel is preached, but whether it can effect this more successfully through the societies named than in other ways is precisely the question under consideration; and this question can not be taken for granted; nor can it be assumed to be true. It must be shown *a priori* to be more probably true than false, or be sustained by actual facts; otherwise, it stands as a mere assumption, and a denial is good against it. Now as to the probable view of the question, we shall dismiss this at once, as being incapable of being brought to any satisfactory conclusion;

and as to a showing by actual facts, we strongly incline to the opinion, that of all the modes in which the church can cause the truth to be proclaimed, the agency of Missionary Societies is the most unwieldy, the most dangerous, and the one which yields the smallest results for the amount of funds consumed, of any in use. But even this, were it an actual fact and not a mere opinion as here said, might not be conclusive against the use of these societies. For as to their being unwieldy, this might be waived on the score that they are not wholly so; and as to their being dangerous, this would only call for a more stringent and watchful management of them; while as to the meagre and disproportioned results to the amount expended, this might amount to nothing, since the results might be shown to be such as could be accomplished in no other way—a fact which would both justify the use of the agent employed, and the disproportioned outlay. But if the results could not be shown to be of the kind here described, and if the opinion just expressed could be backed by a strong-showing of facts—this circumstance, it can not be denied, would lie fatally against the societies. But even showing these societies to be simply necessary would fall far short of showing them to be absolutely so, and this is all the preceding proposition denies. indeed, we have never yet seen so much as a single argument, which we felt to be clear, broad, and level to the common sense of all, that went to show that these societies are necessary in any sense. The right of Christian men to have them is a right we by no means call in question; but a claim to have them based on any really necessary ground is a claim the force of which we must in candor say we have not felt. Others, however, claim to have felt differently; and it is but modest to conclude that their feelings may be as sound a test of a real necessity in the case as our own. This we shall not deny, though confiding still in our own feeling. In all matters purely discretionary, we hold that the opinion of the many, provided the many be men of large experience, sound judgments, and unmoved by wrong-directing influences, is the only true, safe, and final ground of action. Now it can not be denied that our most experienced and intelligent brethren, unactuated, too, by improper motives, have declared in favor of these societies. They must then have felt them to be necessary in some sense, or, if not necessary, at least highly proper and useful. To the benefit of all this, these societies are justly entitled when estimating the necessity for their existence. But even this does not establish the existence of a real necessity; for, in the absence of Scriptural authority, all these brethren may be wrong; only the chances that they are right may be fairly admitted to be in excess over the chances of any single individual.

3. That Missionary Societies may be rendered useful to an extent which fully warrants the use of them. This proposition is not, as some will feel, opposed to the preceding. Many things are useful,

though still not necessary. A subsoil plow is certainly useful in farming, though none will say that it is absolutely necessary; nor is it even necessary, in any sense, to a high degree of success in that department of labor. So with Missionary Societies; while we allow them to be useful, we deny them to be necessary. Now, if these positions be correct, and this we believe will be admitted, it then follows that these societies, since not necessary, but simply useful, may be dissolved whenever they cease to be useful, or at the discretion of the many. Much more, of course, should they be dissolved whenever they become injurious, or even dangerous, to an extent which excites great and serious fear. Further, since no Christian man is to be proscribed because he can not, in conscience, consent to the creation of these societies, so neither is he to be proscribed when, in his discretion, he decides that they should be dissolved. They are in no sense or view to be made a test of soundness in the faith or of fellowship. The moment they are so, in my opinion, the wrath of God settles down upon them, and upon those who so make them tests. Both in their origin and existence they are as purely optional as the tunes a church shall sing, or the kind of steps a meeting-house shall have at its door. Hence no Christian man's conscience is to be fettered by them, or his speech abridged by them; nor is he, in any sense or way, in his person, good name, or worldly effects, to be injured by them. Until they cease to be discretionary associations, and become tyrannies sporting with lawless insolence a power which is not inherent in them, they can neither speak nor act to the well-grounded wounding of the most untutored conscience in the realm of Christ. The moment they do this, that moment they deserve to be kicked and spit upon by every saint who feels that he owes allegiance only to Christ Jesus, and not to the mere creations of the human will. If it be said that they can not be so managed as not, now and then, to wound and oppress, we deny it; but add, if they must be thus managed, then should they instantly cease to exist. They are in that view entitled to neither the respect nor sympathy of any single child of God.

But to the proposition in hand, the truth of which, we must insist, rests on actual facts. That the Missionary Societies of the States of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, though confessedly still in their infancy, have done good, and good on a highly creditable scale, no benevolent man who is just in his decisions, and acquainted with the facts in the case, can deny. Perhaps the names of other State societies deserve to be mentioned here; and if so, they are omitted from want of acquaintance with their workings. Besides the societies named do not claim to have attained any thing like the highest state of efficiency they are Capable of. When they do, we shall certainly look for large and most gratifying results of their labors. Even from what is now before us, we feel at liberty to treat the proposition in

hand as true. The proof might be greatly extended, so much so as to reach the most convincing details; but the length of this piece would thereby be too much increased.

4. Missionary Societies are dangerous institutions. Not in themselves, of course, or when doing right, or acting within their own proper bounds; but dangerous because of their extreme liability to usurp power which does not belong to them, and to perform acts hurtful and oppressive to the feelings of God's children, which they can not lawfully perform. No man living can say that the danger here does not exist, or that it is imaginary. The tendency of all human institutions, especially of all moneyed and chartered institutions, is to augment continually their power, that thereby they may become the more effective in their operations. This is perfectly natural; nor can it be pronounced absolutely wrong. But just here the danger appears. Let now any one, no matter who he may be, or from what motives he may act, rise up to oppose these institutions, and not more naturally does the wild beast defend to the death her young than do they seek to maim or crush the interfering party. But their most dangerous features lie, not in their efforts to preserve themselves, but in their usurpation and use of unwarrantable power.. As a mournful and humiliating illustration of what is here said, we have only to refer to the action of our own general Missionary Society, within the two years preceding the past, in turning aside to pass resolutions expressive of the political feelings of a majority of those then present, to the pain and grief of remonstrating and dissenting brethren. In this act the feelings, not merely of young men with high blood, but of venerable men whose whole grand lives had been given to the cause of Christ, not even excepting those of the patriarchal President of the Society, were rudely disregarded and trampled upon. Boys and women there cast votes, and rushed the party papers through, while men like John Smith hung their heads in shame. For this act no justification can be pleaded. It is a stain upon the records of the Society which it will take long years to efface. How much more sublime would its action have been if, like an affectionate mother, it had thrown itself between its chafed and chafing children and said: Not a word on the angry theme; be still; ye are brethren; let there be no strife among you; work only for the cause of Christ, and the salvation of the lost; work with a whole, undivided heart. Why, oh why, brethren, did you not act thus? But if in coming time all shall go well, then will we, in the lofty and noble spirit of the Master, forgive the seventy times seven, and forget the bitter past.

Here, moreover, while speaking of the foregoing Society, we beg to call attention, in no peevish or fretful spirit, to the list of honored speakers for the time already named. Is there nothing partisan in this? Or can there be no true men among those who are unable to

pronounce in favor of the dogmatic shibboleths of the managers of said Society? Is it a *general* Missionary Society? Can *all* the children of God meet there on equal footing, or none save those who shout *Magna est Diana*? If such be its decree, it may yet live to learn that after a day of passion comes a day of sober thought, and with it a day of reckoning. Are such men as F. R. Palmer, John B. McGinn, John I. Rogers, Curtis J. Smith, Alexander Proctor, Lansford B. Wilkes, John W. McGarvey, *et al.*, to be slighted and overlooked because they can not chant the *te deum* of the wild passing hour? Surely this can never happen with a *Christian* Missionary Society. Gentle, amiable Haley, we have not forgotten thee, *nor that apology!* But in reply to this it will be said, the Society is at best but human, and, therefore, not to be judged by a perfect standard. This is just and true; and no one wishes to judge it more leniently than the pen that traces this. If, then, in time to come it *will do right*, then are we its steadfast friend; but if in time to come it *will not*, then we can not be.

Hold, cries a brother, close at hand, we have the *Quarterly* on probation. Lift your voice against the A. C. M., and we silence you, silence your paper, take from wife and little ones the bread that feeds, and consign all to disgrace. We believe that, rude stranger; and more than that we believe. Afford you the chance, and you would once more relight the fires of Smithfield about the man that dares dissent from you on the difference between *dum tweedle* and *tweedle dum*—that we believe. But by the Lord's leave we shall dare speak our honest thought in defiance of your taunt and heartless threat.

We know not that we hold any peculiar views in regard to Missionary Societies. We believe them right *per se*, and capable of accomplishing large good when managed properly. We wish we had ten where we now have one, if thus managed; unless thus managed, we trust the time is not far distant when we shall have none. We hold, then, that a Missionary Society can do absolutely nothing except engage in the spread of the gospel; that it can take no jurisdiction over any church, none over any saint; that it can pronounce no judgment in regard to doctrine, none in regard to opinion; that it is immaterial to the Society whether its members are for a monarchy or a republic; that the duty a Christian owes to the State is a point settled by Christ, and not to be settled by the Society; and that whether this duty to the State is or is not well performed is a question to be determined by the State itself as to its citizen, by the individual church itself as to its member, and in no sense by the Society. These things we hold to be true of all Missionary Societies. When they act within these limits we pray for their success; when they transcend these limits we pray that they may become desolate

as Sahara. Considering what our general Missionary Society has already done, and been the cause and the occasion of—its assumption and use of unwarrantable power; the bitter feeling it has engendered; the distrust in which it is held; the fears that are entertained in regard to its future course, and we say with real candor we believe its friendly dissolution at present would afford relief to a hundred thousand hearts in our ranks. We further believe that there is a growing feeling among us, as a people, that with our present system of State Societies the general Society is inconsistent; and that it is destined ultimately to fall into complete disuse. We confess we are not prepared to decide in favor of this feeling yet. We think the general Society may be made highly useful, and for once we are willing to afford it the fairest and fullest opportunity of proving itself worthy of the great brotherhood whom it professes to serve. But if it ever bobs again, or passes another political resolution, we hope no child of God will ever after that place one cent more in its treasury, and that it may die an instant and disgraceful death. And now for saying all this what have we to expect from the Society? Shall we be thanked for saying, as a Christian man, what we feel it to be our solemn duty to say, and what we have an indisputable right to say? Or will the friends of the Society take counsel together and say: Down with the paper, down with the man; no dog shall open his mouth against us and ours and live? We wish we were free from doubt on the question. Of Missionary Societies heretofore we have said but little, that little being for them. We speak here from a sense of duty—a high sense—and claim the right to be heard. We have been no busybody in the affairs of these institutions; especially have we placed no obstacles in their way. They have generally met far from the field of our labors, which has prevented our meeting often with them. This we regret. When we have thought them wrong we have frankly said it; when we have believed them right we have given them a quiet, hearty support. Thus we expect to act for the future.

THE HYMN BOOK. —In the March number of the *Quarterly* appeared a calm, studied article on hymns and hymn books from a brother eminent for his pertinent practical sense. This article we cordially indorsed. It frankly admitted the defects of our present Hymn Book; but at the same time vindicated its claim to the first place among Hymn Books. The characteristics of a book, such as it was thought we need, were pointed out; and the belief expressed that a *revision* of our present book is about all that the wants of the brotherhood demand. In all this we concurred. We certainly felt, however, that then was not the time to enter upon the work; and we feel that now is not the time. The present is a time of great national distress. Many of the children of God have been reduced to extreme

poverty. Their spirits are in grief and their hearts are crushed. Their old Hymn Book is doubly dear to them now. It contains the songs that fathers and brothers, now no more, have sung. The kin of these buried are not in a condition to part from the book which contains these songs. In times of deep sorrow the soul sanctions but few changes. It can not sanction this. How many a mother, amid falling tears and bursting sighs, warbles in low plaintive accents the familiar contents of this book, while she notes the leaf turned down, the pencil mark, the finger print—mementoes of pleasures forever fled. Can she feel that to be a friendly hand which coldly snatches this book from her bosom and presents in its stead a gay new thing? Perhaps she can. In times such as the present, two books above all others, like angels from the merciful Presence on high, minister comfort to the stricken spirit. These are the Bible, the old Bible, the family Bible, and the Hymn Book "my brother bought and gave me and in which his name is written." But these must not be left to us now. No; one of them, at least, must be torn from the heart that clings to it as to that cherished lock, with ill-concealed regard, it seems to me, for its feeling.

Besides, thousands of brethren are at this instant without the means to purchase the scantiest supply of the bread and the clothing needed to keep life in; and we know that in places in Missouri and elsewhere even this supply can not at all times be commanded. If never before, surely at present we have the poor with us—yea, and among us. But our present burdens are not enough; our present deprivations are not enough. To these must still be added, depriving us of our Hymn Book and compelling us to purchase another, unable though we be. The effort to do so is an insult to every fibre in the soul of the reduced and sorrowing child of God. Of course all, no matter what their lot in life may be, whether prosperous or adverse, affluent or in penury, will be expected to buy the new book. Should they fail, surely they must be written down as old fogies, as opposed to the progress which rhymsters and creed-mongers breed, and therefore as wholly unworthy of the consideration of the *elite* conservators of faith, repentance, and baptism in the present day. I would rather sing out of the old book till the last trump shall sound, than to give the pain which the proposed change will cause in some single families in our

But we are told that the Hymn Book should be the property of the brotherhood. Now, of course, it is expected that all men will infer that whatever is the property of the A. C. M. is the property of the brotherhood. But were the brotherhood asked to accept this property in this way? They were not. Were they consulted as to the curatorship to which it should be consigned? They were not. Were they requested to state what disposition should be made of the proceeds

arising from it? They were not. We admire the conceptions which some men of the present day have, of the rights of property, and especially the interest they feel to increase the property of the brotherhood; but whether they are the most likely to succeed in the way proposed or not, time and chance must determine. Now that the Hymn Book has passed into the hands of the A. C. M. we have an opinion of our own that it will be managed quite to the liking of the Society, and with but little regard to the wishes of those whose voice has been so cavalierly shunned in the transaction.

Again: Brother Campbell is now a venerable old man, with memory gone, and wholly unfit for any kind of business. From him in his declining years the right to the Hymn Book has been obtained. Could it have been obtained fifteen years ago? No more would that sagacious brain have done then what it has now done, than would it have burnt the nails from the fingers which compiled those hymns. We

age, and induces it to do what that very cunning knows it could not have effected when memory was good and judgment clear. While we are perfectly willing that the Hymn Book should become the property of the brotherhood, and that the proceeds arising from the sale thereof (none should be allowed to arise) should be devoted to the cause to which our venerable brother has given the energies of his grand life, yet will this now be done? It may be; *it may not be*. But for one, my voice is high for selling the Hymn Book at the net cost of printing, without one cent of profit. Then no body of men can be accused of enriching themselves from its yieldings; *nor can these be spent on sectional and partisan objects*. If the Hymn Book should be the property of the brotherhood, let it become so in reality; but let us not be amused with the silly tale that what is the property of the A. C. M. is the property of the brotherhood, and that it is best for us all to enrich, by large assets, if not the Society, at least its man Friday—the printer.

Further: we are for keeping the A. C. M. a completely dependent institution—as dependent for the money it uses as is the beggar for the bread he eats. We are not wholly, without proof as to what the Society is capable of when excited and thinking it has the power. Endow it, and let it become a plethoric thing, haughty and independent, and our conjecture is that it would prove, should it deem the course essential to its ends, not wholly free from prescriptive tendencies. The Saviour did not commit himself to man, because he knew what is in him; and we fear to commit the Hymn Book and an independence to the Society. But its managers will say: Are we dogs, that we should do this thing? Not at all, brethren; but in that day you will have the power.

Was the Society afraid to trust to the liberality of the brotherhood for



future supplies? If not, why did it seek to own and control the Hymn Book? Or if afraid, why so? Have the brotherhood lost confidence in the thing? By this deed it has published its own conscious dread of the future. We give it as our deliberate conviction, that, were all ranks and classes of our brethren consulted, not one individual in every hundred could be found to sanction the present disposition of the Hymn Book. The whole thing has been concocted by a few men, and rushed through in hot haste without the privity of the brethren, and without caring one pinch of snuff whether they approved it or not. This we believe to be the plain unvarnished truth. The brethren will be compelled to purchase our books, reason those who pushed the secret work through. What can they do? asked they; they must have books, and they can get them nowhere else. Be not too confident of this, proud talker. You may find more difficulty in stuffing that new book down the necks of the brethren than you dream of; and when you appeal to them for money to pay for what they never authorized you to do, you may find their purses costly to a degree which may wake you to a sense of what, with decent respect for the feelings of others, you should have sought to know before you took your high-handed step. And mark you this—*another book is not an impossibility*. We are for peace—peace in the Union, peace out of it; peace in the church, peace out of it; peace now and forever, if we can have it on right principles; but if not, then let the strife rage, and let him who forced in the issue take the consequences. We stand in soul and heart and spirit opposed to this novel and dangerous arrangement.

GRATUITOUS. —In the great State of Indiana it is estimated that we have eighty thousand *brethren* (?). In this State resides an infirm old man and faithful preacher of the gospel. For several years past this venerable brother has been, by name, paraded before the world in our prints, as a public pauper, supplicating our whole brotherhood for the pittance necessary to save him in his last days from the bitterness of hunger and nakedness. Now we have a suggestion to make to our brethren of the aforementioned fertile State; and we make it the more courageously, as we have no fear that it can cause any one among them to blush. The suggestion is this: Would it not be better for them to proceed immediately, and in a body, to garrote Bro. Longley, to avoid the disgrace of starving him to death by inches. Their time-worn servant would be at rest then. Put on a bold face, brethren, and do the deed at once. The world will only think the more of you for the dispatch. Besides, many young men will at once rush forward to take the old man's place, lured by the prospect of becoming gray in the service of Christ in the State of Indiana.

## LETTER FROM C. A. BUCKBEE.

ELD. M. E. LARD.

*My Dear Brother:* —I have just received No. 1 of Vol. II. of your *Quarterly*. Its mechanical appearance commends it to my taste. Its table of contents offers a feast to the reader, and the clear open type makes the reading a pleasurable task.

The brethren of the Reformation need just such a work as this. They have talent and piety enough to fill the pages of the *Quarterly* with good food for the mind and heart of the Christian. Let the friends help you by a large subscription list, and you will be able to do a great service to the cause of truth.

Allow me to urge that the articles be more brief. Twenty pages for one discussion is long enough. I can read as long articles as any one; but I generally lay such aside for leisure reading—the time for leisure reading seldom comes.

I have read with much interest your criticism on the Bible Union and its works, and am glad to observe that, to some extent, the revision commends itself to your critical judgment, as an improvement on the common version. The object of your article, however, being rather to examine the revision rigidly, to discover how far it fails of being perfect, necessarily presents to the reader's mind those things which remain to be done, leaving out of view the improvements already

Some of your criticisms I like. They are in harmony with my own judgment. On some other points, however, I believe, on a further examination, your views would be very much modified. My object is, not to reply to these criticisms, but to thank you for the care you have bestowed upon the work in this examination, and to assure you that all you say on the revision will receive the careful consideration of the translators. Indeed, most of your suggestions have already gone before them, and will not be dismissed without a most patient and prayerful effort to arrive at the truth.

The rules, adopted by the Bible Union, for the direction of its translators and revisers, are subjected by you to a rigid examination, and your conclusion seems to be that they could have been better, and that their construction may be prejudicial to the purpose of the Society. This is the first instance in which the excellence of the rules has been questioned. They were adopted for the purpose of securing in all respects a faithful version of the original sacred Scriptures. The Union so understands them. The officers and managers, and the translators,

so understand them. Criticism may now suggest a different wording of these rules. But of one thing you may be sure: no possible wording of the rules could bind our translators more strongly than they now feel themselves bound to give to the people the word of God faithfully translated. There never was any intention to leave a way open for error to creep into the work of our translators and revisers, through the rules of the Bible Union.

The primary revision of Matthew's gospel, and the final Committee's revision of the New Testament, so far as it was printed and before you, you assume to be from the pen of Dr. Conant. He is referred to throughout the article as the only responsible reviser. This is an entire misapprehension. In the latter work, Dr. Conant is only an associated reviser. He works with the other members of the Committee. They are mutually responsible for the whole work. Dr. Conant is the sole author of the primary work on Matthew, and he alone is responsible for that. His work on Matthew was submitted, with the works of other primary revisers, to the final Committee. This I suppose to be the real explanation of the variations in the Committee's work, from the changes recommended by Dr. Conant in his work on Matthew.

The Committee stated in the prefatory note to the first edition, that there were questions on which they had not yet had sufficient opportunity for conference and decision. These questions they will now have time to consider; and I believe the results will gratify you, and give joy to all the friends of God's pure word.

I am fully persuaded that the work undertaken by the American Bible Union will be thoroughly done. I am glad to see the friends of the Bible interested in the progress of this movement. I do not believe that this first edition from the Committee has reached the limit of their ability to render the original perfectly into our tongue. It is an honest contribution, and is in the right direction. Whatever further possible improvements can be made, will be made. The determination of every officer and manager, of every translator, and, I believe, of every member of the Bible Union, is fixed, never to rest till in our language we have a perfect version; I mean a version as perfect as men can make—a version free from any sectarian bias, pure in its style, idiomatic in expression, and faithful in all respects to the sacred originals.

It is a hopeful sign that the very first issues awaken discussion and elicit criticism. Even if the criticisms are not all favorable, it is good. It is better that we whose hearts are in the work should be the first to find how far short we have come from hitting the mark the first time, since we know that we shall work on until we work up to the perfect standard which we mean to reach. We, who are the friends of truth, have nothing to fear in carrying on the examination in the open day, before all men. There is great hope for the cause in this fact.

"IN the name," or "INTO the name" which shall it be, in a faithful version? I like *into* the name. I have used that expression for years, when immersing penitent believers. Our final Committee have this question before them. They are as anxious to be true to God and men as any persons can be. And one thing is sure: the Bible Union will have the truth on that point. We who favor *into* instead of *in* find it necessary to explain the change which we would propose, which explanation is in the line of comment. At first, few grasp the idea, precious to us. They need to be taught. I am willing to concede that my view may not be correct. It is a question for scholarship to determine. The scholars employed by the Bible Union, on a thorough examination of that much-controverted little word, may gratify my preference. They will not, however, act rashly, nor do any thing merely to gratify me. Not for all the gold in the mines of California would they act contrary to their convictions of the truth, to please any one. Nor would I have them to do so.

You ought to know that some things remain in the revision as they were in the common version, not because the Committee are satisfied with them; but because they have not yet reached expressions that fully meet their view of what the changes should be. This they have so frequently stated, that I am certain that we will be far more gratified by their work gradually perfected than we could be by immature changes that might be made, avoiding some difficulties, and yet such as would not be all we need.

It is sometimes not considered that the Committee of the Union have accomplished a work for the text itself never before done. The work in collating the manuscripts has been very great. Providence favored us with facilities for this examination never before enjoyed by any one man or set of men. It has been an immense labor. It was their first question always: What is the true original text? I feel confident that a work has been done in this direction for which scholars in all future ages will be grateful. Not a line of this work appears yet in print. It is the basis of the revision. It ought to be printed; but at present we have not the means. Eventually we hope to be able to command means sufficient to give to the world the text itself.

The work already done has consumed much time. In 1852, a Committee reported to the Union that they felt warranted in encouraging the friends to hope for the New Testament in three years. That hope was not cherished by the Board. It has taken more time, however, than the Board generally anticipated. We did hope to issue the Testament at a much earlier day. Could money have secured it, I believe that the managers themselves, besides giving their services gratuitously, as they have done, would have given freely thousands of dollars, at any time, to have had it sooner. The longing desire of the people for the New Testament has been a constant pressure on the

Board, and through the Board upon the revisers. And I am satisfied that it could not have been brought to its present condition of excellence, and printed, any sooner. The pressure, however, is now removed; and sufficient time will be given for patient review and re-examination of such questions as have been reserved for further thought; and for careful consideration of all criticisms, in order that the word of the Lord may be perfectly rendered in our language. Impartial criticism will be gratefully welcomed. It is to be hoped, however, that all criticism from our brethren will be extended in the spirit of love for truth; and that none will attribute motives to the Committee which they would not knowingly allow in themselves. Our translators, I believe, are as free from sectarian bias as men can be. We want to place before them every criticism; and those who would do good will commend themselves most to the heart and esteem of scholars by a calm, candid, and generous spirit manifested in its search for pure truth.

Immersionists have long had to breast the torrent of superficial and ungenerous criticism. But we have gained the victory, not by an overbearing dogmatic spirit, but by calm, patient, honest presentation of philological facts.

The great family of immersed believers in Christ are irrevocably committed to the work of procuring faithful translations of the Bible. The Disciples and the Baptists in this work are one people. They are one in many other things—more nearly one people than many wish to believe. They love God's pure word. They really desire an accurate version. They wish to follow fully the counsels of God. Give them the truth, the whole truth, in the translation, and I am persuaded that the intelligent piety of these powerful bodies will respond to that truth. Whatever they find in their practice and teaching condemned by the pure word of the Lord, they will cast from them. My acquaintance with some of the representative men among the Disciples has endeared them to my heart. I honor and love them. And it is my hope that at no distant day these bodies may be completely one in Christ Jesus. Their unity will contribute greatly to the union of all who love the truth. But our union must be based on the pure word of God; and I look upon the Bible Union organization as a providential agency adapted to open the way for this desirable result.

The platform of the Bible Union has commended the institution to the sympathies and support of thousands of the best men among Disciples and Baptists. Many also connected with other bodies have favored and aided it. Its founders, its officers, managers, and agents have ever refused to acknowledge it as belonging to any sect. It appeals to the friends of truth everywhere, and gladly welcomes all to its privileges and responsibilities who desire faithful translations.

The progress of the Union has not been apparently rapid; but it

has made great advances in the right direction. The nature, the extent, and difficulties of the work were not fully understood at the beginning. It was a new enterprise. Obstacles and unforeseen difficulties had to be encountered and overcome. All human enterprises have to be tried, as in a furnace. The more holy the object, the more intense the searching flame. The Bible Union has been tried. Its difficulties have been great. The nature of its work made it an arduous one. The prejudices of ignorance and the spirit of sectarianism have had to be met and subdued. Imperfection in men has not been unfelt. By the good favor of God we have endured—we have overcome—we have advanced. We have, to a marvelous degree, kept the institution free from any just suspicion of partyism. And by the same divine favor, we hope to overcome all that stands in the way of procuring for all lands the most perfect translations of the sacred Scriptures.

The brethren of the Reformation have been hearty and faithful co-laborers in the Bible Union. In the Board of Managers, the Disciples' church in New York is more largely represented than any other church in the city. Their influence is felt for good; and their counsel is always sought in all our undertakings. I am glad it is so. There is no enterprise of this age in which they can exert an influence outside their own ranks so powerful as in connection with this Bible Union work. They have, in the origin, history, and labors of the Union, a common share and blessing. They will have a mutual reward and joy in the final results.

We can not fail. That which you desire, is the desire of the Bible Union. It will be obtained. And when we come to celebrate the "Harvest Home," the voices of grateful praise will go up as one voice from the Disciples and from the Baptists of this and other lands; while, mingling with their glad praises, the voices of others in other bodies of the so-called Christian world will be heard.

And then, my brother, then there will be laid a sure foundation for the one body, the one Lord, one faith, and one immersion of the people of God. With a pure Bible in our hands, with love for that word superior to party prejudice, and in the conviction that the followers of Jesus should be one, in order to the world's conversion, we may fondly hope that the labor of these years will be followed by a pure Christianity—a united church moving triumphantly and gloriously onward in its great work, the evangelization of our world—its conquest for the Redeemer.

Fraternally yours,

C.A. BUCKBEE.

*My dear Brother Buckbee:*—I thank you sincerely for the foregoing, candid, fraternal letter; and with real pleasure lay it before my readers. I feel this to be an act of simple justice to yourself, but espe-

cially so to the Society in whose interest you speak. Coming as the letter does from a Baptist, one who has from the first been identified with the Bible Union, who knows perfectly its labors and its aims, and who has himself with heart and hope wrought in it and for it, must certainly entitle it to a most friendly reading from all. Besides the last number of the *Quarterly* bore heavily on the rules and works of the Bible Union. Of this I am not insensible; and it is but frankness to say that it was not undesigned. If, however, injustice has been done, or too great a degree of severity used, no one can be more willing than I that the readers of the *Quarterly* should know the fact. Of this, then, your letter will enable them to judge.

Of these criticisms I do not propose now to speak. They are before the public, and of them the public will form its own judgment. For this they were written. They are not both from the same hand; but both are alike indorsed. Of them I shall add only: that purer motives never move the heart than prompted them. They are not the product of passion, but the sedate convictions of those who penned them—convictions not the most hastily formed, nor resting, it may be, upon the narrowest possible view of the subjects treated of. A change in these judgments, so far as they directly respect the deliverances of the Bible Union on their merits, is something not likely, we think, soon to occur: and we must add, something we should regret to see occur. The change we wish, and for which, by your leave, we will still not unfondly hope, is a change, not in the judgments expressed, but a change in the things judged. No loftier love of truth dwells in human forms than that which induced the criticisms in question; and when the errors complained of are corrected, no broader smile will sit on any face, or deeper joy fill any heart, than that same love will cause in the complainers. Our devoutest prayer is, that our feeble hope may not be disappointed.

'The business of a critic, you can well believe, is not the most agreeable in the world. Finding fault with what others do is surely an unamiable task, and seldom requited either by thanks or gains. Yet no business is more necessary; and especially is it necessary when Christ's holy truth is the thing to be guarded thereby. We feel thankful that you have not deemed our humble contributions in this way deserving of contempt. They were made for others, and with no expectation that any eye working for the Bible Union would ever rest upon them. Otherwise, I am not ashamed to confess, a gentler tone might possibly, now and then, have breathed through some at present caustic sentence. Will you forgive us this weakness?

You tell me that the Bible Union, in time gone, has had its troubles, encountered its difficulties, and carried long and painfully its anxieties. All this we will believe on your single word. But you add: that its expectations, and those of its friends, were not realized within the

allotted time. We well know this. But tell me, noble brother, do you allot us now another time? What guarantee, then, give you us that, even within this time, the expectations you would have us cherish still, will be realized? Would you build our hopes on nothing surer than the unfulfilling past, and the vaguely promising present? If so, be not angry with us, I entreat you, should our credulity prove a little shy. We are silly children, and when you burn our fingers once, think us not odd, should we refuse to commit them to your keeping again. All you bid us hope for, we will hope for; all you bid us expect, we will expect; and more than this we will expect. We will expect the same degree and kind of disappointment in coming time that sickens us now. From this you see how thoroughly we are prepared for the most agreeable of all surprises. Will you disappoint us in this?

Our mutual friend and brother, Holman, has forwarded me the New Testament as "corrected by the final Committee." I thank him for his courtesy. Is this the work of the final Committee? It is; we are not mistaken—the print is on the title page. But is this the *final work* of the final Committee? It is not. Your letter plainly tells me so. Why, then, was it printed? Why sent forth to the world? Why was it not withheld till finished in every paragraph, sentence, word, and point? We have become accustomed to wait on the Bible Union; we could have waited on it still; our patience could, without a break, have reached through ten years more—it is of the most tenacious stuff. Again: this work, though "corrected" by the final Committee, is, after all, it seems, *not correct*. This we think more than likely. But of its incorrections—are they known, or are they unknown? If known, why does the book contain them? Why were they not removed? If unknown, do they certainly exist? And if not, how can you promise us corrections in time to come? Bear with me, generous brother, in my rudeness; but I wish you to see yourselves as others see you.

But when, we repeat, when may we expect the final work of the final Committee, in its final dress? May we expect it in five years? In ten? In twenty? Shall we never be answered? Or shall we whose heads are growing gray, who inwardly so deeply sigh for that final work—shall we in sorrow descend into the grave without ever once looking on that lovely thing we long for—the sacred New Testament accurately expressed in chaste, simple, happy English? We pause, but not to hear the reply.

Allow me to reciprocate in most cordial terms the hope you express, and as I believe from your heart, that at no distant day the Baptists and we as a people may be one. Few events of earth could so fill me with joy as this. For our present separation, in my candid opinion, no justifiable reason exists. But suffer me to add, that the question lies with the Baptists. It is they, not we, who have reared the divid-



ing wall; and they, not we, must take it down. As for ourselves, we have firmly, and I believe immovably, taken our stand, and tendered the olive branch. That tender has been coldly spurned. Here the matter rests. When the Baptists see fit to relax their unsanctioned restrictions on our intercourse, and to meet us on the pure word of God and that only, to meet us in the spirit of the great Teacher, then shall we extend to them a hand as warm and a heart as true as earth shall ever boast.

You tell me that in your Board of Managers the Disciples of New York are more largely represented than any other church in the city. I regret that you should have told me this. I doubt not you did it from a sense of justice to my brethren. But is this all that is due them? Who of all the denominations within your memory, the Baptists even not excepted, gave the Bible Union the unanimous countenance it received from the Disciples? And can you name the body that poured into your treasury its thousands with the same liberal hand which marked their conduct? Have you honored them as they deserved to be honored even on this score? I stoop to utter no complaint; but I am not above expressing in terms of proper bearing my sense of wrong. Why have we not been represented even in your "final Committee?" Do you haughtily reply: Your scholarship is insufficient. Hold! courteous stranger, hold! Long before the works of your "final Committee" have passed the ordeal of that contemptible scholarship, you may have many grave reasons to lower your tone a little. But few of my brethren have spoken as yet; infer not their non-existence. *Incognito* they may have been; still they have not lacked a whereabouts. Let me relate you a little incident for your illumination. Forgive my boldness.

Hardly four summers have gone, since an obscure village school teacher in the State of Kentucky, unknown to the world, especially to the Bible Union, undertook a translation of the New Testament. He wrought not amid the splendors of Broome Street, nor had he access to hoary libraries, opulent in ancient manuscripts and modern learning. No. He wrought in his humble, hired cot, in penury and want, unblessed by the world's *eclat*, and unsmiled upon by names of the great. Yet at this writing his work in faultless dress lies before me. And now, without expressing any opinion as to its absolute merits, I lay it on the stand of the final Committee, beside their corrected work, and proudly challenge for it a comparison with the finest thing they have done.

You add: A highly favorable opinion, but since an opinion respecting the work of a brother, therefore to be taken with much allowance. Be still. That is a tool which hath two edges. Attempt not its use on me; I will not on you.

Taunt us not too confidently with our want of scholarship till you

know us better. You might arouse men where you little dreamt to find babes sleeping. Besides, even allowing the standard of our scholarship to be low, did it never occur to you that it might be rendered highly respectable by sending some one of our brethren to Greece, and defraying his expenses out of the funds of the Union, that he might learn the modern dialect of its people, and thereby fit himself to work on your final Committee? Deem me not discourteous, indulgent sir; and feel assured of my being incapable of saying these things to hurt. They are in me; and now that I am in the mood, let me speak. When you know all, the spot in which to make your track will be clear. I can not repress in my soul the feeling that had the Union sought our scholarship as minutely as it searched for our pennies, and shown the willingness to honor Disciples which it has to exalt Baptists, we should this day have had on its final Committee one or two representing men. I candidly wish I could say these things in more gracious terms, but can not. Especially do I wish to add, that I know nothing of yourself personally, nothing of your chief men; above all, I see nothing in your amiable letter that would justify in me a single remark which could give one twitch of pain; and solemnly nothing of the sort is intended. I speak of things public, and for no end but that of justice. To which it may be rejoined, that speaking thus is indelicate; and might be construed to imply that we seek the place we have named. Not at all. We seek no place for self or any one else in our ranks, in the Bible Union. We speak from no ignoble feeling; we speak from a sense of injury done, and not from a paltry place-seeking spirit.

But you reiterate that the Disciples in the city of New York are more largely represented in your Board than any other church in it. To this we have nothing to say. But I have too much respect for your courtesy and good sense to think you expected me to infer from this that the Disciples as a body are represented in any sense in your Board. Such representation is a fact which we must decline to recognize. I doubt not the brethren from the city who sit on your Board are very estimable gentlemen. I know none of them, except possibly one, and am only by him left to feel the absence of representation to be the more real. Are we represented there by men who know and are known to our powerful body as you are pleased to style us—men who have spent their lives for it, and whose names are embalmed in its best and holiest memories? You must answer this. Suffer me to say that this plea of representation falls coldly on my ear. To some it may serve as a covering of the eyes; not to me. Of one thing I am sure: we are not represented in your Board by W. K. Pendleton, John W. McGarvey, Alexander Proctor, or plain honest Ben. Franklin. You will say: Their services could not be had. Did the Union ever try to procure their services? Not extremely, we conjecture.

By every consideration of justice and gratitude; by the ties which

spring from a great common work; by the tribute which is due the laborer; by the measure which should be meted to distinguished liberality; by the respect which belongs to the loftiest interest; by the estimate in which the prayers of a thousand hearts should be held—by all these have we, as a people, been entitled to be, at all times, as numerous represented, both in your Board and in your final Committee, as the Baptists. This we claim as a stern right; more than this, not. Bear with me, dear sir, but did it never occur to you that there is nothing which could bring the color to the cheek of refinement in proclaiming to the world that the Bible Union is a non-partisan institution, and yet in filling all its high places with Baptist men, and in doing all its important final work with Baptist fingers? Who did this? you will say. Who did this? say I. Sprinkling sects did it not; my brethren did it not; who then? Baptist men love Baptist men—is brief. But are not distinguished men in Germany engaged on the final work of the Union? Aye; and for bunkum, too—men who know less of the English language than many a kitchen maid in New York City. Will these furnish us the most elegant English version in the world? Perhaps so.

I wish it were in my power to feel that the hearts and affections of my brethren should return to the Bible Union, and to assure you that such is likely to be the case. But it is not. They are gone from you now, forever gone. Compliments and flattering epithets have no effect. We look with mournful feelings on our past folly in committing to your keeping our confidence as we did. We shall never trust you again. Henceforth we are our own Bible Union. Your works we shall curiously read; those we confide in we shall make ourselves.

Be assured we shall not without interest watch the future course of the Bible Union; but that interest is the interest of strangers now. Could we hope for your complete success in the work in which you are engaged, we should deeply delight to do so; but while you work through your present agents, we can not. That the object for which you avowedly toil may be by you most fully attained, and that you may live to see it, is as profound a wish as dwells in my heart. For this, if you will not decline the humble offering, I shall devoutly pray.

Only one point more remains on which we feel special solicitude, and on which we wish to speak with peculiar emphasis. We touch the motives of no man in, or working for, the Bible Union. We acquit you here, kind brother, of even the semblance of wrong. On this point, then, we beg you to feel most perfectly at ease. The things we complain of we are more than willing to place to the account of frail humanity, working, not in its intentional moods, but under the burden of its great unconscious infirmities. We pray you, accept this assurance as from our heart.

In conclusion, I beg to say that I am profoundly sensible of the high

bearing and fine spirit of your letter. We are unused to such things from Baptists, for which they are all the more delicious. Accept assurances of my heart-warm Christian affection and high personal regard.

Yours in the great work of Christ,

EDITOR.

BROTHER A. CHATTERTON. —Our exchanges have just borne to us the melancholy news that this sterling man now rests in peace. Personally we did not know Bro. Chatterton; by reputation we did. As a man, he has left us a name without a spot; and unless we much mistook his heart, a sounder one lies not in the soil of Iowa. We loved him with a sincere love, and mourn his loss with a bitterness hard to assuage. From his frail nature and feeble health for years past, we were not wholly surprised by the painful intelligence; yet it grieves us not the less on that account. These are not the days when, humanly speaking, we can afford to lose sound men; and unless we misread our fallen brother, such was he. The great cause we plead, peculiarly needs, in the present dark hour, the aid of the noble and the true. Men high in purpose, sound in the faith, and firm in will—these are the men to stand sentinels now. A few from whom we hoped better things are obviously letting down. Their preaching and writing are fast becoming sentimental, vague, and *boshy*. With courtly composure, they can break the loaf across the line with unwashed bodies; rejoice in the tones of a Romish organ; flaunt their creeds in our faces; and with exquisite grimace pout and leer at the mention of faith, repentance, and baptism. From these the cause we plead has all to fear, nothing to hope. Others can spout politics high as a Greenland whale throws water, strut through streets militarily, and advise major-generals how to become more cruel to confederates. Alas, how many of the latter rout disgrace our pulpits now. These can refuse to fellowship a brother from whom they dissent on the mad question of the day, yet consent to eat with a ranting Methodist with whom they agree. Still the Bible is not, as a standard, to be deemed obsolete with them! We never before felt the necessity to be so imperious as now, for men who will sturdily resist the slightest innovation in Christian practice, and sternly refuse to countenance even the semblance of departure from the faith as defined in the Bible. In sorrow of spirit we say these things. To us, many a sign of the times augurs ill. The *true*s and the *slacks* are daily standing wider apart, and the seam in the rank can hardly be pronounced any longer an invisible thing. We distinctly see where Satan is striking his blow, and how. Lord, avert that treacherous stroke!

## BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THE sensation produced by the appearance of an article in the March number of the *Quarterly*, on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, has been equaled only by that experienced by the agitation of the Communion question during the last two years. The writer of said article should be credited both for originality, boldness, and caution. He neither dogmatizes as to his views, nor falters in expressing them. He does not write as a sensationalist; but as a seeker for truth. All who have capacity enough to admit that some of our views on this subject may have been erroneous, will no doubt be benefited in reading up the discussion; those who are too weak to make such admission would do as well perhaps to spend their time some other way. The world has always had its men who, too weak to discuss fairly, have spent their little force in denouncing. This has always been the unfailing source of division among good people; for the reformer, never desiring to leave the church to which he belonged, but to reform it, has nevertheless been uniformly driven out of the church because of his newly developed truths. This was the case with Luther, Wesley, Campbell, and of all others such as these. Let us, then, never be chargeable with an imbecility that disqualifies us for a reinvestigation of any subject that fairly commands our attention.

I. —It is not my intention in the present paper to review any writer that has preceded me, though several may occasionally be referred to. I start out with the conviction that the first writer is much nearer the truth than any of his reviewers. For several years the conviction has been growing in my mind that this whole subject needed a thorough re-examination. The confusion of thought manifested in several articles recently published seems to take its rise in a certain error so well sanctified in the minds of our brotherhood for thirty or forty years, that it seems almost sacrilegious to assail it. The "rat in the tower" has for a long time saved it from attack. The error is this: *That there have never been but two instances of a baptism of the Holy Spirit recorded in the New Testament.* So firmly has this mistake been rooted in the mind, that neither writers nor speakers ever stop to prove it, but take it as granted. Hence a recent writer in the *Quarterly* speaks of "the two immersions in the Holy Spirit?" and again he speaks of the immersion of the Holy Spirit as "confined to the apostles and the house' hold of Cornelius." The same sentiment can be heard almost any Lord's day from our pulpits; and as all say that there have been but two such immersions, of course it is useless to think of a different theory in these days.

We shall now proceed to make several consecutive charges upon this venerable position, and if we fail to carry it by storm we promise to retire in good order. Be it carefully observed in the first place, that, according to the advocates of this theory, the invariable concomitant of a baptism of the Holy Spirit is the development of miraculous power either to speak with tongues, to prophesy, or to work some other miracle—that where such demonstration is absent there is no such immersion; that where it is present it is the true and unmistakable indication of the baptism. We admit there are but two instances in which it is expressly called a baptism, but deny this fact to be sufficient to prove all that is expected of it. There are but two passages in the New Testament in which baptism in water is called a burial, and what charming logic it would be to argue thence that there never were but two instances—that of the Romans and that of the Colossians—of a burial in baptism. True, some who do not like this flank movement nor the enfiling fire it commands, may defend themselves by saying the cases are very different, inasmuch as all the terms and circumstances denning baptism in water prove it to be a burial, all being equivalent expressions, whereas different terms are used to express the different operations of the Spirit. For example, one was *baptized* in the Spirit, another merely *received* the Holy Spirit, etc. But, unfortunately for this manoeuvre, the words "baptized" and "received" are used interchangeably. It will not be denied that the house of Cornelius were *baptized* in the Holy Spirit; and yet Peter says: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have *received* the Holy Spirit, as well as we?" "As well as we!" Then "we" on the day of Pentecost *"received"* the Holy Spirit just as Cornelius "received" it. They both received it, and both were baptized in it, respectively, by a single movement on the part of the Spirit. The terms describing the operations of the Spirit are not opposed to, but are in sympathy with, our views. The mere fact of its being called a baptism but twice is no proof, then, of this oft repeated and rather careless assertion.

Too much influence has been allowed to vague and unwarranted distinctions as to the meaning of the several terms descriptive of the descent of the Spirit. One finds a marked difference between receiving the Spirit, and being baptized in it; another between his "falling upon them," and being "poured out," another between his being "shed on us," and Christ's "sending the Comforter;" while others yet imagine that to have received the Spirit by the imposition of the apostles' hands must have been a different thing from receiving it without their interposition. Now the truth seems to be, that all these expressions are used interchangeably. For example, in Acts x., 44-41, we have the three expressions, "fell on them," "poured out," and "received," as unexceptionable equivalents, so used by Peter himself. Then in Acts xi.,

16, we find "baptized with the Holy Spirit" is thrown in as another expression equivalent to each of the former three; for when Peter was telling of this "falling," "pouring out," and "receiving," he says: "Then I remembered the word of the Lord, Ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Spirit." Then it follows that the Samaritans were baptized with the Spirit, for at first he had "fallen on none of them," and afterward "they *received* the Holy Spirit." Again, in Acts ii., 33, Peter says: "He hath *shed forth* this which ye now see and hear." And in Titus iii., 4, we read: "After the kindness and love of God toward man appeared, \* \* \* he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he *shed on us* abundantly." Here Paul, not speaking of the twelve, but of the "saved," adopts the high language of Peter on the day of Pentecost, showing that God sheds his Holy Spirit on others besides the "two" exclusive companies. And this comports well with the prophecy of Joel, who said: "I will pour out my Spirit upon *all* flesh," meaning doubtless all the saved. It was not confined on that day to the twelve, but was poured out on your "sons" and your "*daughters*;" on the "handmaidens," of whom a number were present on that occasion, as well as on the "servants." The hundred and twenty, including the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, were all with one accord in one place, and the cloven tongues "sat upon *each* of them." These women, like old Anna the prophetess, had spiritual gifts, for it is said: "And they shall prophesy."

If the possession of miraculous gifts is the invariable concomitant and proof of a spiritual baptism, then not only were these women baptized in the Spirit; but many others, in other places, and at other times, were similarly blessed. In Acts xix., 6, when Paul, after baptizing those twelve men in water, "laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Why was not this a baptism in the Spirit? Did not the signs accompany them? At the house of Cornelius they "spake with tongues and magnified God," and in this case they "spake with tongues and prophesied." The mere fact that in one case it was called a baptism and was not so named in the other, when in both cases the same spirit was received and the same effect followed, is rather a sorry proof of the position I oppose.

. Again: if the presence of miraculous endowments is the proof of a baptism in the Spirit, why deny that many of the church of Corinth were baptized? They "came behind in no gift." They spake with tongues, prophesied, interpreted tongues, healed the sick, and discerned the spirits. Were not these the same gifts as were communicated in the oft repeated "two cases?" But theirs was never called a baptism in the Spirit. True, neither was the baptism of the jailor ever called a burial, and yet we know it was a burial; and so we know the Corinthians were baptized in the Spirit, because they were affected just

as others were who confessedly were so baptized. Moreover, they were exhorted to "covet earnestly the best Spiritual gifts." The expression, "God hath set some in the church, apostles, prophets," etc., does not favor the notion that only two cases of Spiritual baptism ever occurred, for he "hath set them in the church—not one church, nor "two" churches, but in the church generally; for they all alike needed these "gifts to men" until they should come to the "unity of faith and of knowledge"—till the whole will of God was revealed and written out. Did not God set these gifts in the church of Philippi also? Is it satisfactory to say we have no account of it? We have no account of Philip's preaching repentance to the Samaritans, and yet we know he did preach it. We have no account of the Thessalonians receiving spiritual gifts, that is, of their being baptized in the Spirit, and yet upon the same principle we know they were so baptized, for God put these gifts "*in the church*" general.

We will now from another stand-point consider the exclusive view of this subject. In John, chapters xiv., xv., and xvi., we have the promise of the Comforter repeated five different times. I will not occupy space to quote all these passages at length, for whoever doubts or denies the following assertions is requested to read and compare them. First, then, I will affirm, what may not be denied, that *all these promises of the Comforter had direct reference to the baptism of the Holy Spirit*, which began to be realized on the day of Pentecost. After the resurrection, by applying said promises and bringing them nearer to his disciples, Jesus said (Acts i., 5): "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence;" also, "Ye shall receive the power, after the Holy Spirit is come upon you"—all of which was realized a few days after. Second, *this promise of the Comforter was made for all the children of God*. Consequently the baptism, its equivalent, is, in a sense to be defined hereafter, intended for all. Joel had spoken of this Comforter, or this baptism, long before; and had shown it to be a very general blessing whenever it should come. "Having received the promise of the Father," refers alike to Joel's prophecy, and to the promise of the Comforter. Nor was this comfort a peculiar sort of comfort for the apostles especially, for Paul generalizes it in 2 Cor. i., 4, by taking the same Greek word and applying it to the brethren generally. Hear him: "God comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God." If the comfort was the same, the Comforter promised to them is promised to all God's people.

Once more on this point. The passage in Matt. iii., 10-12, has already been noticed by the writer, who has called out this discussion. He has clearly shown that the good tree and the bad tree, as also the wheat and the chaff, represent the good and the bad people



respectively, as well as their destinies. He has also shown how strange and arbitrary it is to take out the cognate comparison from between these two, and refuse an equal scope to it—the baptism in the Spirit and in fire—the fire is for all the wicked, and the baptism in the Spirit is for—for the ever-recurring "two cases!" The legs of the lame are not equal. I wish only to reinforce what has been said, by stating a single fact. This passage is repeated four different times in the New Testament, and wherever the writer has both characters before him, he mentions both the baptism in fire and in the Spirit, and whenever none but the righteous are before the writer's mind, the latter only is named. See Matt. iii., 11; Mark i., 8; Luke iii., 16; and Acts i., 5—a pretty strong intimation that the spiritual baptism was meant for all the righteous, especially as there is not the least evidence to believe that the apostles were in the crowd, or that, if BO, they alone were addressed when John spake to them all.

If there be any force in the above reasonings and evidences, what is there so incredible in the assertion that they were "all (miraculously, say) baptized into one body." Whether every member of the church was endowed with miraculous gifts, or only a part are embraced in the text in controversy, the passage simply affirms that *that* "all" had received the spiritual baptism, for this is the subject treated of in the twelve previous verses. The apostle had just said: "To one is given, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom." This verse being transposed, and the passive voice changed to the active, and the word Spirit put in the nominative, the sense comes out the same, thus: "The Spirit gives the word of wisdom to one, the word of knowledge to another," making the Spirit the active and *immediate* agent in this work. The Spirit conferred these gifts, not through the word, nor through the apostles necessarily, but generally by falling on the recipients. Now transpose the 13th verse, and it too will read: "One Spirit baptizes us all into one body." That is, "he shall baptize you (all) in the Holy Spirit." The Spirit, as the immediate agent, did on the day of Pentecost baptize three thousand. He did baptize the household of Cornelius, also the twelve disciples at Ephesus, also the church at Corinth—and more—for God saith: "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh." Just here I ought to answer the objection that no doubt has already risen in the minds of some as to my last few sentences; that I am confounding what the Spirit does with what the Son says he will do, and what the Father is to do. I reply once for all, I have no confidence in that very discriminating analysis that chalks off the precise boundaries for each of the three divine personalities to operate in. The Father is to do this, and the Spirit that, and the Son something different from both, while each is to observe with divine punctilio the rights and jurisdiction of the other. The hand that moves this pen acts in harmony with the mind that

understands, and the moral nature that approves—a sort of Trinity—yet it would be difficult, as well as useless, to discover the frontiers of each domain, and show just where they edge up one to the other. Even so, if it is said Jesus will baptize you in the Holy Spirit, this is nothing different from the saying, that, "One Spirit baptizes us all into one body." Likewise to have Christ, on the one hand, baptize with the Spirit, and then the Spirit confer the Spiritual endowments, partakes a little too much of the division-of-labor idea, as taught in political economy. It may appear in a few more pages, not only that the one and self-same Spirit works all these things, but that he works them at a single movement, whether it is spoken of as of himself or proceeding from the Father or the Son. I am conscious that this page especially would be liable, if no further explanation should be offered, to serious objection; especially to the objection urged by Kappa in the June *Quarterly*, that this view seems to shut out water baptism from all agency in bringing us into the "one body." But if the reader will follow us through the succeeding section, this may be satisfactorily answered. The aim thus far has been simply to establish the truth, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, whatever it consisted in, was a *necessity* in *every church* for their edification, for adapting them to the work of the ministry—that there were more than two cases of such baptism—I ask the reader to grant me this as proved, or at least not to hold me responsible for having tried to prove any thing else. I will now advance to another proposition.

II. —For the sake of perspicuity we premise that all the effects of the Holy Spirit upon those who receive it may be classified as the *moral* and the *miraculous*—the moral embracing all the fruits of the Spirit, as mentioned in Gal. vi. Our proposition now submitted is: That a baptism of the Holy Spirit in the apostles' days embraced both the moral and miraculous effects. The general opinion is, that these were disconnected—that the miraculous alone was the effect of the Spiritual baptism, and that the miraculous was the higher endowment of the two. Just the reverse of this is true. The moral was the higher endowment and the most important result of the baptism. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and have not *love*, I am nothing. And though I have the *gift* of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have all (miraculous) faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not *love* (the moral) I am nothing." That is, a man may possess all the miraculous part, and be nothing without the moral part of the influences of Spiritual baptism, which are far greater. "Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works." Jesus does not deny what they affirm, but still he says "depart." But who ever possessed the moral effect of this baptism, and was rejected by the Saviour for want of the miraculous?

Now that the Corinthian church was baptized by the Holy Spirit we have before proved, and that the moral and miraculous were both included in its results is very patent in 1 Cor. xiii, 1-3, just quoted. Did not Paul desire the union of love and the miraculous powers in the same person? The whole chapter is proof of it. Moreover, he shows that love was the basis of the miraculous powers and all that gave them any value. To this it may be replied, that though the one may be the basis of the other, and though both effects should have dwelt in them, this does not prove these two effects both to proceed from one operation of the Spirit. We answer: There is but *one* operation of the Spirit spoken of—that to *receive* the Spirit, to be *baptized* in the Spirit, etc., are synonymous expressions and indicate the same act of the Spirit. If the Spirit at one time conferred Spiritual gifts, and at another time filled the heart with love, he has left no indication of it on record. The truth seems to be that when the Spirit filled their hearts with love, he also kept right on and projected his power into Spiritual gifts for temporary purposes, but always constituting the moral qualifications the base of all his operations; then recalling the miraculous energies whenever they were no longer needed, and all returning into the centre of all Spiritual energy.

But we have still more convincing evidence. Jesus said: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever." This undeniably refers to the moral effects. Comfort is the food for the soul, and there he is to abide forever—after the miracles have ceased. But now observe another allusion to the same agent: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, *shall teach* you all things." This refers to the miraculous inspiration of the apostles, for it is both to teach and bring to their remembrance. "He shall guide you into all truth." Yet all the while he is a moral Comforter. Now observe that while both these influences are promised through the Comforter, only one coming or one manner of his coming is promised for the accomplishment of these ends. The only question remaining is: Was the promise as to both these effects realized on the day of Pentecost? It was; for none will deny the miraculous gifts of that day, and none will deny the moral power, the heart force, imparted to all the disciples on that day, and yet it was all effected by the one descent, the one action, the one baptism, of the Holy Spirit. "Ye shall receive *power*, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you." What kind of power? Intellectual, moral, or miraculous? All kinds that they needed. Did Peter need love? It was granted. Did he need tongues? They were granted. Did he need moral courage? He wilted before a reproachful girl a few days before; now see him standing at full height, with hands uplifted to the multitude, begging attention to the most unwelcome

truths—with tongue unloosed and soul on fire, his whole frame is in action, preaching with the divinest moral power the name, the sacrifice, and the mercy of Jesus. Explain the secret. "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you." He was baptized in the Holy Spirit, whose presence alone in his heart is a sufficient explanation of all we see developed in the man. A number of other passages might be quoted to prove that a baptism in apostolic times embraced both the moral and miraculous influences, but these shall suffice for the present.

Now when Paul wrote to the church at Corinth, these baptisms of the Spirit were common, producing, doubtless, both the above-named results, for the miraculous had not yet been withdrawn. And without being too punctilious in observing the parts supposed to be taken by the Father, Son, and Spirit in conferring the Spirit, or without making too much out of the fact that sometimes the apostles administered the Spirit, it may be said that the Spirit is the producer or author of these effects. The Spirit undoubtedly baptized the disciples on the day of Pentecost. There was no imposition of hands, nor would it have altered the main features of the case had there been. Jesus received the promise of the Father, and sent the Comforter, who, when come, is to do the work. Now, will it be denied that the apostles were baptized directly by the "One Spirit I" Were not the whole hundred and twenty baptized by the "One Spirit?" Was not the same blessing promised to the three thousand? "Ye shall *receive* the gift of the Holy Spirit." What was true of these disciples was true of the other churches in apostolic times, as shown

Let us then come to 1 Cor. xii., 13: "We are all baptized in one Spirit." That is, they had all received the Holy Spirit, and were the subjects both of its moral and miraculous effects—they had been baptized by one Spirit, or it was the one Spirit that baptized them all. Without pretending to say that we in modern times are baptized by the Spirit, as they were, is it not true that *they* were all so immersed in one Spirit? Paul spoke of it as a fact then common to all, including himself with them. I have not yet said that any one in modern times is or can be baptized with the Spirit. I simply ask the reader's consent to what I have tried to prove. 1. That baptism of the Spirit was a general thing among the ancient churches; and, 2. That it embraced both the moral and miraculous. And supposing the reader to agree with me in those two propositions, we are prepared to make another advance, and come to the very heart of the difficulty.

III. —The vital question that comes to the quick is now briefly to be discussed. We might all agree that baptisms of the Spirit were general in the primitive churches, and that such baptisms embraced both moral and miraculous influences, and then the important ques-

tion would arise: *Is that reception of the Spirit which, since the days of miracles, is attended only with the moral influences, to be called a baptism of the Spirit?* The first writer in the *Quarterly* on this subject suggests that the whole 60ul of every Christian is immersed in the Holy Spirit, and hence that we are now-a-days baptized in the Spirit. If this be true, then a baptism of the Spirit does not include every thing we have been taught to believe it embraced—does not necessarily include the miraculous developments. If the phrase is susceptible of this definition, no one need be alarmed at his position, for he is only giving a different name to the thing we have always recognized as existing. We having been accustomed to style it a *reception* of the Holy Spirit, while said writer affirms the same thing to be worthy of the name of a baptism of the Spirit; and if so, then 1 Cor. xii., 13, is still applicable to us, and the passage is explained, for the souls of all Christians are baptized in the same Spirit, receiving the moral, but not the miraculous, effects thereof.

To give direction to our thoughts on this point, it may be observed that the apostles and the Saviour all considered the moral as of more consequence in determining Christian character than the miraculous, inasmuch as the latter might be fully possessed and still the subject might be but "sounding brass." "Covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way." This more excellent way, better than the highest miraculous gifts, is love. Judas and others like him might "cast out devils, and do many wonderful works," and still be found wanting. As gold is more precious than earth, so is love than mere intellectual or physical power. Now it is fair to conclude that the greater would be more worthy the name of a baptism than the less. If the miraculous has always been thought worthy the name of a baptism, even by those who did not recognize the union of the moral with it, why should not the moral, now proved to be the greater of the two, be considered a baptism?

It would be both a legitimate and a direct mode of argumentation to inquire whether the word *baptism* was ever applied to the soul under circumstances that fairly excluded all idea of miraculous gifts. If so, it would do much toward bringing down our exaggerated notions of the importance of the mere miraculous machinery that never had but a temporary existence, and in raising our conceptions of that which "never faileth." The reader's special attention, then, is called to two instances of this kind:

*First*, Jesus said to the two sons of Zebedee: "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" The common consent of Bible students, preachers, and commentators makes this refer to the overwhelming sorrows of his heart. His soul at one time became "exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." This was the "baptism that he was to be baptized with." It was a baptism of *soul*.

Why, then, could there not be a baptism of the soul with love, joy, and gladness? There are no more psychological difficulties in the way of the one than of the other.

*Second*, Jesus said again: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The ellipsis filled up would make it: "Born of water and born of the Spirit." Now we all say that to be born of water means to be baptized in water. Then what does to be born of the Spirit mean? To be baptized in the Spirit? Why not? If not, what does it mean? If the word *born* means baptized in one case it does in the other. The only way to escape from the dilemma is to deny that "born" means baptized, and this would pay too high a price for all we would gain. Is it true, then, that unless we are baptized in the Spirit as well as in water we can not enter into the kingdom of God? In other words, have we not always missed the proper name of this ordinary heart-felt influence, and called it something different from what the Bible does? So it seems to me now. I will not settle it hastily. The thought, in an undefined form, has been loitering in my mind for several years. Still it is no pet with me. If any good thinker, able to write dispassionately, seeking to create no panic, will do us all the favor to show where my mistake is, I still promise to "retire" in good

It has been thought that the proposed construction of 1 Cor. xii., 13, would interfere with our already established views of the design of water baptism—that if we are baptized "in the Spirit into one body," the church, or Christ, then water baptism does not introduce us into the church. This difficulty will be very easily managed; for the writer making this point does not believe that water baptism alone brings us into the church, but that there must be the preparation of the heart also. In other words, it will be admitted that we are brought into the church by being born both of water and the Spirit; that is, by being baptized in water, and by being baptized in the Spirit. In the passage referred to, the apostle had occasion to refer to but one of these baptisms without the least fear that this would exclude the other. We are saved by faith, but this saying does not exclude obedience, merely because obedience is not mentioned. We are baptized in water into Christ, and we "are baptized in Spirit into one body," both true, without the least collision.

Or even if there be no baptism of the Spirit in modern times, there was in Paul's time, and that baptism embraced the moral influence upon the heart, and also the miraculous, so that when the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized in water, they were then baptized with the Holy Spirit. They were born of water and of the Spirit, with miraculous gifts besides. This view relieves the verse of any obscurity, whether the moral effects constitute the baptism or not.

I shall now close. These thoughts are submitted to the pure hearts and strong minds of a noble brotherhood. No mere blusterer can do any thing with a subject like this. I have not descended into verbal criticism, because I thought the subject needed analyzing in another direction. We should all humbly acknowledge our liability to error, and seek our Father's smiles upon our efforts to understand his word, which is able to guide us into all the truth. CLEMENT.

---

MILITARY TERMS AND PHRASES.—Of the matter of the foregoing article we shall not here speak, except to say that it is certainly bold, transparent, and in places extreme and untrue. In thought, its author is strong, clear, and self-relying; in spirit and manner, candid and courteous. As a contributor he is highly esteemed. But we would most kindly suggest to Clement that he might now and then, at least, content himself with simply landing his boat. There is no necessity of running it at all times clear out on dry land, and even up on the top of the beetling cliff. Writing constantly on extreme questions and taking extreme positions is a good way to procure the title of extremist, and to prejudice one's prospects for future good. We should regret the happening of any thing of the kind in his case. Will he bear with the present suggestion?

But of one thing we wish to express our decided disapprobation, and this not merely for the sake of one, but for the sake of all whom it may concern. We do enter our firm but gentle protest against interlarding articles on religious subjects with terms and phrases borrowed from the horrid war now raging. For this there is no necessity. We got along well without these terms before the war began; can we not do so still? Have the world of peace and love, the sphere of the arts and sciences, and the hallowed home circle, all at once become so poor that Mars must be petitioned to supply us with language in which to speak of the things of the Spirit? These terms can wake no pleasing sensations in any Christian heart. Neither about them, nor in them, does there linger a solitary memory that could ever make me wish to see one of them in print again. They are bound up with scenes of shocking inhumanity, injustice, and sin; and we say, let no Christian man stain his paper by their use, or his soul with their contents. Of course we claim the right to prescribe to no brother the style in which he shall clothe his thoughts; but when, through mere inadvertence, a faulty style has been assumed, we feel that we transcend no fraternal bounds when we call attention to the fact, and point out a more excellent way. With some of these terms a few even of our preachers are so fascinated that they can not refrain from their use in the pulpit. To all, in affection we say, take these things hence.

## JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE WORD BAPTISM.

How did John probably acquire the meaning of the word baptism? This question is both curious and interesting. Certainly it was not born in him; and it is not an intuition. Neither is it probable that he acquired it by revelation. Indeed, it is not the business of revelation to define terms, but to use them in a sense at the time well known. Hence from this source he could hardly have acquired it. Must we, then, assume that at the time when God sent him to baptize, the term was in current use with a received and settled meaning? This assumption would seem the most natural and just, and as being the first which occurs to the mind is, perhaps, the one most essential to the solution of the question. Before his day, however, the term could hardly have been current in the sense in which he used it. As confined exclusively to human beings, and denoting an act connected only with water, in other words, as denoting an ordinance, we may feel perfectly sure it was not in use. True, we hear frequent mention made of what is termed proselyte baptism among the Jews; but we have always looked upon this as a figment having in fact or veritable history no foundation whatever. We shall consequently treat it as a myth here. But without going at length into the question, which is wholly immaterial to the object we have in view, whether the word was current at the time to which we are alluding, with a meaning familiar and well understood, let us assume as a hypothesis that it was not. Let us, in other words, assume that John first brought the word into current use as the name of a rite, and fixed its meaning. How may we conclude he effected this? Let us suppose that when God said to him: Go, baptize all penitent Jews for remission of sins, and thereby prepare them to receive the Saviour, that then for the first time in life the word became with him one of serious importance. How could he proceed to ascertain its precise meaning? He would naturally first inquire to what language the word belongs. At once, of course, he would be told the Greek. This question being settled, he would next wish to know in what books the word occurs; especially would he wish to know whether it occurred in the Bible, the book of all others most familiar to him; and if so, in what sense. On this point, if in doubt at all, he could not long remain so. He would at once find it in the Septuagint, as the book is called, of which it is necessary I should here briefly speak.

It is a conceded fact that the Hebrew Bible was translated into the Greek language about three hundred years before Christ. This translation is called the Septuagint—a Latin word signifying seventy,



because, as tradition has it, the translation was made by seventy learned men. It was not made by inspired men; but is in the main faithful to the Hebrew. It is thought to be the first version of the Old Testament ever made; and is certainly the form in which this book was generally circulated among the Jews speaking the Greek language in the time of the Saviour. The estimate in which it was held by the authors of the New Testament is shown by this, that they make many quotations from it in its own identical words. This, though not proof that it was regarded by them as in all respects correct, still entitles it to a high degree of confidence. In this translation occur the two words *bapto* and *baptizo*—the latter being derived from the former, and having, as to the act which they denote, one and the same meaning exactly. But the important question is: *How came they to appear in the translation?* That they are in it is indisputable; but why in it? Is there no accounting for the fact, in other words, no solution of the question? There is.

That the Septuagint version was made either by Hebrews who understood the Greek language, or by Greeks who understood the Hebrew language, we may feel sure. The former we think the more likely hypothesis. If by Hebrews, then by men who knew the exact meaning of each word in their own language, and hence how to represent it in Greek. But if by Greeks, then by men who understood perfectly their own language, and hence the term which would most correctly translate any given Hebrew word. How, now, came these men, whether Greeks or Hebrews, to use the words *bapto* and *baptizo*? Certainly they used them, if synonymous, and this we are here taking for granted, to represent some Hebrew word which required their use, some word which they exactly translated. This word we know to be *taval*—pronounced as if it spelt *tawval*.

The word *taval* means in Hebrew *to dip, to immerse*—nothing else. This is its meaning, and this *its only meaning*. Other unauthorized meanings may be assigned it, as to stain, to dye; but these are incorrect. Such words denote the effect of the dipping, not the act itself; and it is *the act itself*, and never its effects, that *taval* expresses. Indeed, the words stain and dye, about which so much has been said in the controversy on baptism, never express directly and specifically the act of the person, but always the result of it, and the act of the coloring fluid. A person strictly speaking can neither stain nor dye. This the coloring fluid alone can do. The person applies the fluid, nothing more. To make all this clear, and it is most important that it be made clear, suppose I say to a person: Stain or dye my pen with ink. What in this case can the person do? He can only dip the pen in the ink or put the ink on the pen. But neither of these acts effects the staining. The act merely brings the pen and ink together; the staining follows. Now *taval* never expresses this result.

It expresses strictly the act of dipping, from which results the staining. Had this distinction been perceived and kept in mind, it would have saved some men a world of trouble in their efforts to get rid of the true import of baptism. Take for example the sentence: the man baptized his beard. Now, says the Pedobaptist, here the word baptize clearly means to stain, and not to dip; hence dipping can not be its only signification. Not at all. The explanation is most obvious: the man simply dipped his beard in the coloring fluid; the staining followed. Nothing can be more simple than this.

*Taval* occurs in the Hebrew Bible fifteen times. In thirteen of these it is represented in the Septuagint by *bapto*, in one by *baptizo*, and in the other by *moluno*, which means to stain. This, as a fact in philology, and as tending to settle the meaning of the word baptism, is most significant, if not decisive. We have the Septuagint in existence to this day; it was made about three hundred years before Christ; was current in his time, and is frequently cited in the New Testament; contributed largely to shape both the thoughts and the speech of its authors, especially to fix the sense in which they would use many terms. In this book occur the words *bapto* and *baptizo* fourteen times.

We have the Hebrew Bible in existence at this time; in it occurs the word *taval* fifteen times, and this word means only to dip, to immerse, and never any thing else. Now, in fourteen instances in the Septuagint this same word is represented either by *bapto* or *baptizo*; and indisputably should have been in the other. What, then, according to the authors of the Septuagint must the words *bapto* and *baptizo* mean? But one answer to this question can be given—they mean immerse, and that only. This single circumstance we regard as worth more than half the criticisms on *baptizo* we have ever seen. Indeed, as a fact, we regard it as conclusive.

But we have another method in which to ascertain the meaning of these words; and which will, at the same time, serve to strengthen the conclusion just reached. This method is to examine the individual instances in which the terms occur. The very connection in which a word is sometimes found determines above doubt its meaning; or the fact it is used to describe may be such as to enable the mind to see the act or thing it is intended to denote. With the common people, who are unskilled in questions of verbal criticism, this method is, of all others, perhaps the most satisfactory. They with little confidence deduce the meaning of words from dictionaries and authors, who, whether ancient or modern, may after all not be completely trustworthy. But when they see the meaning of a word in a fact as in a mirror; when, in other words, they are made to feel it rising out of the very act it is used to express, they accept it and hold it as unalterably fixed. We shall now proceed to use this method, and shall arrange in numerical order the facts to be examined.

1. "And Boaz said to Ruth, At meal-time come thou hither, and eat of the bread, and *dip* thy morsel in the vinegar." (Ruth ii., 14.)

Let us now closely inspect this record. A woman sits before us, between her fingers is a morsel of bread, and beside her a cruse of vinegar. We see her *dip* this morsel in the vinegar. Can even the most perverted be blind here? The mind actually seems to see the thing done. The whole scene is so vividly brought before us in imagination that the act is perceived as if by intuition; the transaction is in each part so minutely reproduced to the mind that the bread is seen to enter the vinegar. We can no more doubt what the act is than we can doubt the existence of the woman, the cruse, or the vinegar. Now this act is expressed in Hebrew by *taval*, in Greek by *bapto*, in English by *dip*. We have not three different acts expressed by three different words; but three different words used to express the same act. Their meaning is one. Though different sounds in different languages their sense is the same. Consequently *bapto* and *dip* denote the same act, or have the same meaning. But *bapto* and *baptizo* in sense are one; hence *baptizo* and *dip* must in sense be one. But since *dip* and *immerse* express the same act, it thence follows that *baptizo* and *immerse* express the same act. Therefore baptism is immersion. This conclusion is unanswerable, so far as any conclusion can be so held which rests on a single fact.

2. "And it came to pass when the people removed from their tents, to pass over the Jordan, and the priests bearing the ark of the covenant before the people; and as they that bare the ark were come to the Jordan, and *the feet* of the priests that bare the ark were *dipped* in the brim of the water, that the waters which came down from above," etc. (Josh, iii., 14, 15.)

Take now in your mental eye a priest going down to the banks of the Jordan. He walks forward till his *feet* are *dipped* in the brim of the water. Can you fail to see this? Can even sin itself so blind you as to prevent it? The priest is not dipped; the ark is not dipped. His feet are not sprinkled; neither is the water poured on them. *His feet are dipped in the water.* No word but *dip*, or one having precisely the same meaning, can express the act here done. This act is denoted, in Hebrew by *taval*, in Greek by *bapto*, in English by *dip*. Now from *bapto* comes *baptizo*, and from this baptism. What, then, must baptism mean? *Taval* means to dip, to immerse, and is translated by *bapto*; from *bapto* comes *baptizo*, and from this baptism—hence baptism must mean to dip, to immerse. Is not this enough? Is it not final?

3. "And all they of the land came to a wood, and there was honey upon the ground. And when the people were come into the wood, behold, the honey dropped; but no man put his hand to his mouth, for the people feared the oath. But Jonathan heard not when his

father charged the people with an oath; wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and *dipped* it in a honeycomb, and put his hand to his mouth." (1 Sam. xiv., 25-21.)

Here again we have one of those remarkable narratives which bring the object we are in quest of, like a picture, before the mind. The point or end of a rod is *dipped* in honeycomb, and the honey borne to the mouth. Not the rod was dipped, but its point; the point was not thrust, nor wet, nor moistened, nor sprinkled, nor bedewed, but *dipped*. No word but dip can express the act. Such instances of word-painting transport the mind into the very presence of the act performed; and we are affected as if actually seeing it, and not as if merely reading of it. Now this act is not complex; but one, simple, indivisible. It is not a concatenation or series; but a unit, a single thing, an act. As to what it was, or how performed, we can not doubt if we would. We feel hardly a degree removed from the certainty which personal presence and observation impart. Now, as in the preceding instances, so here, this act is expressed, in Hebrew by *taval*, in Greek by *bapto*, in English by *dip*. So far, consequently, 'it appears that they all have one and the same meaning, which is the act dip or immerse. Hence, since *bapto*, *baptizo*, and baptism mean the same thing, it follows that baptism means to dip or immerse. If facts, the import of which no degree or kind of ingenuity is able to pervert or misconstrue, can settle the meaning of a word, then may we hold that the meaning of baptism is settled. And this is a mode of effecting this result, which comes as near rising above or being independent of lexical authority as any mode can be said to be. Indeed, it is next to actual observation itself, that is, to seeing those who know the meaning of a word exhibit the thing it denotes or perform the act it expresses.

4. "And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water: as for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall *dip* them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water." (Lev. xiv., 5, 6.)

This passage is most exultantly cited by Pedobaptists to show that *bapto* can not always mean to immerse. Here, say they, was an earthen vessel held over running water; and while in this position, a little bird was killed, and its blood allowed to fall into the vessel. Now, they add, it was impossible to immerse in this small quantity of blood, which at most could not have exceeded two or three spoonfuls, the living bird, the cedar wood, the scarlet, and the hyssop. Let me assure Pedobaptists that the difficulty exists only in their own heads; and that it has no other origin than in their own misconception of facts. The truth is, the earthen vessel was not held over the running water at all, but the running water was taken and put in

the vessel. The water is called running, not because it was running at the time when the bird was killed over it, but because it was taken from a running stream. It was to be running, not stagnant water. This water was first taken and put into the vessel; then in the vessel over this water the bird was killed, its blood falling into the water. After this the living bird, the cedar wood, the scarlet, and the hyssop, were dipped in the blood thus mingled with the water. Obviously no difficulty exists here. The bird and other things were literally dipped or immersed in the blood in the water. There is neither difficulty in the fact nor difficulty in the passage which records the fact. Indeed, the very reason why the blood and the water were mingled together in the same vessel was, that there might be enough of the fluid to enable the priest to dip the objects specified—a singular proof that *bapto* never signifies to sprinkle, and that sprinkling can never complement its meaning. If sprinkling would have answered, the blood of the bird alone, without any water, was quite sufficient; but dipping was the act prescribed, hence the addition of the water.

Now the mind pictures to itself nothing more vividly than it does a priest standing beside that earthen vessel filled with water, with blood in it, dipping in it, first, a little bird, then some cedar wood, a bunch of hyssop, and piece of scarlet. The whole transaction comes before us like a scene of the present moment. We fancy we see the stain on the bird, and the other things looking so wet. No word but *dip* can express the act; and no act but this completes the view. This act is expressed, in Hebrew by *taval*, in Greek by *bapto*, in English by *dip*. But *bapto* and baptism denote the same act; hence baptism means to dip, to immerse.

But perhaps it may be said that these are instances of the use of *bapto* only, and not of *baptizo*. I grant the fact, but deny that it in the least affects the issue in hand. For as yet the attempt, I believe, has not been successfully made to show that *bapto* and *baptizo* differ as to the act they express. But I shall now subjoin an instance of the use of *baptizo*.

5. "And Elisha sent a messenger to him (Naaman the leper) saying, Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean. \* \* \* Then went he down and *dipped* himself seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like to the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." (2 Kings v., 10-14.)

The injunction of the prophet is: "Go and wash in the Jordan seven times." The Greek is *louo*, the meaning of which, or its Hebrew equivalent, Naaman understood perfectly; for such precepts are never conveyed in uncertain language. Accordingly, he went to the Jordan—did not have a little of its water fetched for the sake of *con-*

venience—and *dipped* himself seven times; a striking proof that *louo*, when used of the entire person, was understood at that time to mean dip or immerse. Here a little digression. Elisha told Naaman to go and *wash*; Naaman went and *dipped*. Ananias told Saul to arise and *wash*—the same word; what did Saul go and do? Will some Pedo-baptist answer? But Naaman *dipped* himself seven times in the Jordan. The word in Hebrew is *taval*, in Greek *baptizo*, in English *dip*, all employed to express one and the same act, and are hence identical in sense. Here now we find *baptizo* and *taval* to agree; elsewhere we have found *bapto* and *taval* to agree; hence *bapto* and *baptism* agree. But *taval* means to dip; consequently baptism means to dip, and this in water is *immersion*. Since the Saviour's time, when has such a case been made out in favor of sprinkling or pouring? It seems half cruel to ask the question, yet we do not mean to be cruel by it.

But let the object we have here in view be steadily kept in mind. We are not attempting to ascertain what the rite called baptism is, but specifically what *the act* is which the term denotes. Nor whether the subject of this act is uniformly the same; for we find that it is not. On the contrary, we find that the thing dipped may be a bit of bread, a foot, the end of a rod, a bird, or a human body. Hence the conception of specific and uniform subject is not in the word baptism. It does not express *what* is dipped, but simply the act. Nor yet whether the term includes some particular element in which the dipping takes place. On the contrary, we find on rather a larger induction of cases than is here indicated, that the subject dipped may be dipped in oil, in blood, in water, in honey, or in water and blood combined, as the case may require. Hence the term contains not the notion of some particular element. What it means, in and of itself, is *action*, nothing else. Of course, every act of dipping, implies an element and thing dipped; but what these are must be learned from other terms, and not from the word dip. The function of this word is exclusive and simple.

6. But it is now time to speak of the exceptional case, which will be found in the following passage: "And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and dipped the coat in the blood." (Gen. xxxvii., 31.)

Here, in Hebrew the word is *taval*, in Greek *moluno*, in English *dip*. How then shall we account for the presence of *moluno* in the Septuagint? Uniformity in usage required *bapto*, and not *moluno*; yet we have the latter term, and not the former. Clearly *moluno* is a commentary on the fact, and not a translation of *taval*. *Taval* means to dip; hence the coat was dipped in the blood; but the blood *stained* the coat, and this is the fact which *moluno* expresses. Hence *moluno* is employed to express, not the act denoted by *taval*, but a fact resulting

from it, and is consequently a commentary, and not a translation. This is so clear that enlargement on it is not necessary.

With these instances we shall close our citations of illustrative and verifying facts. They might be so extended as to include every instance of the use of the word *taval*, but we think without any very beneficial results. The surface covered by our argument would thereby be somewhat extended, with no real accession to its conclusiveness. From the facts and circumstances now before us, John could learn the import of baptism without so much as one vestige of doubt being left in his mind. Of this we venture to say the reader feels a conscious assurance in his own soul. We hold it to be next thing to impossible to make out the meaning of an ancient word more certainly than the meaning of baptism is here made out. Indeed, if with facts like these before us its import is still uncertain, then I should boldly question whether the word certain is predicable of any ancient fact or truth conveyed in human speech. In that case it seems to me that we are compelled to regard many features in our religion as painfully uncertain and unsatisfactory. But we hold the meaning of the word to be settled; settled with just as much precision as is the meaning of the words walk and eat, or any other term in domestic, habitual, and constant use. And no honest and competent man ever yet gave the subject a proper investigation and came to any other conclusion.

Let us now suppose John to have arrived at the conclusion that the word baptize means to dip or immerse and nothing else. His duty would at once become clear to his mind. As his commission related exclusively to the Jews, he would immediately prepare to immerse such as were in the necessary mental or spiritual state to receive it. He would accordingly repair to places of much or sufficient water. Now it will hardly be denied that baptism is the only word in John's commission having any connection with water. Not that water is inherent in its meaning, for it is not; it is only associated with it, but in the ordinance permanently. This, then, is the term which required his presence beside bodies of water. But what feature in the meaning of the term required this? Certainly not the circumstance that the term permits a discretionary use of water; for any use of water does not require him who uses it to resort to bodies thereof. To reason it seems intuitively clear that, be the import of baptism what it may, it yet is something requiring, when water is the element used, and persons the subjects of the act, both depth and volume in the element. Yet neither of these circumstances is necessary, if the water to be used may be applied in small quantities as in sprinkling. In the water, then, baptism demands both depth and volume, and in him who uses it immediate presence. These are surely significant facts; but we proceed.

In the history of John's baptism, we have three very important terms, all having much the same signification; namely, the water, the river, the Jordan. To these his baptism stood closely and peculiarly related. He baptized *in* the water, *in* the river, *in* the Jordan. He did not baptize the river, nor *with* it, nor *by* it; but *in* it. He did not baptize with water from the river, but in the water of the river. We have, 1. John the baptizer. 2. The act baptizing. 3. The people the subjects. 4. The particle *in* expressing the relation of the act to the water, and showing where it took place. 5. The river or water. Each one of these items is indisputable and indispensable. Now let us allow as a hypothesis that baptism means to immerse, or sprinkle, or pour. Some one of these it must mean, and more than one it can not mean. Which one, then, serves best to account for all the facts and items of John's baptism, and to fulfill all its conditions? We can not sprinkle the river, we can not pour the river. This is absolutely impossible, and hence excluded. We can sprinkle in a river, and pour in a river; but then we *can not sprinkle and pour men in a river*. Neither, therefore, is this view possible, and hence it must be rejected. We are consequently left to the single act immerse as the only act which can account for all the facts of John's baptism, and fulfill all its conditions. We can immerse in a river, and immerse men in one; here the water has both depth and volume or necessary capacity; in order to immerse in a river, we must go to it as did John, in order to be immersed in it, the people must come to it as did they in the days of John. No act but immersion requires this; no act but immersion will serve to account for it.

Take, now, all the foregoing facts and circumstances fully into account; weigh them as they deserve to be weighed, and we have, it seems to me, the meaning of the word baptism made out to a degree of certainty which borders on the absolute. We have a word in the Hebrew Bible of the most precise and definite meaning, which is to immerse. This word is rendered into Greek by *bapto* as its exact equivalent; and *bapto* and baptism mean the same thing. Facts, the import of which can not be misconceived, fully confirm that both *taval* and *bapto* do mean to dip. John's commission contained the word baptism. This word led him to streams and large bodies of water. Here he baptized the people *in* the water. This baptism must have consisted in immersion, as no other word contains a meaning consistent with all the facts in the case. *I hence conclude that baptism is immersion and nothing else.* In any other view the subject labors under insuperable difficulties. We, then, have facts for which we can never account on any rational and satisfactory principles. We have constructions of language unnatural, strained, and without authority. We have conclusions to which the human soul in its honest moods can never assent. We hence feel constrained to reject every hypothesis but immersion.



Before concluding this piece I have one case which I wish to submit to the opponents of immersion. It will afford them a little sport for their ingenuity, and prove a fine test of their skill in translating. It is contained in the following language: "There went out to him (John) all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem! and were all baptized of him *in* the river of Jordan." It is here said they were all baptized *en* (*in*) the river. Now I request the opponent of immersion to translate the particle *en*. That it is translatable he will not deny. Let him then translate it. This done, let him substitute his translation for the particle, and read the passage. But he will never translate by any word except *in*. I boldly tell him he can not do it. And if he must translate by *in*, then no word but immerse or an equivalent word can follow. This unalterably determines the meaning of the word baptism. On this single fact we would not fear to rest the whole of the present controversy. We regard it as final.

A RULE or EDITORIAL COURTESY. —That the conduct of editors in their intercourse one with another should be marked by the highest urbanity and gentlemanly bearing, none will question. From the cold world for whose good they toil have they enough to bear. At least, then, let them not be subjected to inconvenience from each other. They are a noble fraternity, and can afford both grace and style in their interchanges. We respectfully, then, submit the following: When an article appears in one paper, it is perfectly legitimate for the editor of a different paper to review it in his own pages. This is his appropriate channel of thought, and all he says he is expected to say in this way. But it is not right for an editor to allow *correspondents* the use of his pages to reply to matter which originally appeared in a different paper. The paper in which an article first appears is the paper in which all *correspondents* should be required to reply to it. From this rule the *Quarterly*, at least, will not swerve, and it will take no notice of any article that may appear in any paper in violation of it. Last year we had ground to complain that this rule was not acted upon by all our exchanges. We hope to have none during the present. When a paper has a far wider circulation than ours, it is not just to allow it to bear burlesques, perversions, and unkind personalities from correspondents, anonymous and others, over the land to our hurt. Intentionally this has not been permitted; unintentionally it has; and we claim that we are entitled to exemption from it in time to come. When the piece of a vain scribbler is unfit to appear in the *Quarterly*, any other paper, it seems to me, lowers itself, by giving it currency.

## H. T. ANDERSON'S TRANSLATION.

THIS work, so long looked for, has at last been received. We perhaps have reason to feel gained that we were not deemed of sufficient account to receive a copy at an earlier date; still we must in frankness say we can not. That this is owing to our inability to appreciate the *courtly* delicacy with which a slight can sometimes be conveyed we have the least imaginable inclination to deny. We certainly wish we could have seen the work earlier, but shall shed no childish tears over the fact that we did not. Other brethren were allowed to inspect its pages while passing through the press, and could speak of its worth with as much familiarity as though it had been a household thing; yet not even so much as a foul proof-sheet could be tossed to the editor of the *Quarterly*. Well, all this is not without its advantage. Any favorable opinion we may see fit to express of the work can at least not be set down to the account of gentle courtesies received.

The mind of our brotherhood has unquestionable reason to be highly preoccupied in favor of this book. Our *Millennial Harbinger* has several times spoken of it, certainly in no unflattering terms; while our best weekly has repeatedly noticed it in unmeasured praise. It is perhaps far better to conclude this right, than to confide aught to a judgment which thinks it wrong. Yet candor compels us to be frank. Of all the books men are called upon to read, let the translation of God's Holy Word be the first left to stand on its merits. Here especially should every mind be allowed to remain free to form its own opinion from actual examination. Yet in the instance before us this is not the case. The present work comes before the public sparkling with eulogies pronounced upon it long before its title-page was written. Nor is this all. These eulogies have not always come from lips the best prepared to pronounce them. It hurts me to say this, yet I feel it to be demanded. I am high above the vulgar feeling which can reproach a brother with his misfortune, especially one who is laborious, scrupulous, and sound. The noble pen that marks many a column in the *A. C. Review* with evidence of broad fine sense, and a kind pure heart, makes no pretensions to scholarship. It knows nothing of the Greek. Yet this pen, with all the confidence of an oracle, pronounces on the man that can make the best translation, and heralds his translation to the world as the best when made. If there be nothing indelicate in this, we shall be more than ready to acknowledge that our sense of the proper is low. What has struck us, in the present case, has not impossibly struck others; and we beg that a

most fraternal hint may be neither unkindly taken nor lost. In matters of faith we fetter no man's pen or tongue; but when the professedly unqualified step aside to deliver judgments in questions of translation, we solemnly feel that to be no enemy's hand which says: Hold, you assume to discharge a function for which you are not fitted, and by persistence in the work may expose yourselves to the world's cold jeer. And now let me add that the heart which can set down what is here said as prompted by any ignoble feeling, wrongs motives as pure as ever moved a pen. These utterances scorn to acknowledge a base

We sincerely regret that Bro. Anderson's work was not simply announced, as in hand, as in press, without any decisive judgment being pronounced as to its merits, till all had been permitted to see it and decide on its claims. But instead of this, it has been to an unfair degree, in our opinion, prejudged, and now comes before the public as a thing with a settled fame. It is no new book slowly working its way to the confidence of the world by its intrinsic excellence; but confronts us as an old acquaintance, stereotyped and finished. It is *the product of the man*—this let none dare to question, save at the risk of being written down a cynic. Had all this happened of a book purely human we could not have been constrained to open our lips; but such is not the case. It has happened of the avowed best translation in the world. Did the book, then, need the laudations it has received? Certainly not. But if as a translation it is not the best, then have these praises been unjust; and whether unjust or not, they have still seemed to us premature. That disappointment and mortification at the tardy, unsatisfactory course of the Bible Union have had the insensible effect to precipitate this state of things, we have hardly a doubt. Still a failure to realize what we had a just right to expect from that quarter is not good ground for flushing hasty hopes in another. Many a man from the course taken is so thoroughly persuaded that this is indisputably the translation we need, that he is positively in no condition to hear its merits called in question. Indeed, we feel that we incur no view. Bro. Pendleton spoke highly of the work before it ever saw the light, so did Bro. Milligan, so did Bro. McGarvey, so did Bro. Franklin. These are eminent brethren, and their opinions are entitled to an uncommon measure of confidence. How, now, dare any single man lift his voice to call in question the book which goes forth to the world with the high approval of these cherished names? The position of the reviewer has surely been anticipated and rendered perilous. We shall only add that if the opinions of the brotherhood are to be thus preformed and forestalled in a matter of so much importance as that of a translation of the New Testament, then may we well pause and tremblingly cast up the chances of the future.

As to the mechanical execution of Bro. Anderson's translation, we must pronounce it, to our taste, faultless. Nothing can be more lovely to the eye, in the shape of a book, than these clean white pages, so finely proportioned, bold, sharp type, and fine airy spacing. On simply opening the work, it salutes the look as if it were something half divine. There sits on every page an easy, graceful air, which makes the reading an exquisite pleasure. We love the generous liberality which grudges not to the dress in which the word of Christ shall appear abroad—beauty, purity, and charming simplicity. Could we be fascinated to overlook a blemish in any translation of holy truth, we should fear to trust ourselves to write over this most artistic thing. We certainly feel the book to be one of the most elegant and appropriate in appearance we have ever seen.

In forming an opinion of the degree of perfection which characterizes the work as a translation, it will be held that we should not overlook the fact that it has been completed, as its author remarks, "under many adverse circumstances." This, however, while we are more than willing to take it into the account in attempting to appreciate him, we must decline allowing to interfere in the least with the judgment which we are to form of his book. However much its author may be entitled to our sympathy, and we believe he is in large measure, and are sure he has it without measure, still on this score his book can set up no claim to a gentle handling. It must be judged as if its author were sleeping his last sleep. The circumstances of no man, no matter how adverse, can entitle his translation to leniency at the hand of the reviewer. He must be completely ignored while subjecting his labor to the test. We shall not, however, conceal our emotion at the thought that a brother, who has devoted the vigor of his days to the cause of his Master; and who, now in the white leaf of life, sits down to give us his ripest judgment as to the meaning of the sacred text, should be compelled to mourn the "adverse circumstances" in which he has been forced to prosecute his task. We understand the pressure and the grief which wrung from the heart the melancholy words we have just repeated; and no hand will pen a truer response thereto than the one that traces this. Still we shall try to bear ourselves nobly through our present duty, wholly unwarped by any emotion or feeling.

As a general remark we wish to say, that Bro. Anderson's translation carries to us obvious evidence on every page of minute, painstaking care and perfect fairness. We do not think that even the most captious spirit can accuse him of not meaning to be just to the original, and accurate in expressing its sense. We are free to say we have been unable to detect even one trace of any other than the noblest purpose to give to the world the exact meaning of the sacred text. In this respect we are glad to feel that his work is entitled to

the highest praise. This, however, it is but just to add, can hardly be viewed as a merit in a translation. Its absence would certainly be an unpardonable defect; but its presence is simply right, yet not a merit. We shall now proceed to notice the work more in detail. In doing this we shall arrange our remarks under the following simple headings: 1. Non-translations. 2. Erroneous translations. 3. Minor defects. The citations under each of the headings shall be few; at least no more will be adduced than are deemed necessary to afford the reader a concise, clear ground on which to rest a judgment. Under the last heading the examples will be necessarily the most

I. —*Non-translations*. For this heading we venture to think the reader will not feel prepared. For it we ourselves were not prepared; and we wish we had even one plea to urge in excuse for it as a grave charge against the work in hand. The translation which comes before the public in the present day, with the high claim of superiority over all predecessors and competitors, with yet its pages blotched with foreign and unfamiliar words, is not entitled to escape a sentence of censure at once severe and just. And such is the case with the present work; and that, too, in no trivial or unimportant points. But to the specifications:

1. The word *hades*. This word occurs in the Greek New Testament eleven times, in not one of which has it been rendered in the present work. It is simply retained, not translated. For this there is no sort of justification. That the word is translatable H. T. A. himself will not deny. Why, then, did he not render it? There is not a word in the Greek New Testament of clearer or more determinate meaning. Give us, then, that meaning. The truth has groaned long enough under the non-translations of the received version, and suffered enough from them, without being again subjected to new obscurations and injuries from the same cause. That *hades* means precisely and simply *the unseen*, we venture to say no living scholar will deny. This is its exact meaning in Greek, and this its exact translation in English. Print it, then, in the book. But what sense, says H. T. A., can the reader collect from the expression *the unseen*? And what, pray, can he collect from *hades*? Answer me, and I will you. What *the unseen* is in itself I know not; but that this is the exact rendering of *hades* is certain: Now, of two words, both of which are different names in different languages for the same unknown thing, give us evermore that which we have learned from maternal lips. Because we do not know what *the unseen* is, it does not thence result that this expression is not the true rendering of *hades*; and if the true rendering, let us have it. We will first provide ourselves with a correct translation, and study it faithfully; if, after this, our ignorance still remains, so let it be, we have done our best.

But we shall be told that *hades* is now an English word, current in our standard Dictionaries. Not at all. *Hades* is no English word, but a Greek word recently transferred to the English language, and having for the common English ear no meaning, except such as is expressed in English words. Give us, then, we still clamor, the English words in which its sense is expressed, and not the unfamiliar *hades* itself. The common English reader has no means of learning the import of this word except the English Dictionary. Now this Dictionary either does or does not give its meaning correctly. If it does not, then the common reader can not learn the meaning from it. In this case indisputably a translation is demanded. But if the Dictionary gives the meaning correctly, then substitute the meaning of the Dictionary for the word itself, and we have a translation. But we shall exhibit to the eye of the reader the difference between a translation and the non-translation, and leave him to decide for himself:

#### Ex. 7. 4.

And Jesus answered and said to him :  
Blasphemy art thou, Simion, son of Jonah; for  
Dust and Wood did not reveal this to you,  
but my Father who is in heaven. And I  
say to you, that you are Peter, and on this  
rock I will build my church; and the gates  
of Hades shall not prevail against it.

#### Alteration.

Then Jesus answered and said to him :  
Blasphemy art thou, Simion, son of Jonah; for  
Dust and Wood did not reveal this to you,  
but my Father in Heaven. And I say to  
you, that you are Peter; and on this rock I  
will build my church; and the gates of the  
nether world shall not prevail against it.

2. *Paraclete*. To say that we were surprised, on opening this lauded version, to find in it one of the most important terms in the Greek New Testament wholly untranslated in four out of five instances of its use, but mildly expresses our sensations. Had the necessity for this been imperious or inexorable we could not so have felt. But it was not. Certainly we shall not pronounce it easy to find a single word in English which at once fully and exhaustingly translates *paraclete*. Indeed we doubt whether this can be done. We do not say it can not be; we only say we doubt it. But the importance of the term unquestionably demands for it a translation, if not by a single word then by two; and if not by two, then by as many as its import requires. No one will say that the term is untranslatable, or that it was intended by the Saviour not to be translated. If untranslatable then is it indefinable; and if indefinable then is it an enigma, and not a revelation. To translate *Pneuma* as one designation of the Holy Spirit, and not *paraclete*, is whimsical and weak; and the reason which demands the one demands the other; while the reason which forbids the one forbids the other. Bro. Anderson was unfettered in making his translation by the silly rule of the Bible Union, which requires a translation to be made in "corresponding words and phrases where they can be found." He was hence free to use one word or ten in rendering *paraclete*, just as its sense requires. Why, then, did he

not do it? Does he confess his inability to translate the term? Why, then, did he undertake a task for which he is not fitted? If he can translate it, then is he chargeable with not doing what he can do, and what all living men will say he should have done. Or was he afraid on doctrinal grounds to commit himself to a particular translation? Then should he have postponed the work which he has undertaken to do, but not done, until he had recovered from his timidity. But in one instance Bro. Anderson translates the word. This shows that he believes it translatable; nay, more, that there is nothing forbidding its translation. How, now, can he justify himself for translating it in one case, and not translating it in others? He can not do it. To tell us that *paraclete* is an English word, found in our standard Dictionaries is an evasion so shallow that I shall certainly be far above thinking him capable of resorting to it.

How many of the thousands of the poor into whose hands a translation of the New Testament is expected to go can afford Webster and Worcester, and the rest of the learned machinery necessary to collect the meaning of *paraclete*? Perhaps one in one hundred; perhaps not one in five. Of all the necessities of this or any other age, the sublimest is a translation of the New Testament so pure and simple as to convey the truth to the humble, unlettered heart at once, and with no aid but itself. Is it possible, O my soul, that we are never to have it? Shall the Saviour and friend of man be compelled forever to stalk into the cabin of the poor on Grecian stilts, and prattle in *paracletes* to the dark, untutored spirits there? Over the present *partial* version we feel compelled to sing: Striding back to Athens again; oh, striding back again! That it is in this particular a retrogression, few that read it will fail to feel.

We open this elegant book, and in many respects elegant and faultless translation, and feel ourselves borne lightly on over its graceful pages, till we approach the following, when the shock we experience is mildly phrased painful: "But yet I tell you the truth: it is profitable for you that I go away. For if I go not away the *Paraclete* will not come to you." At this we grow sick, lay the volume down, and cry: Out, false thing, out.

But H. T. A. will say: Give us, then, the word which should take the place of *paraclete*. When I undertake to make a translation I will. Till then I shall content myself with pronouncing yours, in this particular, wholly unworthy of even the respect, to say nothing of the confidence, of the brethren whom you expect to indorse it and accept it. Too severe! will cry those whose opinions have been preformed by the flattering notices the work received before it was half finished. Be it so, then, in your judgment. We intend to hold a pen unmoved by every thing but right. We mean to be neither insensible to the excellences of the book, nor blind to its faults. We shall proudly ac-

knowledge those, and candidly censure these. We hold no timid nerve when a translation of God's holy truth, boastfully claimed to be the best in the world, is passing through our fingers.

We shall not increase our specifications under this heading farther than to mention Magi, Rabbi, and Rabboni. A few samples are all we have space for. Now surely these terms must be refreshing and edifying to the simple house-girl who reads the word of God only to imbibe its sense and spirit! Is there any justification for their retention. Candidly we can not see it. They are not mere unmeaning personal names, but descriptive or significant epithets, for which it is not difficult, it seems to us, to find, in English words, or phrases closely corresponding in sense. Indeed, even an inadequate rendering, where an adequate one can not be had, is better than none. The terms themselves convey to the English ear no meaning whatever. An inadequate rendering would. Let us have it, then, if we can have nothing better. But is it alleged that they are not significant epithets with a translatable sense? Then, of course, no injury can be done the word of God by substituting in their stead familiar English sounds. We still insist on something else besides the terms.

II. —*Erroneous Translations.* Under this heading, the charges will be still more serious than those under the preceding; for an untranslated word conveys to the English reader simply no sense, whereas an erroneous translation conveys a positively wrong sense. In the one case, we have not what we should have; in the other, we have what we should not have. Only this remains to be added; that in the present case we can not feel so confident as in the former, for an erroneous translation may be so only to us, and not so in fact.

1. "The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." That the word book in this citation will be understood by the common reader, with perhaps not a single exception, as referring to the entire narrative of Matthew, admits of scarcely a doubt. Indeed we have no evidence from the present translation that even its author himself understands it in any other sense, or meant to use it in any other. Yet that the word *biblos*, of which it is the translation, refers not to the narrative of Matthew, but to the immediately following list of names, may be set down as the settled judgment of the best critics. This judgment we accept as correct. Now this important fact is not indicated in the present version, neither can it be collected from it. We must hence think it erroneous in its very opening sentence.

The word *biblos*, when Matthew wrote, had not the appropriate and settled meaning which book has with us. It applied to any written document, of whatever material, without regard to length or magnitude. It hence correctly denoted a roll or list of names. That this is its meaning in the present case we esteem as certain.



2. "But Jesus Christ was begotten thus." (Matt. i., 18.) To Bay nothing of the common reader, we venture to think few, very few, even among scholars, will read this rendering without feeling startled. Indeed we could hardly believe our own eyes when we saw it. Not that it is either an impossible view or an impossible rendering, for it can be pronounced neither; but that it is highly improbable, indeed almost certainly wrong, we think clear. In the first place, even allowing *genhsij* and not *genesij* to be the true text, and the rendering is far from being sustained. For it is not a universal law of the Greek language that nouns of the form of *genhsij* are interchangeable with the verb in the passive voice from which they are derived. Yet, unless this were the case, and Bro. Anderson knows perfectly that it is not the case, his rendering can not be held as necessarily true. This is decisive against it as a necessary rendering. In the second place, according to lexical authority, *birth* is indisputably as correct a rendering of *genhsij* as *begetting*, and certainly the more common of the two. At least such is the case, if a judgment of any value can be based on the only four lexicons we have at command. Now this hardly leaves the claims of the two words, birth and begetting, evenly balanced, but seems to tilt the scales slightly against the latter.

But assuming that the rendering has been based on *genhsij* and not on *genesij*, for its author affords us no means of knowing on which he based *genhsij* it, and the difference in meaning between the two words is not sufficient to enable us to determine; and still his rendering is not sustained. *Genefij* does not necessarily mean begetting, and in the New Testament indisputably does not mean it, if the only other instance of its use in that book may be held as decisive of its import. In Luke i., 13, 14, we have these words: "Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness, and many shall rejoice at his *birth* (*genesij*)." That *genesij* here means birth, and birth only, is determined by the very fact it is used to express. This we must hold to be obvious and settled. Now, when a term occurs in the New Testament twice or more times, in one of which its meaning is certainly and definitely determined, that is, where, of necessity, it bears one particular meaning, and can have no other—this fact is held, by one of the most imperious laws of exegesis, to determine its meaning for all the other instances, unless some countervailing or modifying circumstance exists to demand a change. Now since *genesij* is determined in Luke to mean birth and not begetting, and since no modifying circumstance exists in Matthew, it thence follows that in Matthew it must mean birth simply and only. It would be difficult to adduce a more decisive use of criticism against a given rendering than is the present against the rendering in hand.

When to this we add, that facts themselves, in the very paragraph

in Matthew in which the rendering occurs, stand boldly against it, we must feel it to be fatally refuted. Bro. Anderson translates as follows: "But Jesus Christ was begotten thus: After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they had come together, she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit." Now is any thing here said, telling us *how* Jesus Christ was begotten. The thing is positively untrue. We are merely told: 1. That Mary was found to be with child; 2. By the Holy Spirit. But this finding must have been some time subsequent to the begetting. Not one word is said about the begetting; especially we have no description of it. Yet a description, involving particular mode, is precisely the thing which the rendering in hand, in order to be true, requires. We must hence reject it as utterly false.

3. "And Barnabas went to Tarsus, to seek for Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it came to pass, that they met together in the church for a whole year, and taught a great multitude; and the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch."

Few passages in the New Testament have given rise, among us as a people, to more controversy, and seemingly with less decisive results, than this. From the first we have held it, and justly so, to involve a most important question. That question is: *By whom were the disciples first called Christians?* The passage was first discussed at length, we believe, by Breth. Campbell and Stone. Long subsequently it was debated more concisely, but at the same time with increased precision and power, by Breth. Campbell and Shannon. In the mean time, and since, it was and has been subjected to examination with varying ability, but with much the same result. It appeared that nothing conclusive and completely satisfactory could or was likely to be reached. It was not, be the date long borne in mind, until the 11th of October last, that the passage received its last criticism, and the question it involves was forever put to rest. That decisive criticism was from the pen of Bro. Anderson, and appeared in the *American Christian Review* of the date aforementioned. It was intended to vindicate the rendering of the passage we have just cited, which his book contains. Now if it will not be deemed by him unpardonable effrontery, we shall crave the liberty of inspecting a little that criticism, and of giving email additional conspicuity to the conclusions of the great master whose name rounds up the piece. Of course, it can sustain no injury from the junior and inferior hand that would presumptuously disturb its quiet now.

The opening paragraph in the criticism runs thus: "In reply to the question above, I have to say, that the laws of language require the translation that I have given. As this is not the first time that the above question has been presented, and as it should be put to rest finally, I will state the law in the case. Verbs of *calling* and

*naming* take two accusatives: one of the person or thing, the other of the name. But active transitive verbs, and no others, take such cases. *Chrematizo* being intransitive can not come under this law."

1. "The laws of language require the translation that I have made." If so, the translation is indisputably correct. But can there be no mistake about these laws? The foregoing assertion would seem to imply none. It is neither prefaced nor interlarded by one softening expression indicative of the semblance of doubt. It is eased by no—it is thought, it is deemed, it is held, etc. Bold and oracular, it says: "*The laws of language require,*" etc.

2. "As this is not the first time that the above question has been presented, *and as it should be put to rest finally* (italics ours), I will state the law in the case." Moves as if he were the embodiment of light. Again: "*I hope these remarks will finally settle this question* (italics ours). If I seem to write with some boldness, I ask the reader to pardon a boldness which is founded on well-established usage of Greek terms." Finality—no other term can accurately describe the conclusion of this confident author.

3. But what is that law? It is this: "Verbs of *calling* and *naming* take two accusatives: one of the person or thing, the other of the name. But active transitive verbs, and no others, take such cases. *Chrematizo* being intransitive can not come under this law."

Now, reader, mark you this: *Chrematizo* is here pronounced *intransitive*. It can not then be construed as a verb of calling and naming. Yet Bro. Anderson himself renders it as a verb of calling, thus: "And the disciples *were called* Christians first at Antioch 1" Now where does he get this notion of calling? It is either in *chrematizo*, or it is not. If it is in it, then his law is false; if not in it, then has he an idea in his translation which is not in the Greek, and this makes his translation false. Will he choose?

But we are by no means done with the present case. The writer says: "*Chrematizo* being *intransitive* can not," etc. From this it is clear that he holds *chrematizo* to be an intransitive verb. But the point is not one of inference. The following from the same piece sets it at rest: "As already stated, *chrematizo* is an intransitive verb, and can not take an accusative object." Is it possible that this is Bro. Anderson's deliberate utterance? If so, we must solemnly say we blush over his pretensions to scholarship. If this were an ordinary question, surely he might be permitted to go unexposed. But when a man, be he brother or not, comes before the world, in the broad light of the present day, to make a translation which shall eclipse all others, is he entitled, we ask, if he betrays gross unfamiliarity with his subject, to escape a just measure of censure? Especially, should he be allowed to come before the public, and base on his own narrow views of a language about which he affects to know so much, but about

which in fact he seems to know so little, a law, having no existence save in his own head, for the final settlement of a great and serious question? We can not think it; and yet we regret to ask these questions.

Now I have lying before me at this moment no less than *twelve instances* in which *chrematizo* is used as a transitive verb followed by the accusative of object. Some of these I will now transcribe for the benefit of my confident and critical brother:

1. *Pantej gar eij afeiron autousin ob-xrhmatizomenoi to-nousin*: All they who handle money keep continually growing rich. (Aristot. Pol.) Will Bro. Anderson here tell the reader what case *vousin* is in, and what verb governs it?

2. *Exrhmatizeo aphi touj men autraj di'eph'otou? taj de- gunaikaj dia-thj nhtroj*: He kept constantly cheating the men through himself, but the women through his mother. (Polyb.) Is *chrematizo* transitive or intransitive here? Tell us Bro. Anderson. What is the case of *autraj* and *gunaikaj*; are they the accusative of object, or are they not? And how do you govern them? You say "*chrematizo* is an intransitive verb, and can not take an accusative object!"

3. *Xrhmatisantej tahta ef' aperi hqon*: Transacting the matters for which they came. (Thuc.) Here again we have *tahta* the accusative object, following the transitive verb *chrematizo*, notwithstanding the reckless assertion of our translator and critic to the contrary. But the citations of this class we shall close here. We shall readily grant that they are such as lie beyond the range of ordinary reading. They are not, however, the less instructive on that account. Moreover, they warrant at least this mournful lesson: that, before we venture to make bold assertions, on which to base hasty special rules for the settlement of grave questions in sacred criticism, we should at least know that the whole field-view lies open before us, and that no facts remain hidden from our eyes, which may subsequently be called up to bring the purple to our cheeks. Now we might excuse our author for his unacquaintance with the preceding cases; but what shall we think of his assertions in the face of the following:

4. *Grakon panta; touj logouj ouj exrhmatisa proj se[ epi bibliou*: the words which I have delivered to you in a little book. (Sept. Jer., xxxvii., 2.) Will Bro. Anderson tell us whether *chrematizo* is here transitive or intransitive? If intransitive, how he governs *ouj*? If transitive, what we are to think of his assertion to the contrary?

5. *Shqi e[ auj^? oikou Kurieu, kai-xrhmatiejf apasi toijIoudaioij.... apanta; touj logouj ouj sunetaza< soi xrhmatisai ahtojf*: Stand in the hall of the Lord's house, and deliver to all the Jews.... all the words which I have commanded you to deliver to them. (Sept. Jer. xxxiii., 2.)

Here again, indisputably, we have *chrematizo* used transitively, and followed, not only by the accusative of object, but also by the dative.

In the view, now, of all these examples will our brother tell us how much confidence we are to repose in his judgment as a critic? Shall we regard *chrematizo*, according to these instances, as a transitive verb and followed by the accusative of object; or shall we, with him, assert it to be intransitive and incapable of taking that case? In the article from which we have quoted he says: "There are some things that I know and some that I do not know." The gentle swagger of this we hardly think sufficiently concealed. Will he, then, tell us what he knows of *chrematizo*. If he tells us truly, then drops the golden feather from his soaring wing; if not, we must feel that his frankness is a little taxed. But he is a just and true man, and will do right.

But the examples bearing most fatally against the criticism in hand are yet to be cited. They are the following; and belong to mediæval Greek

6. ~~ἑχρημάτισεν ὁ αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς αὐτὸν ὠνόμασε~~ *He chrematized himself thus: Augustus Caesar Octavianos; that is he named himself thus.* (Mala.)

In this example, not only is *chrematizo* used as a transitive verb, and followed by the accusative, but it is, beyond all question, used as a verb of naming. We can make no choice, as we are left no alternative. No word but called, styled, named, or some equivalent word, will render it. This is obvious from the fact that the very names given are mentioned. From this we see that *chrematizo* is not only used as a transitive verb, but also as a verb of naming. We candidly feel this to be completely decisive against Bro. Anderson's criticism, and consequently that it bears heavily against his translation of Acts xi., 26. There remains only this to be noted, that the person named is in the accusative, while the names themselves are in the nominative.

7. ~~ἑχρημάτισεν ὁ αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς αὐτὸν ὠνόμασε~~ *From that time they called themselves Colossians.* (Idem.)

Here, now, instead of *chrematizo* being an intransitive verb, as Bro. Anderson asserts, we find it both used transitively, and actually followed by *two* accusatives, one of the person, the other of the name—the very circumstances, and the only circumstances, which, according to him, are essential to constitute a verb of naming. ~~ἑαυτὸν~~ is confessedly the accusative of the person and governed by *echrematison*. This makes the verb transitive. And ~~ὡς αὐτὸν ὠνόμασε~~ is unquestionably the accusative of the name. If this is not making out a case even up to the point of extreme completeness, then is a case hard to make out. Does my brother now think that he stated the law and the facts correctly, which determine the rendering of Acts xi., 26? I believe it will not be deemed an act of rudeness in me to add, that he can at least repeat: "There are some things that I know, and some that I do not know."

In regard to one or two of the preceding examples it is proper to say, that they have been rendered as detached or isolated Sentences or phrases, and with no regard to the context from which they are taken. To give the sense which would most readily occur to the reader's mind on first sight is all we have aimed at. This, however, is a point which can in no sense affect the object we have in view in citing them.

Finally, from the premises now before us, we feel fully authorized in drawing these conclusions: 1. That *chrematizo* is an active transitive verb, and may be followed by both the accusative of immediate object, and the dative of the person to or for whom a thing is done. 2. That it is indisputably a verb of naming, not by force of its inherent meaning, but by usage. 3. That it may be followed by the accusative of the person named and by the nominative of the name given. 4. Or it may be followed by the accusative of both the person named and the name given. Such unquestionably are the conclusions warranted by the foregoing examples.

And now as to the passage of Scripture in hand. 1. *Chrematizo* has its regular active and regular passive forms, and both these are found in the New Testament. 2. The active form is used in Acts xi., 26. To the mind of the Holy Spirit, then, there existed a necessity for it, and this necessity forbade the use of the passive. Now to ignore this fact, and arbitrarily to compel the word in defiance of its form to speak a passive sense, as Bro. Anderson has done, seems to me a virtual impeachment of the trustworthiness of the sacred record. 3. The sense yielded by the passive rendering is not the same as that yielded by the active. Now, without an obvious, an inexorable necessity for it, no living man dare substitute that sense for this. Yet this is precisely what Bro. Anderson does. If the two senses were the same, then certainly the interchange of one for the other would be a question purely of taste, and a matter of complete indifference. But such is not the case. We consequently feel compelled, in view of all the facts now before us, to pronounce his whole comment on *chrematizo* false and shallow, and his rendering of Acts xi., 26, arbitrary and wrong.

The only two renderings, it seems to me, which the passage is, on principles of sound exegesis, susceptible of are respectively the following:

1. Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; and finding him, brought him to Antioch. And it happened that a whole year they met with the church, and taught a large crowd; and that the disciples bore the name of Christians first in Antioch.

We shall not deny that this is a probable rendering; but we think it nothing more, and certainly it is not a necessary one. To us it too much resembles the forced rendering of a captious objector—the

rendering of a man who knows that you are right, but who nevertheless is determined not to agree with you, and who insists on some petty variance from you. Besides, it should be noted that whatever rules will permit this rendering will also permit the other, which certainly has the advantage of being the more easy and the more natural of the two. Further: this rendering makes the disciples take up and bear the name Christian at the very time when Saul and Barnabas were laboring among them, and, consequently, impliedly by their sanction, which comes to the same thing as if Saul and Barnabas had themselves given the name. Now this is precisely what the other rendering asserts. We can hence see no great difference, in effect, between two renderings, the one of which implies that inspired men sanctioned the first assumption of the name: and the other of which asserts outright that they gave it.

2. *Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; and finding him, brought him to Antioch. And it happened that, a whole year, they met with the church, and taught a large crowd, and called the disciples Christians first in Antioch.*

It will be long, if we may be allowed a modest opinion, before we shall have a translation which, in point of simplicity and fidelity to the original, will excel this. Altered it may be; but whether improved or not, is a different matter. 1. It renders *chrematisai* actively, as we sternly insist it should be. To render it otherwise is arbitrary and untenable. 2. It assigns to all the three closely consecutive, and alike dependent infinitives—*sumaxqhñai*, *didaxai*, and *xrhmatissai* the same accusative subject—*aufouj*. This is the word which is first and most naturally suggested to the mind as the true subject. Any other seems to come in awkwardly, and as if by constraint. That *autous* is the subject of *sumachthenai* and *didaxai* is universally conceded. Now note that both these verbs are *preceded* by their subject. Yet the sacred writer, while pursuing the same train of thought, which would certainly suggest the same arrangement of words, is made by Bro. Anderson to place the subject of *chrematisai* *after* it. To us this looks unnatural and false. 3. It makes both the persons named, and the name given follow this verb as accusatives of object, in strict accordance with the seventh example cited. We must, hence, from all the facts and reasonings now before us, conclude our brother's rendering of the passage to be untrue to the sacred original, and consequently untrue in itself.

But we must here close our examination of what we deem mistranslated passages. This is obviously the most interesting and important part of our task, but we can pursue it no further; our article is already stretching beyond the limits we had proposed. We have noted at least half a score more of passages which we should like to subject to the test, but lack the space. To some of these we may advert at

another time; but for the present must leave them wholly to the decision of the reader himself.

III. —*Minor Defects.* The reader must not suppose, because we speak of minor defects, that any defect in a translation of Christ's holy word can be held as unimportant. This is not our meaning. But certainly some defects are of a much more serious nature than others. Some involve the sense, others merely the mode of expressing it. These we should unquestionably regard as less than those. Again: the sense is material and divine; the mode of expressing it, though not immaterial, is human and optional. Here allowance is proper, and judgment should be charitable. We have elsewhere in the *Quarterly* given our views of what a translation should be, and shall not enlarge on the matter here; except so far as to reiterate the rule which we think should control the expression of the sense. The rule is this: The sense of the sacred text should be expressed in the fewest English words that will adequately convey it to the mind. These words, let me add, should be arranged with no reference to the order of words in the original. The usages of the English and the modes of English thought alone should determine the form the English sentence should take. Further: the rule indisputably implies that the simplest words and simplest modes of combining them shall be used, for these only, to the common mind at least, will adequately convey the sense. The correctness of some of these principles, if not all, we know Bro. Anderson recognizes. His language immaterially varied, id: "I have been careful to express the exact sense of the original, without permitting myself to be confined to an imitation of the letter of the Greek" In this we think him certainly right. We shall now proceed to note some passages in which we think his translation might be improved. These we shall not wander over the book to hunt, but shall take them, for the most part, from its first pages.

"But Jesus Christ was begotten thus: After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they had come together, she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit."

We here call the reader's attention to the horrid word *betrothed*. We have no language in which to express our sensations on attempting to pronounce the execrable thing. In England we know it is not uncommon; but with us, especially in humble circles, it has fallen into, complete desuetude. We wish it were forever expunged from the English language, and that it could never again revisit either eye or ear, except as a verbal fossil of the infamous bygone, and then only when the necessity should arise to frighten mortals out of their wits. Out on you, and away with you, gibbering imp of the past! We have no use for you, and would never again look on your grotesque form. Fit only to be seen in the defunct almanac found in the untidy wallet of some long since buried felon; we say; hence, away!



Again: in the passage it strikes us that there is an affectation of grammatical niceties, neither necessary to the expression of the sense, nor called for by the genius of our language. The rendering sounds to us artificial and prudish. It seems utterly wanting in the broad obvious simplicity of a divine record. We shall not deny that we like the alteration best:

## M. W. A.

But Jesus Christ was begotten thus. After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they had come together, she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit.

## Alteration.

Now the birth of Jesus Christ happened thus: His mother Mary was engaged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit.

There is not a peasant-girl in all the land that can not, at sight, collect the meaning of the alteration. For this purpose she needs no Dictionary. It flashes into her mind before she can pause to ask herself whether she understands it or not. And such should be every sentence in the word of God, where it is possible to so make it. Bro. Anderson has certainly aimed at simplicity in his translation; and we are glad to say, has, in the main, succeeded well. Still in very many passages we think it decidedly at fault in this respect. We should always prefer two or three or even more simple easy words to one learned or unfamiliar one, in making a translation. The unlettered poor should never be out of sight of him who lifts his pen to represent in his own tongue the meaning of God's word. The following, being the remainder of the foregoing paragraph, will suggest to the reader a few points in which we think the present version susceptible of slight changes for the better:

## M. W. A.

Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and considering to make an excuse of her, minded to put her away privately. But while he was thinking of these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying: Joseph, son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary your wife; for she shall bring thee a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins. And she shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins. Every one that was done, that the word might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet saying: Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel, which, when translated, is, God with us. And Joseph awoke from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him: and took home his wife, and knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son. And he called his name Jesus. (Chap. I., 19-24.)

## Alteration.

Then Joseph, her husband, who was a just man, and desiring to excuse her, determined to put her away privately. But while he was thinking of these matters, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, and said: Joseph, son of David, fear not to take to yourself Mary your wife; for she shall be with child by the Holy Spirit; and she shall give birth to a son, and you shall name him Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins. Every one that was spoken of by the Lord through the prophet: for it shall be fulfilled, with child, and give birth to a son, and they shall name him Emmanuel, which means God is with us. Then Joseph, waking from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him; and took to himself his wife, but knew not her till she had given birth to her first-born son. And Joseph named him Jesus.

That some of the differences here shown involve mere questions of taste we shall not deny: but others involve slightly the perspicuity of the thought. Indeed one serious defect which we think we have noticed in the work before us is, the want of condensation where the sense would not suffer by it; and the lack of greater fullness where the sense would gain by it. As an illustration of what we here last mean, take the following, which will also contrast somewhat boldly with the version in hand, both as to sense and power:

B. T. A.

Then Herod, when he had secretly called the wise men, required of them secretly as when the star, then visible, had made its appearance: and sending them to Bethlehem, he said: Go, make diligent inquiry for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word, that I also may go and do him homage. When they had heard the king, they departed; and in the night, which they had seen in the east, went before them, till they came and stood over the child where the woman child was. And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with great exultation. And having come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother; and falling down, they did him homage. And when they had opened their treasures, they offered to him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrror. And having been warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they departed into their own country by another way. (Mat. II, 7-12.)

A. T. A.

Then Herod secretly called the wise men, and learned from them the exact time when the star first appeared. He then sent to them: Go into Bethlehem and search well for the babe, and when you find him, bring me word, that I also may go and do him homage. When they heard the king, they left, and in the night which they had seen in the east led them, till they came and stood over the babe where the woman child was. When they saw the star, they fell the fastest way. Then they went into the house, and saw the babe with Mary his mother; and fell down and bowed him. Then opening their treasures, they gave him gifts—gold, and incense for incense. But being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they left for their own country by another way.

On these different renderings we shall presume the reader to be fully competent to make his own observations, and to draw the proper conclusions. Nothing can be more untrue to the original than a heavy diluted style. When we have done our best, we shall never be able to reach its condensation, simplicity, and marvelous force. As an evidence of this, the Greek from which the above renderings are made contains 115 words; Bro. Anderson's version, 164; ours, 145; that is to say, our version contains thirty words more than the original, while his contains forty-nine. When we remember that this computation is made on only six verses of the New Testament, it presents a frightful odds either against the translators, or against their language.

We shall now present a passage in which we think the author has not only missed the sense, but by which he has actually made the Scriptures speak nonsense; and which furnishes about as complete a jumble of words as we remember anywhere to have met with:

B. T. A.

And when he had chosen him all the chief priests and scribes of the people, he inquired of them where the Christ should be

A. T. A.

Then calling together all the chief priests and scribes of the people, he asked them: Where is the Christ to be born? They re-

born. And they said to him: Is Bethlehem of Judah: for thou it is written by the prophet: And thou, Bethlehem, city of Judah, art by no means the least among the chiefs of Judah; for out of thee shall come a leader, that shall be a shepherd to my people Israel. (Mat. ii, 1-6)

plied: to Bethlehem, of Judah; for as written the prophet: And you, Bethlehem, head of Judah, art not the least in furnishing Judah's leaders; for out of you shall come the leader who shall rule my people to rest.

We say of a country, it is rich in minerals, rich in this, rich in that, great in statesmen, great in poets. This seems to me to be precisely the meaning of the sacred text. Bethlehem was to be great in leaders, because it was to furnish *the* great leader. To make the sacred writer say: You, Bethlehem, are not the least among the leaders of Judah, makes Bethlehem itself one of these leaders, which is sheer nonsense. Again: to translate *gh/* by the word *city* is an inexcusable whim. The word has no such meaning. Bethlehem was in the tract of country originally given to Judah. Hence with perfect propriety it, in apposition with the land it stood on, could be addressed as belonging to him. The obvious meaning of the passage is: And you, Bethlehem, a tract of Judah's land, are not least in the princes of Judah.

We shall next cite a passage about which some diversity of opinion exists. Its meaning is not generally thought to be difficult; but to express it clearly within short compass is certainly not easy. Bro. Anderson's version of it differs but very little from others; and in this, perhaps, he has been prudent. Still we think he might with safety have indulged a little more latitude:

H. T. A.

THE HERR, WHEN HE SAW THAT HE WAS deceived by the Magi, was greatly annoyed, and went out and slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem and all its borders, from the age of two years and under, according to the time which he had secretly inquired of the Magi. (Mat. ii, 16)

Alteration.

THE HERR, knowing that he was deceived by the wise men, became very mad, and went out and murdered all the male children in Bethlehem, and in the whole country around it, who were two years old and less, at the time when, according to the wise men, the star first appeared.

We are not insensible of the objection which can be urged against a part of this alteration; but with us freedom with clearness is preferable to literalism with obscurity. When the light of a passage is at all perceptible, let it out, is our motto.

With one more extract we must close this part of our task. Pleasant as it is to luxuriate amid these delightful exercises, we must yet bring them to an end.

"Now, faith is a sure confidence with respect to things hoped for, a firm persuasion with respect to things not seen: for by this the ancients obtained a good reputation.

"By faith we understand that the ages were set in order by the word of God, so that the things which are seen have not come into being from things that appear." (Heb. xi, 1-3.)

To call this a translation we certainly feel to be a little difficult.

A commentary it may be, but a translation we can not think it. On what ground, I beg to ask my brother, does he render *upostasij* "sure confidence?" That he can find loose lexical authority for it, I shall not deny; but that he can show a necessity for it, springing either out of the strict and true meaning of the word, or out of the various connections in which it is used in the New Testament, I certainly must deny. We are not at liberty to construct a definition of faith from extraneous sources, and then make the word of Christ indorse it. On the contrary, we must elaborate the definition we accept from the divine, and not the divine from the one we hold. *'Upostasij* means primarily and simply basis, ground, foundation; and we see no necessity for departing from this meaning in the present case. "Firm persuasion" is not a bad meaning of *elēgxoí*, though we think the single word *conviction* better, and enough. We deeply distrust the propriety of intensifying epithets where they are not absolutely demanded. When we hope for things, faith is the basis of the act; when events are unwitnessed, faith is the conviction of their reality. This we think the meaning of the passage, and what should be compressed into a translation of it.

On the 3d verse we shall not comment. To us it seems strange and forced, but this is not conclusive against it. One of its terms is sometimes difficult, and it may be well, for the present, to leave the reader to his own calm thought. We shall presently indicate a change, but nothing more.

We would here suggest that in a version made on strict principles the word faith would never occur. We certainly say this from no prejudice to the word, but from sound, high reasons. The word belief alone would appear in such a version. In English we have the two words faith and belief; in Greek but one; but this one occurs both in the form of a verb and a noun. When it occurs in the form of a verb we are compelled in English to use the word *believe*; since faith with us is never found as a verb. We never say of a person that he *faiths* this or *faiths* that. We always, of necessity, say he *believes*. Now the word cognately and strictly corresponding to *believe* is *belief*, and not faith. Since, then, the verb in the original compels us to use *believe*, the noun in the original should be uniformly represented by the word *belief*. The following important Scripture could in this way be greatly improved: But without *belief* it is impossible to please him; for he that comes to God must *believe* that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that seek him. We would now suggest the following alteration in the preceding verses:

#### W. T. 4.

Now, *faith* is a sure confidence with respect to things hoped for, a firm persuasion with respect to things not seen: for by the same means we obtained a good reputation.

#### Alteration.

Now, *belief* is the ground on which things are hoped for, the certainty of the truth of things unseen. By this the saints have been justified with God.

By faith we understand that the ages  
were not in order by the word of God; so  
that the things which are seen were not  
made out of things that are  
seen.

By faith we know that the worlds were  
created by the word of God; so that the  
things seen were made out of things not  
seen.

By translating *aijvñaj* ages, it seems to me that Bro. Anderson renders the first part of the last verse singularly inconsistent with the last part. Indeed, according to him we see no dependence of the one on the other. Yet certainly the original implies a dependence. But we shall add no more.

Of the excellences of the book before us we should delight to speak, but lack the space. Certainly they are many and varied. In places beyond mention we think it stands high above any thing in the language we speak. In others we candidly feel it to be far below the work we need. Yet we wish it to be placed in the hands of every saint in our ranks. While we do not think it entitled to implicit confidence, we yet think it entitled to high confidence. No one can carefully read it without being profited; we hence wish all to have it. Bro. Anderson is entitled to the gratitude of the brotherhood for his honest effort to contribute to their illumination and comfort. While we want the work to circulate for its own sake and worth, we yet have another reason for wishing it to have an extensive sale. Its author, for his faithful service, deserves something more than empty verbal compliments. We do not mean to be indelicate, but we want the proceeds of the work to be so large and free as to make his heart glad and his spirit light. Brethren, lift up and hold high the hand that spends its strength for man and his great first Friend.

When all our brethren have procured and read the present work, and when public opinion has settled down as to its merits, we have some grave suggestions to make in regard to a final translation for our great body. Such a work is with us an imperious necessity, and should not longer be postponed. Now is not the time, nor the present the place, to speak; but not long hence the word may be in season.

---

THE BRITISH MILLENNIAL HARBINGER. —We should like to see this excellent Monthly more extensively circulated in this country. It is edited by Bro. David King, Birmingham, England, and is sound and true. Many of its articles are marked by decided ability, discretion, and foresight. Its news department would be peculiarly interesting to our brethren on this side of the water. We should like to see five hundred copies circulating among us. Brethren Franklin and Bice will order it for subscribers. It is printed in handsome style and on excellent paper.

## THE BURNT OFFERINGS.

OF all the offerings made to the Lord, burnt offerings were the most ancient. They demand our special attention for their solemnity and importance. Before the Jewish institution was given, and before the Flood, these sacrifices were made. Indeed, they were the first required after the fall, and therefore precedence must be given them as typical institutions. They would have been unmeaning and useless, unless they had some relation to the future sacrifice offered by the Messiah upon the cross. It was this that gave them all their significancy and value.

Moses thus speaks of the first one that had been offered: "And in process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of the flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering." (Gen. iv., 4.)

Paul calls this "a more excellent sacrifice" than Cain's. It was a better one; and the reason assigned for it is, that it had been offered by faith. By implication, Cain's was not so offered; or if it was, the bloody offering, first, was demanded, before the thank offering could be accepted. Propitiation must precede worship. The blood of expiation before the offering of thanks. Faith in the atonement before any expressions of gratitude could be received.

Gain's offering of the fruits of the field was an inversion of the order of Heaven's law. In it there was no acknowledgment of sin, no need for pardon, no expressions of guilt.

In what way this offering of Abel's was made, is not said in Gen. iv., 4. It is probable that fire descended from heaven and consumed the sacrifice. (Compare Gen. xv., 17; Lev. ix., 24; Judg. vi., 21; 1 Kings xviii, 38.)

On account of the faith of Abel and his offering, he was declared to be righteous. He was justified and accepted. The appellation *dikaïos*, or righteous, is given to Abel in Matt. xxiii., 35; 1 John iii., 12. He not only had faith in the divine testimony concerning the proper and only way of approaching God, but, in obedience to the divine command, he offered "a more excellent sacrifice" than Cain.

From the beginning, faith and obedience were united; and both were necessary to fulfill the requirements of the law of pardon. It was not faith alone, nor sacrifice alone; but faith and the sacrifice. Thus it was by faith he offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain.

A burnt offering was also made by Noah after the Flood, "Of every clean beast and of every clean fowl. \* \* And the Lord smelled

a sweet savor; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for (though) the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every living thing as I have done." (Gen. viii., 20-22.)

The same kind of animals and fowls, required by the law of Moses in the burnt offerings, Noah laid upon the altar.

Thus, in the commencement of the new world, after the fall, Abel offered burnt sacrifices to God; and in the regeneration of that world by the waters of the Flood and the word, on the first day of the new epoch, burnt offerings were made by Noah, its head and representative. In the commencement of the Jewish institution burnt offerings had the precedence. They were the first to be presented to the Lord. This order was never interrupted, but was faithfully observed. (Lev. i.)

As far back as the days of Job, these offerings were made on great and solemn occasions. (Job i., 5.)

When the angel of the Lord visited Manoah and his wife, probably in the form of a man, they wished to detain him until they made ready a kid for him, but the angel said: "Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread; and (or rather *but*) if thou wilt offer a burnt offering, thou must offer it unto the Lord." The angel declined the expressions of gratitude they were willing to bestow upon him, and he directed them to offer their gifts to God as a burnt offering. This was the first and most important duty required at their hands in view of the favors God was about to bestow upon them, and to prepare them suitably to receive them.

It will appear that the Jews offered burnt sacrifices before the giving of the law. (Exod. x., 25; xxiv., 5.) This was done by the command of Moses, either in accordance with the traditions and usages of the past, or by direct revelation from the God of Abraham.

There were certain peculiarities found in the burnt offerings which deserve our special notice, in order to understand their true typical import. It must not, however, be supposed that there is an exact resemblance between the types and shadows of the law and their antitypes. Paul admonishes us on this head: "Moreover, the law, which contained a mere outline of future blessings, and not the complete image of these things, can never, by those yearly sacrifices which are continually offered, fully accomplish what is needed for those who approach the altar." (Heb. x., 1. Stuart *in loco*.)

Thus the law contains "a mere outline of future blessings," and by no means "a complete image" of them. But still it is an "outline" and an "image." It bears the same relation to the "future blessings" that a draft does to a house; and a rude picture to a person. They are suggestive representations of future things, which were to find their reality and meaning in them. If this was not the

case, they must be regarded as arbitrary appointments, and ultimate and final institutions, which did not look beyond themselves to any thing further. This would destroy all our conception of the *tupoi* of the Old Testament, and the *antitupoi* of the New. (See 1 Cor. x., 6, 11; Heb. ix., 9, 23; x., 1.) The points of resemblance are not of a materialistic character; not yet in form or corporeity. The body, substance, and physical conditions of the types may bear no resemblance to the things typified, no more than the metallic type in the printing office does to the thought which in words they embody. But there are hidden in them great and sublime conceptions, prophetic glimpses, significant indices, glorious adumbrations; and in their just relations to each other and the parties who offer them, the person to whom they are offered and those for whom they are made, they embody spiritualistic teachings, which answer to "the truth" and reality found in the mission and work of Christ. They necessarily require much thought and reflection, a careful examination of their conditions, and an interpretation of their meaning. They constitute a heavenly language, a divine alphabet, a system of splendid hieroglyphics, which must be studied until each word and impersonation, each diagram and inscription, each manakin and model, shall be understood. Like the symbols of Daniel and John, each has a fixed and appropriate meaning from which we are not at liberty to depart. As each word in every language has one meaning, one primary meaning, and no two words in the same language are exact synonyms, so is it with the types and shadows of the law.

We think the whole system of typology needs a more careful study and analysis than has ever yet been given to it. It can be subjected to rules and laws, as perfect, and as easily applied as to any language, written or spoken. The plan usually resorted to in interpreting any secret language must be used, such as Champolion, De Sacy, and others employed on the Rosetta stone, and other ancient inscriptions and hieroglyphs. Their results were most satisfactory and certain. The first thing is to ascertain, by close examination, the number of different signs and characters; next to distinguish the different groups or combinations that occur most frequently; and lastly, according to the supposed or ascertained sense of the general purport of the writing, to explain the character of the words of the language they are supposed to embody. An alphabet may thus be formed of the popular and symbolic signs, which, when strictly used, will reveal all that may be known of the language. It has been supposed by some that the earliest attempt at writing, in conveying ideas to the mind, is to be found in what is usually termed "picture writing." Among the Indians in our own country, their rude representations of men and brutes, and other physical objects delineated on bark or skins, have been used, and are still, to convey information



that is intelligible to their own people. So, too, of the Mexicans, intelligence of the landing of Cortez was communicated to the capital by this mode of writing; and so among the Egyptians. Whoever will examine a single hieroglyph of any of these nations, and especially one of the ancient Egyptians, will be struck with the coincidence between it and the typical institutions of the law. The Jews, during their long sojourn in Egypt, must have been familiar with the language of symbols and its laws, and the whole ritual of Moses had to them a meaning which the more intelligent could not fail to understand. Not that we suppose that they were able to ascertain its ultimate design and true typical import, but for all the purposes of a divine institution they read in those significant symbols and signs a meaning for them, which lay upon their very surface. They knew the difference between the burnt offering and the peace offering, and never confounded them. They knew that what would suffice as an offering for one of the people would not do for a ruler or a priest. They knew that the altar in the court-yard had a design and a meaning that the golden altar in the tabernacle had not. The minute and specific details of the service required care and study, and would lead to inquiry and close examination; and therefore the reasonableness of each institution and act would gradually open up before them, until, if not the sunlight of a glorious vision broke upon them, at least the less distinct but mellow rays of moonlight settled down upon the whole ritualistic worship of the nation. The language of the service they could understand; but the far-reaching ideas, as they are found in the Christology of the apostle to the Hebrews, they were ignorant of. Do we know all that is meant by the only two symbols found in Christianity—immersion and the Lord's supper? We know enough to answer all present purposes; but there may be more in them than any one in the flesh has yet seen. They may have ideas in them which only the resurrection and the second coming shall be able fully to disclose.

We believe that as the gospel may be found in baptism and the supper, and in the facts and truths which they represent, so the gospel may be found in Leviticus as read in the light of the New Testament. What a rich and varied theme for contemplation would it be, if we could enter upon this subject under the guidance of fixed and unalterable laws of interpretation! What new and multiform processes of thought would be evoked? It is now a garden of all that is beautiful and gorgeous in color and form, in genius and species; but to us inclosed. Only one here and there has a key to open the door, and even these have only examined a flower or a petal. We understand something of the Tabernacle and its furniture; and what glorious subjects have we found in them for Christian thought and teaching! Some of the best efforts we have ever heard

were found in the elucidation of this subject. But each distinct portion of it would present matter for numerous discourses.

We will call attention to some of the specific directions in regard to the burnt offerings:

They were to be taken from the flock or herd, or from the fowls. (Lev. i., 2, 14.)

They were offered to make an atonement for sin or reconciliation for iniquity. (Lev. ix., 7.)

The guilt of the offerer was transferred to the animal slain, and this was done by the imposition of the hands of him who presented it. (Lev. i., 4; Numb, viii., 12.)

If an animal was required, it was to be slain by him who brought it. (Lev. i., 5, 11.)

If it was a fowl, it was to be slain by the priest. (Lev. i., 15.)

If it was to be offered "in behalf of the people at large, it was to be killed by the Levites. (Ezek. xlv., 10, 11.)

It was to be a male without blemish. (Lev. i., 3; xxii., 19.)

It was to be presented at the door of the tabernacle. (Lev. i., 3; Deut. xii., 6, 11, 14.)

The offering must be a voluntary one; not forcibly taken or grudgingly given. (Lev. i., 3; xxii., 19.)

It was to be entirely burned; no part of it was to be eaten by the priests. It was to be a whole burnt offering. (Lev. i., 8, 9, 12, 13; vi., 9.)

Its blood was to be sprinkled round about the altar. (Lev. i., 15.)

If a bird, its blood was to be wrung out at the foot of the altar. (Lev. i., 15.)

The ashes was to be collected at the foot of the altar, and conveyed without the camp to a clean place. (Lev. vi., 11.)

The skin was to be given to the priest who offered the animal. (Lev. vii., 8.)

Every morning and evening a burnt offering was to be made. (Exod. xxix., 38-42.)

On every Sabbath day, in addition to the continual burnt offerings, two lambs of the first year were to be offered. (Numb, xxviii., 9, 10.)

On the first "day of every month they were to offer two young bullocks, and one ram, and seven lambs without spot, of the first year, as a burnt offering. (Numb, xxviii., 11.)

And on the feast of unleavened bread, and on the day of atonement, and at the consecration of priests and Levites. (Numb, xxviii., 19; Lev. xvi., 3, 5; ix., 2; Numb, viii., 12.) And also at the consecration of kings, the purification of women, at the dedication of sacred places, after great mercies, and before war.

The fat of all the peace offerings was laid on the altar and consumed with the burnt offerings. (Lev. iii., 5; vi., 12.)

The burnt offering, from its exalted position and prime importance, must be regarded as an eminent type of Christ, in the great work he has accomplished as an offering for sin. After the numerous offerings of the law, the Son comes to fill up the grand outline of the ceremonial types. He appears as the antitype of them all. "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." By the one offering which he has made, the true worshiper is now sanctified. The body of Jesus Christ was once offered without spot to God. Like the burnt offering, it was presented whole. It was a complete and exhaustless sacrifice; nothing was wanting, nothing withheld. He came to fulfill all the requirements of the law. His meat and drink it was to do the will of him who sent him.

"Voluntarily," he gave himself up to the bitterness of death. He was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Others, have died by necessity, in fulfillment of the inexorable decree, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;" but his death was a voluntary act of obedience to God.

He was a man, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, the son of Mary, yet he did what no one else has ever done or can do—he always did the things which pleased his Father. His self-devotedness, his purity, his obedience, no one knew so well as his Father. His sacrifice was a "sweet savor unto God," as in all the burnt offerings.

There is much in the burnt offering of the law which needs to be considered. The books which contain them are a part of "the scriptures, profitable for doctrine," and "written aforetime for our learning." The diligent student of the Bible will find more in them than a dead ritual. There is hidden wisdom in them of the highest type, suggestive thoughts of the profoundest character. The whole alphabet of Christology is found there, which, when properly arranged, testifies of the Messiah, his sufferings, and the glory that shall follow.

The burnt offering is in type—"Christ, without spot," offering himself to God.

Under the law, "the burnt sacrifice of the herd was to be a male without blemish."

A man is said to be always greater than his acts. It is the altar that sanctifies the gift, not the gift the altar. The pure and spotless character and life of Jesus give dignity and value to his sacrifice. On this, as on an altar, chiefly, did the value of his offering consist. He was the Son of God, Immanuel, God with us. Nothing could exceed the value of that offering, which a person of such rank and dignity, such peerless excellence and princely power, could bestow. He was without blemish, even in the sight of God. How this one offering forever throws into the shade all the costly offerings made under the law!

2. Other sacrifices admitted of a female without blemish; but this

required "a male of the first year." In it there was to be no imperfection—no acknowledged or implied weakness. It was an offering wholly given to God, and expressly for his eye and heart. It was a transaction between God and the person who offered it. It pointed to the cross.

The eye and heart of man only contemplate the outward, the sensuous; but there are mysteries connected with the cross which only the mind of God comprehends. Any one who looks at that amazing Sight can see that, so far as the mighty Sufferer is concerned, he lost sight of every thing but the "will of his Father." "Not my will, but thine be done; Father, let this cup pass." His last act was the voluntary surrender of his spirit into the hands of God. It was wholly an affair between God and himself. His refusal to drink the stupefying draught presented him on the cross, shows how intensely he regarded the will of God as uppermost in his mind. He would do nothing that could impair the "voluntary" and intelligent offering he was now presenting to his Father. His piercing cry, "Why hast *thou* forsaken me," indicates the close relation in which he stood to the Father; and how, like the shadow of death in its darkest gloom, the withdrawal of that face was to him. We judge that it was only but for a moment, but the eclipse was more to him than if the universe had sunk in night and been reduced to chaos. It was the most awful period in the history of the cycles of eternity. It foreshadowed the doom of our race if we had been left without the blood of sacrifice; and gave to the innocent soul of Jesus a taste of the bitterness of that cup which all had been doomed to drink to its dregs, if he had refused it. The withdrawal of the Father's countenance left him for a moment, under "the hour of the power of darkness." It was the dreadful umbra of "the second death," more intense and awful than any that shall fall on the worst of offenders. It was then that he bare our sins in his own body on the cross. The chastisement by which our peace was effected was laid upon him. The weight of our guilt crushed him to death.

The cross of Christ was viewed by him in two aspects: one in relation to the Father, and the other in relation to our race. The will of God was to be done perfectly, and without any defect on the part of the Saviour; and the bearing away our sins in his own body was to be accomplished so fully, that the worshipers being cleansed should have no more consciousness of sin. Therefore his expression, "Lo, I come to do *thy* will, O God;" and also the reason why the apostle speaks of it as an act of obedience: "Obedient unto death, *even* the death of the cross." In the last aspect of the case—the sin-bearing office he sustained, his holy soul shrunk back as from the touch of pollution. "Father, let *this* cup pass from me; yet not my will, but thine be done." In both, as respects the Father and

the sins of the race, he was willing to do and to bear whatever the will of God and the necessities of the case required.

Never did the Son of God appear in the eyes of his Father in an attitude of such grace and loveliness as when he expired on the cross. It was "the savor of the burnt offering" filling the heaven of heavens with its divine fragrance. It was the infinite love of "the Only Begotten" unfolding its hidden riches to the eye—the all-searching eye of the Father. He saw down into the unfathomable depths of his mighty soul the purest, the brightest flame of undying affection and unshaken devotion to the will of God that was ever seen before or since. History furnishes no fact that even faintly illustrates this scene of unutterable tenderness, of dutiful affection, of intelligent obedience, of unswerving fidelity; and fiction, in its widest range of invention, is struck dumb in view of the heroism and grandeur of the dying scene of Calvary! It must stand alone in the history of the universe, as the most tender, touching, and impressive event ever known; and which will furnish the theme of all the songs in the ages of eternity: "Unto Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood be glory and dominion forever and ever."

It is this view of the cross which invests it with its deep interest in the mind of the enlightened Christian. His sins, indeed, are all washed away by the blood of the sin-offering, but in such a way as to throw around the cross the attractiveness and glory of the love of God, and the no less burning effulgence of his Son's. The one answering to that of the other.

On the cross you see that thorn-crowned head lying on the bosom of the Father! The throbbings of that sinless heart were answered back by the infinite tenderness of the all-pitying, all-loving Jehovah. The steady and onward step of devotion through floods of great waters and fires which consumed, filled him with admiration and exultant joy. It was as the shout of a great victory; the triumphal holocaust of the Lord of the universe for the greatest of all deliverances. It was the proof-perfect, and without spot, of the stern and unyielding confidence of the Son in the integrity and excellence of the will of God. It was the obedient Isaac, without an accepted lamb caught in the thicket. It was more than Abraham's joy; it was the joy of the Lord!

The offering of Christ was an act of obedience prompted by love. It was obedience made perfect through sufferings unparalleled. It astonished angels; never had they seen the innocent suffer; never had they seen such devotion and self-abnegation as this! No wonder that they desired to look into this deep mystery. They have wondered at it ever since. It passes their conception; it is to us a great deep.

It is from this elevated position we should contemplate the cross of

Christ, if we would rise in our conceptions to its amazing grandeur. The gospel finds its highest power over the human heart in this view of the subject, and furnishes the highest motives for obedience to him who bought us with his blood. "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other: truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven."

The supper on the first day of every week memorializes this "burnt offering," now, to us, changed into a peace offering. We eat of his flesh, and drink of his blood. Eat, O friends; drink, O beloved!

This view of the subject enables us to feel the force of many expressions found on the lips of the Saviour, which otherwise are but faintly understood: "Therefore doth my Father *love me*, because I lay down my life and take it again." "No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." "I delight to do thy will, O God." Thus "he humbled himself," "he made himself of no reputation." "He gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a *sweet smelling savor*."

His cross was the Red Sea of deliverance; the Thermopylae of the universe. His death, the great propitiation. God is well pleased with it. His nature, his moral government, his justice, his truth, are all satisfied. He stands acquitted, when he justifies the ungodly. The offering of Jesus is, not only accepted, but eternally approved. The ashes of this whole burnt offering is gathered up, and has been carried to "a clean place."

His death on the cross, and his humiliation, the Father says—It is enough. No act of dishonor will he permit beyond this hour. It must cease, and cease forever. The universe will be immolated rather than such love shall not be appreciated. Even neglect of his salvation finds no means of escape.

How carefully now he guards his "well-beloved!" He takes him forever into his holy keeping. He has now, by his heroic sacrifice, imperishable honors, and God will exalt him above the sons of men; above all the angels in the heaven of heavens. "Give the King thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness to the King's Son." "He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor." "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." "All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things, and blessed be his glorious name forever; and let the whole earth be filled with his glory."

OMICRON

How **LOVE**, if love the true world's map;  
 How **LOVE**, the true world's map;  
 How **LOVE**, the true world's map;  
 How **LOVE**, the true world's map;

How **LOVE**, and love in love's pure;  
 How **LOVE**, and love in love's pure;  
 How **LOVE**, and love in love's pure;  
 How **LOVE**, and love in love's pure;

ROMANUS ROMAN.

## A FONDNESS FOR THE MYSTERIOUS.

AN excessive fondness for the doubtful, the ambiguous, the mysterious, it will be readily admitted by the unprejudiced, is one of the leading features of sectarianism. The various self-styled rabbis of the various denominations of the present day glory in this, as their pulpit addresses, periodical productions, and theological works abundantly attest. Should any one feel disposed to test this matter, let him enter one of the so-called churches of this day, and sit down near by the sacred desk, so that the drippings of the sanctuary may not fail of their full force and effect. After having attended service for as many months as he may choose, and listened as candidly and attentively as possible, it will be out of his power to tell, from that which he has heard, what, according to the Christian Scriptures, is required of the sinner in order to the enjoyment of the remission of sins. There is such vagueness and indefiniteness in all that has been said as not to present even the dim outlines of the beauty, order, and harmony of the great and beneficent plan of salvation. Usually is it the case, that, when reference is made to the pardon of sins, one portion of Scripture is denominated doubtful, another ambiguous, while a third is unhesitatingly pronounced too abstruse or mysterious for any to apprehend save the regenerated. Almost all kindred subjects touched are left veiled, or clouded to such an extent that the mind is fearfully bewildered—so greatly so, that, relief not being obtained, cold, lifeless, soulless, infidelity ensues. Especially are these statements veritable in regard to the orthodox view of conversion. How often is the sinner informed that he can have no difficulty in ascertaining that the darkest frowns of God are upon him, but that it is quite a difficult matter for him to know the time when he becomes a Christian; that the Scriptures teach him with infallible certainty when he is a servant of sin—when under condemnation, but speak with much dubiety as to the terms by which he is freed from sin, and becomes a servant of righteousness! The truth is, it has been proclaimed, *ad infinitum*, that there is great merit in doubting; so great, that it is itself a work of humility, of piety, of godliness.

According to orthodox parlance, it would be arrogant presumption for a person to say, I know I am a child of God; that must never, at any time, be whispered, whatever may be thought. It may be said, however, that I hope I have become a child of God; as if hope ever looked backward. A person must not know when he has passed from death unto life—when he is permitted to enjoy all the rich bless-

ings and immunities bestowed upon the faithful in Christ; but is allowed at least to lean for strength and support on a tolerably plausible inference or conjecture. All these vital matters ought in a degree to be doubtful, because, forsooth, there is much excellence in doubting. A person must be assured that he is in the kingdom of Satan, and times without number convicted of the fact that he is a wretched, miserable sinner, doomed to everlasting destruction; but it is not permitted him to see his way clearly under the glorious light of the Sun of Righteousness into the kingdom of Christ, or to know with definiteness when he has crossed the line which separates the one kingdom from the other. The orthodox preacher tells the sinner that if he will seek he will surely find. The sinner seeks, but finds not. The preacher with emphasis declares that he will find if he will only seek aright. Seeking again and finding not, the sinner begs: Show me how to seek, for I must find rest or I am undone. The preacher tells the poor mourning soul: Oh, any way will do, only be sure you are honest or sincere; forms and terms are nothing; in these minor matters all the evangelical churches differ slightly; but then honesty is the great thing. The sinner, rising up and walking away with tormenting doubts crowding round the mind, and with a soul bursting with anguish, never more returns to seek in the right or in the wrong way. Now, who is in fault? Who is responsible?

That the present version of the Bible is sufficiently intelligible to make wise unto salvation such as inquire with full purpose of heart is not to be questioned. That mistranslations abound in the Old and New Testaments the learned of all the sects admit. Nevertheless, it is claimed that many words, terms, and phrases, which fall far short of expressing the mind of the Spirit, ought to be retained. Especially is there one word in the New Testament which the sectarian world has resolutely determined shall not be molested—that word is baptism. Abstracted from its connections in the Scriptures, it does not certainly indicate any action at all. For example, it is reported that B was baptized by A, who can positively affirm, in view of the practice of the parties of the day, what was the action performed? One declares it was sprinkling, another pouring, still another that it was immersion. In all this there is much doubt and uncertainty. True, such ought not to be the case, nor would be, if the word *baptisma* was correctly translated. Yet such, is the state of things resulting from substituting man's word for God's word—from substituting an unmeaning, ambiguous, word for one which expresses with clearness and fidelity the mind of the Spirit. According to the authority of the most learned in lexicography and biblical criticism, the Greek word *baptisma* should be rendered immersion. This is its primary meaning. In this all agree. Sprinkling or pouring can not, by any



possibility, be a meaning of it. No argumentation is needed to prove that immersion is the correct rendering. But how much labor is required—how many pretentious, dogmatic, torturous arguments, attenuated as air—in attempting to establish, what never can by fair investigation be established, that baptisma may be translated sprinkling or pouring. The word baptism, which is beyond all cavil a non-translation, sectarianism loves. Not because it is an ordinance of Jesus Christ, or was placed by the Great Teacher with faith and repentance as a condition of the remission of sins; but because as to the meaning of this word the sects can parley, infer, conjecture, and dogmatize, can throw dust in the eyes of the people, and cry aloud—Ambiguity, uncertainty! In all this they glory, and hence will not for one moment consent that the word baptism be supplanted by a term, as to the meaning of which there could be no doubt, uncertainty, or strife, being sustained by the most reliable and venerated authority.

As to the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, the sects have never followed the guidance of the word of truth. They have drawn largely upon their imagination, and have wandered far into the devious and dusky labyrinths of the marvelous and the speculative. The so-called Christian world agree in this, that the Spirit operates in conversion through the word of God. The Spirit being the agent, the word the medium. But this is not proceeding far enough for all parties. A step or two must be taken in the dark. The hypothetical is resorted to, in order to gratify curiosity. A wise presumption is laid hold of, a sage inference is evolved, and the "baseless fabric of a vision" ranks equal to or above a divine warrant. Else all things are incomplete and unsatisfactory. It is inquired by an evangelical rabbi, in the true spirit of orthodoxy: "Has not God the power to convert the sinner by a direct influence of his Spirit? Does not the Spirit sometimes, under certain circumstances, operate in conversion without the word? May not this be the case? What hinders V I would respectfully remark, that what God has the power to do, or may do, in this matter, is not within the purview of legitimate inquiry. It is said, that "the secret things belong to the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever." Still, in the investigation of the influence of the Spirit in conversion, the sects, it would seem, demand something at least that will, not only smack largely of the language of Ashdod, but smell of the smoke of Babylon. Here mystery is invoked with as ardent devotion as poet ever wooed or courted fabled muse with. Without mystery there can be no exegesis; without mystery there can be no acceptable explication; without mystery orthodoxy is at once doubted; and the views propounded, whatever their character, are forthwith pronounced heretical, and must be rejected.

Ah! the truth is, and it need not be concealed, the mist and fog of Babylon are yet hanging on the so-called Christian world. Clouds and darkness are still encircling the land, and gross darkness still finds many a nook and corner in the minds of a misguided and deluded people. Perhaps there is no word half so sweet to the itching ear of the real partisan as that of mystery, and none that fills so admirably the vast domes and corridors of the great sectarian establishment as that of mystery. It is the key-note in each swelling anthem, the *te deum* of all their devotions, of the inner and the outer, the theoretic and the practical, life of genuine orthodoxy.

How often is the following passage quoted, in order to show that the work of the Spirit in conversion consists in some indescribable mystic influence, appreciable only by an exquisitely rapturous feeling: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." What is the Spirit in this passage represented as doing? As bearing witness or testimony. It is hence a witness. Is it the only witness here spoken of? Not at all. "The Spirit itself bears witness *with our spirit*," etc. Suppose that A bears witness with B; would not the language, unqualified, clearly imply that the testimony of A and B had for its object the establishment of the same fact—that it was not in antagonism, but in perfect agreement? Surely this would be the conclusion of the unbiased. With reference to the establishment of what fact do "the Spirit itself" and "our spirit" bear witness? "*That we are the children of God.*" From the time we become the children of God until our departure in triumphant hope from this world do these witnesses confront the skeptic, the scoffer, and the infidel, attesting that we are what we profess to be—the children of God.

But in what way does the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, bear witness? It may here be inquired whether the Spirit is ever represented in the Scriptures as speaking. Numerous instances in proof of the Spirit speaking might be adduced. A few will suffice. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." "Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself to this chariot." "While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee; arise, therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing, for I have sent them."

Shall each word in the phrase, "the Spirit itself beareth witness," etc., be taken in its usual sense, or in an unusual sense? In searching the Scriptures, shall there be instituted a new law of interpretation, that party may be bolstered up? Certainly not. Shall words be taken in their commonly received acceptance? Shall they be al-

lowed to convey to us the same meaning they conveyed to those whom Christ and the apostles immediately addressed? If there be an occult meaning attached to the words of the living Oracles, why preach the word—why call on all to read, study, and ponder the sacred page? Unless the Scriptures, when correctly translated, are intelligible, at least in practical matters, we might as well cease our investigations and criticisms in order to arrive at the truth; might as well close forever the Book of books, and wander forth over this dreary wilderness "homeless, houseless, and couchless," groping our way down to the awful silence of the grave without one ray of light to gleam athwart our path, or one star of hope to beckon on to home and happiness beyond the cold river of death.

I would again ask, How are we to understand the Spirit's bearing witness? Let us see. Suppose a person enters court for the purpose of bearing witness, but his hands are folded, his lips are sealed, he utters not a word, nor does he dictate any thing to be put down for him. Can a person thus testify, thus bear witness? Do we so understand the matter? Assuredly we do not. Words must be employed, or something tantamount to words, or no testimony can be borne. For example, I am a child of God. Now when, according to the testimony of the Spirit, am I such? Let us one moment examine the evidence of the Spirit as to this fact. 1. The Spirit bears witness in the Christian Scriptures, that "without faith it is impossible to please him (*i. e.*, God); for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him; that whatsoever is not of faith is sin." 2. That "God commands all men everywhere to repent," etc. 3. That having confessed faith in Jesus Christ, the believing penitent shall go down into the water and be immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Those who believed on a certain occasion were thus addressed: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift the Holy Spirit."

Again: hear the language of the Spirit: "For you are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." These are the conditions of pardon laid down by the Spirit of God. Have I complied with them or not? If I answer in the affirmative, I am a child of God. What is the testimony of my spirit? 1. That with my whole heart I have cordially believed in Jesus Christ; not coldly and indifferently, but with the warmest love and the most abiding confidence have I received him as my Prophet, Priest, and King—as my Saviour—as my only hope. 2. That I have repented of my sins; that whatever of trial, or difficulty, or peril, or suffering, or persecution may befall me, I will henceforth live to God; that the fascinations and pleasures

of a world lying in wickedness shall never more lead me astray, having set my face Zion-ward, thither will I direct my footsteps. 3. That not one doubt flitting across my mind as to the Messiahship of the Son of God, before men, angels, and God, having made the good confession, I went down a penitent believer into the water and was immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, calling on the name of the Lord, trusting with the fullest confidence that all the blessings connected with this divine institution would be richly bestowed upon me. Conscious of having in good faith, and in strict accordance with the law of remission, submitted to the prescribed terms, I have a certain conviction that I am pardoned of all past sins; that I am a child of God, inasmuch as I have complied with the terms by which the Spirit has determined I should become such. Is not this evidence of adoption into the family of God, based as it is on the word of God, far more satisfactory than that which arises from the mere ebullition of feeling, which is blind? Feeling is not ranked by the Great Teacher, or the executors of his will, as one of the terms of pardon; of having passed from death unto life. True, the Christian will ever feel much and deeply; yet neither is feeling an exponent of the soundness of views, nor of correctness of action. God's word must ever stand far above all feelings. In all matters pertaining to adoption into the family of God, and of that service due from the subject to the great King, must the living Oracles decide. That decision must be final. From it there can of right be no appeal. Human wisdom and human authority must yield to the wisdom and authority of Him who spake as never man spake, and in whom centre all power and authority in heaven and on earth.

I close this article with the following: 1. I charge sectarianism with rendering mysterious that which is clearly revealed in the word of God; with veiling in mist and darkness that which is of a practical character, and necessarily plain.

2. With an excessive fondness for the metaphysical and speculative in things not revealed in the Scriptures; with an over weaning predilection to go beyond the limits of lawful investigation, and look after airy abstractions, which can in no way benefit the human family.

3. With an excessive fondness for those words and phrases in the Scriptures which the impartial and the learned have long since decided to be unfaithful renderings of the original Greek.

4. With delighting in the spiritual armorial of Babylon; with imitating antichrist, whose very name is mystery, who rose in mystery, grew in mystery, flourished in mystery, has ever gloried in mystery, and quakes as an aspen at the wide-spread diffusion of knowledge.

5. In Europe, especially in Germany, Christianity has been frittered down to a myth. Transcendentalism and neology have triumphed in

many places over that faith once delivered to the saints. Here is rank infidelity in the guise of Christianity. Its marrow and fatness consists in doubting, in hoodwinking the truth, and offering in lieu thereof a false philosophy, false laws of interpretation, false views of the revelation of God to man, and in reveling with fiendish glee in dreamy, sensuous, senseless whims.

BENTLEY.

---

ORTHODOXY AND HERESY. —The great division among Christians is about opinions. Every sect has its set of them, and that is called Orthodoxy; and he that professes his assent to them, though with an implicit faith, and without examining, is orthodox, and in the way to salvation. But if he examines, and thereupon questions any one of them, he is presently suspected of heresy; and if he oppose them or hold the contrary, he is presently condemned as in a damnable error, and in the sure way to perdition. Of this, one may say, that there is, nor can be, nothing more wrong. For he that examines, and, upon a fair examination, embraces an error for a truth, has done his duty more than he who embraces the profession (for the truths, themselves, he does not embrace) of the truth without having examined whether it be true or no. And he that has done his duty according to the best of his ability, is certainly more in the way to heaven than he who has done nothing of it. For if it be our duty to search after truth, he certainly that has searched after it, though he has not found it, in some points has paid a more acceptable obedience to the will of his Maker than he that has not searched at all, but professes to have found truth, when he has neither searched nor found it. For he that takes up the opinions of any church in the lump, without examining them, has truly neither searched after nor found truth, but has only found those that he thinks have found truth, and so receives what they say with an implicit faith, and so pays them the homage that is due only to God, who can not be deceived, nor deceive. In this way the several churches (in which, as one may observe, opinions are preferred to life, and orthodoxy is that which they are concerned for and not morals) put the terms of salvation on that which the author of our salvation does not put them in. The believing of a collection of certain propositions, which are called and esteemed fundamental articles, because it has pleased the compilers to put them into their confessions of faith, is made the condition of salvation.

LOCKE.

## PROFESSOR STUART—MILLENNIAL ITEMS.

It is well known, no doubt, to many of our readers that Prof. Stuart has written one of the most learned and elaborate treatises in print on the Book of Revelation. As a critic he stands justly high. He is ordinarily minute, careful, and fair; at times artificial, and obviously weak in the use of affected and pedantic words. In collecting and arraying facts we think him excelled by but few authors; while in drawing conclusions he is, at times, singularly unsafe. In places, his works are not deficient in powerful condensation; though it is to be regretted that now and then they too minutely imitate the Germanic fashion, which, of course, is to write a thousand pages to evince how psychology and the inner consciousness detect and unfold into pleonastic development the differential functions in the essences of *be-ba* and *ba-be*. That we silly folks, who speak homely English, should see no sense in all this, is certainly the very thing expected; and surely nothing can be more natural, unless it is our mindless grin at what Teutonic astuteness alone can comprehend—the wisdom of being foggy.

We shall take the liberty of making a few extracts from Prof. Stuart's work, as they will afford food for the reader's thought, and allow us, at the same time, an opportunity of offering a few further suggestions on some difficult items connected with the millennium.

*Gog and Magog.* On which the Professor thus speaks: "It should be noted, before we dismiss this topic, that the use made of Gog and Magog, in the Apocalypse, is somewhat different from that in Ezekiel xxxviii., xxxix. In the prophet, Gog is considered as the prince of the land of Magog, who also holds in subjection Meshech and Tubal; but, in the Apocalypse, Gog and Magog both are *nations*, or at least countries which are the representatives of nations. In the same light as John, the Arabians, Syrians, and other nations have regarded them. At any rate, the departure from Ezekiel, in this respect, while it is quite unimportant as to the principal meaning of the passage, is yet of such a character as to show that John thought and acted for himself.

" The passages both in Ezekiel and John, which have respect to Gog and Magog, are not, it would seem, to be considered merely as *mythic*. We have abundant and undoubted evidence that in ancient times there were actual Caucasian hordes distinguished by the names in question, and that they were a formidable reality. But that Ezekiel, in his prophecy, meant to be understood as predicting the invasion of Palestine by Gog and Magog, in the *literal* sense, is hardly credi-

ble. He uses these names to designate distant and savage nations; and, in the same way, John employs them. Just in the same manner we now employ the word *barbarians*.

"I can not doubt, after long and often repeated investigation, that Ezekiel has the same general aim in view as John, and designs briefly to disclose the *distant future* of the church, in the latter part of her Messianic days. Considered in this way, the two writers cast great light upon each other. That both should employ these names in a *tropical* way, is no more strange than that we should employ the words Scythian, Tartar, Indian, etc., in the same manner. Understood in this way, there is no special difficulty attending the exegesis of either author: while the literal sense involves us in meshes from which our feet can not be extricated. Nothing could be more natural than for Ezekiel, who lived in Mesopotamia, to speak of Gog and Magog, since they were the formidable enemies of all that region; and that John, writing on the same subject, should retain the same names, was equally natural." (Vol. II., p. 367.)

The best view we have been enabled to form of these difficult terms is, that Gog, which was originally a proper name, came, in the lapse of time, to be used as a term of office, denoting a prince or ruler; while the term Magog, which was also, a proper name, came to denote the country or people of the Gog. From this, and from what seems to have been the fierce and savage nature of this prince and people, or, more probably, line of princes, the terms ultimately became general names for any cruel, warlike ruler and his subjects. This, in the main, is also the view of Prof. Stuart. But to print the terms with initial capitals, as though now the names of any particular prince and people, or as though derived from, such, we think an obvious error, and one which has contributed no little to perplex them. They should clearly be written simply gog and magog.

But who are the gog and the magog of Rev. xx., 8? On the question Prof. Stuart thus speaks: "Here, then, are nations accessible to the wiles of Satan; nations who live beyond the boundaries of the great empire which has so long been under the peaceful reign of the Messiah. They live, as we express it in common parlance, *out of the world, i. e.,* out of the great civilized and christianized world, or in the *four corners of the earth*. Of course the earth is here, as throughout the Scriptures, conceived of as an extended plain, the four corners of which are the most remote from the centre; and the centre, moreover, is regarded as the *holy city*. Their number, too, is great, *like the sand of the sea*. Not an intimation is given that they become *apostates* from a former profession of Christianity, or that Christianity had ever spread among them. Every thing in the description wears the appearance of a meaning the reverse of this. Satan does not *deceive the elect* in this case, but leads astray those who had

never been converted to the Christian faith. That this is so, appears from the face of the narrative; for how comes it that Satan finds no access to men anywhere, except in *the four corners of the earth*? Had those living there been Christians, like the rest of men, what reason can be given why they should, all at once, and in such immense numbers, be seduced from their Christian allegiance while no inroads are anywhere else made upon the domains of Christianity? I see no way in which this question can be satisfactorily answered." (p. 363.)

Now that the nations of the four corners of the earth constitute the true gog and magog of the passage in hand, hardly admits of a doubt. The nations are not one thing; and the gog and magog a different thing. The nations and the gog and the magog are the same. The term nations merely denotes without describing, while the other terms are strictly descriptive. Just as Paul, the Apostle, are two names for the same person; so gog and magog is one designation, and nations, another, for the same countless host of human beings. In translating the passage both these words should be preceded by the article as they are in the Greek. The whole might be rendered very clear thus: And when the thousand years are ended, Satan shall be released from his prison, and will go out to deceive the nations who are in the four corners of the earth, who are the gog and the magog, to collect them together for battle the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.

But who are these nations? This question it seems to me Prof. Stuart strangely misapprehends. He evidently regards these nations as being peoples who live in the remote parts of the earth in the last days of the present state of the church. In this we think him completely mistaken. In the first place, the expression, the four corners of the earth, does not necessarily mean what he holds it to mean, exclusive remoteness. It is a popular expression, inaccurate in fact, but with a well-defined meaning in the sense in which John uses it. If we conceive of the earth as a vast plain with four corners, and ourselves as standing in the centre, then the expression, the four corners, includes the whole of this plain from the centre to its remotest bounds, and not exclusively these bounds. We ourselves use the same expression, and speak of all who dwell in the four quarters of the globe, by which we clearly mean the whole human

In the second place, these are not nations who live in the last days of the present church-state; but nations who live at the end of the thousand years, that is, at the close of the millennium, which is the time when Satan is to be released from prison. Neither are they nations who live through or during the millennium, crowded back into the parts of the earth remote from the camp of the saints. Both



these views are, we think, without the slightest foundation. On the contrary, *these nations are the wicked inhabitants of earth, raised in the second resurrection.* At the moment of Satan's release the wicked dead will all be raised. This resurrection will include none of the righteous. It will embrace only the wicked. These wicked now raised constitute the gog and magog of John—the nations of the four corners of the earth, whom Satan goes out to deceive. They are his old subjects, the dupes of his fearful power, and comprehend every unransomed soul of man. These he goes out to collect together for battle—for a last decisive struggle, a struggle which in our opinion, will immediately succeed the millennium and immediately precede the judgment. Such, in short, is our view of the gog and magog of John.

The following passage from the Professor's book presents to our mind a strange medley of sense and nonsense, truth and error. It would certainly be improper to accuse him of having written it hastily; yet we can not but feel that it bears marks of immaturity.

"As to the notion of a *descent to the earth* by Christ and the martyrs, and their *visible* reign here, there is not a word in the text, nor even an implication; at least I can find none. What a gross conception it would be, to mingle *celestial* and *terrestrial* beings in one common mass! The glorified Saviour, and the glorified martyrs, mingling with material and perishable beings, and becoming subject again to the laws of matter! If it be said, that the earth is itself to be changed entirely, at the beginning of the millennium, and to be fitted by this change for the abode of such glorious beings raised from the dead; where then, I ask, are gog and magog to live during this period, and nurture their hosts 'like the sands of the sea for multitude!' And other men—are they still *mortal* beings, or not? If they are, then a *material* world, however Eden-like, is their place of residence; for flesh and blood can inhabit no world of a different character. How, then, are the glorious Saviour and the glorified martyrs literally to mingle and commune with material and fleshly and perishable beings? The thing is impossible, because it is against the fundamental law of our spiritual nature. If it were not impossible, moreover, still it is utterly improbable, on any ground, that the triumph and exaltation of the martyrs are to consist in their being sent back to the earth, in order to resume a terrestrial existence, surrounded with sufferings and sorrows. Besides all this, there is not a word from the Apocalypstist, as yet, respecting the so much talked of *renovation* of the earth. It is only at the period of the general judgment, that this renovation takes place. (Rev. xxi., 1 seq.) The *material* worlds pass away when this judgment comes; *but not before.* It follows, then, that the idea of *spiritual* beings, as descending from the heavenly world to this, and spending a thousand years in a *ma-*

terial world whose organization is not substantially changed, can have no foundation but in the phantasy of the brain. It is as incongruous as to say that God has material eyes, hands, and other organs of sense." (p. 361.)

1. "As to the notion of a *descent to the earth* by Christ and the martyrs, and their *visible* reign here, there is not a word in the text, nor even an implication; at least I can find none."

Now all this may be said of the *present* text; and yet the descent of Christ to the earth and his personal reign here with the glorified saints may be true. Even allowing that it is not taught in the *present* text; still it may be, and, as we believe, actually is in others. The Professor's assertion has in it this which we think unfair: it may be true as to the present text, yet false as to others, and hence should not have been made without qualification. That Christ is to descend to earth a second time literally and personally, is as indisputable as it is that he literally and personally ascended. The Scriptures assert both in the same plain, unfigurative language: "Men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." This language admits of but one interpretation—a *literal personal descent*.

Further: that this descent and the resurrection of the just, which is the first resurrection, will be simultaneous, that is, occur at the same time, is equally certain. On this point the following passage is decisive: "For the Lord *himself* shall *descend* from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; *and the dead in Christ shall rise first*." This resurrection will include all the righteous; the wicked dead being left unraised till the end of the thousand years. At the same time that all the righteous dead are raised, the righteous living will be changed, so that both, in the same instant, will be rendered alike perfect. "Behold, I show you a mystery," says Paul, "we shall not all sleep," that is, not all die, "*but we shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, *at the last trump*." Here now are three events, real and literal, all happening at the same instant—the descent of Christ, the resurrection of the pious dead, the change of the pious living. Immediately on the happening of these, and before the Saviour reaches the earth, both the raised and the changed are to be caught up in the clouds into the air to meet him. They are not, however, caught away from earth forever, but only temporarily to meet the Lord, who has not yet fully descended. Now, as the saints are after this to be forever with the Lord, and as the Lord is obviously on his return to the earth, it seems to me a necessary implication that the saints return with him to it. Again: indisputably at the end of the thousand years, the saints are all on the earth in the camp and the beloved city; for Satan and the

wicked hosts of the second resurrection come up on the "*breadth of the earth*," and encompass them there. And this, since the Saviour is now to be ever with them, would seem necessarily to imply that he himself is on earth in the city. Now where the saints will be at the end of the thousand years is, we conclude, where they have been during the thousand years, that is, on the earth with the Saviour. This seems to be making out a case, surely not free from difficulty, but still to such a degree probable as not to be contemptible.

2. "What a gross conception it would be, to mingle celestial and terrestrial beings in one common mass! The glorified Saviour and the glorified martyrs mingling with material and perishable beings, and becoming subject again to the laws of matter!"

The conception may be very gross, and we shall not deny that it is; but since the conception is wholly false, its character is a matter not worth a moment's thought. Still it is precisely the conception which they are compelled to accept who insist that during the millennium the wicked will still be left living on the earth. For, that the righteous will during that time live on it, is, we think, simply certain. A millennium spent in heaven or anywhere else than on earth is not the millennium of which the Bible speaks. It is an imagination. The millennium of John is clearly a period computed for earth, and having exclusive reference to it. So at least it seems to us. There is hence no necessity for supposing that the perfected saints and the wicked will promiscuously, or in any other way, mingle together during that time. The hypothesis is not curs, neither is it true; hence the incongruous commingling of which mention is made is something for which we are not responsible.

3. "It follows, then, that the idea of *spiritual* beings as descending from the heavenly world to this, and spending a thousand years in a *material* world whose organization is not substantially changed, can have no foundation but in the phantasy of the brain. It is as incongruous as to say that God has material eyes, hands, and other organs of sense."

The first point in this extract which strikes us as being deficient in proof is that which assumes that if any beings are to inhabit this earth during the millennium, they are to be descended from the heavenly world. Should it not rather be first shown that the saints ever ascend to the heavenly world? We shall certainly not deny it; but still must say that we lack the proof of the fact. The Saviour himself immediately after his death did not ascend to heaven. For the truth of this we have his own language. On the contrary he entered the unseen abode of the spirits of all flesh; in which, it appears, is an apartment called paradise, into which he entered and dwelt during the time he was out of the body. With him into this unseen abode also entered the penitent thief. Here, as we conceive, the Saviour

met all the spirits of the just from Abel down. With them he spent in free, glorious fellowship the time of absence from the body. Where the Saviour and the penitent thief went, all the pious go; and where the Saviour left them, there they are to this day. Where the paradise of the unseen is, we do not pretend to know. Only we think it can safely be said not to be in the heaven in which the Father dwells. It is the popular belief, I know, that as soon as a man dies he goes immediately into the very presence of God. How well founded this belief may be I shall not undertake to say; but sure I am that its proof is not equal to the confidence with which many hold it. The true view seems to me to be this: as soon as the spirit of a pious man leaves the body, it goes at once into paradise in the unseen. Here the intercourse with the Father and the Saviour is perfect; but still not such as to imply immediate presence. In paradise these spirits remain till the morning of the first resurrection. Then they enter their spiritual bodies; and after being caught up to meet the Lord in the air on his way to earth, they return, and here dwell with him in proper person. This view, however, is not dogmatically affirmed, but submitted only as problematic and likely. We certainly shall not deny that passages exist which seem to warrant a conclusion in some features different. Yet on the whole, we think the view just suggested encumbered with fewer difficulties than any other.

Again: the notion which some men, and Prof. Stuart among them, seem to have of spirits and spiritual beings, and the conclusions they deduce from it, lack all the connection of premise and warrantable conclusion. Does Prof. Stuart know what a spirit is? He certainly does not, or did not when he wrote his book. Does he know what a *spiritual* being is, such as man is hereafter to be? The same answer must be given. How, then, can he pretend to see any thing repugnant or incongruous in the idea that man in his perfect state, or state of his spiritual body, is to dwell on earth even in its present condition? I confess I do not see it. Could the earth in its present condition affect man in that state? If so, then it seems to me that it is Prof. Stuart himself who holds the fantastic notion which would subject spiritual beings to *material* regulations. With me a *spiritual* being, such as man will be in his spiritual body, is precisely the being who rises so high above mere materialities as to be wholly unaffected by the present state of the earth. Hence he can dwell here just as well as in heaven itself proper. What is there here even at present to make this an unfit abode for beings in spiritual bodies? Is it the cold—the heat—or what? If so, then they are still subject to the operation of material laws, and hence are the very degraded beings which Prof. Stuart seems to think they can not be. But if they are not affected by climate, nor by any other purely physical or material feature in the present condition of the earth, how can the earth

be an unfit abode for them? In that view, the earth ought to be, and would be for aught we can see to the contrary, just as suitable a home for them as even the highest heaven itself.

Man in his perfect state is not to be a spirit. Then he will have a body no less than now; only that body will be spiritual. It will not be spirit, but simply spiritual. What a spiritual body is we certainly do not know, but still it is a body. Now since man is, in that state, to dwell in a body as well as now, why should it seem strange to Prof. Stuart or any one else that he should then need a material world to live in? Does not the very fact of a body create the necessity for a bodily state of existence, and hence a material state or world? Again: the assumed repugnance between spiritual beings and a material world seems to me to be hastily and very ill conceived. The glorious Word himself not merely dwelt in a material world, but even in a material body. And human spirits dwell in both. Where, then, is the repugnance? The truth is, the assumption is not only groundless, but is based on our acknowledged complete ignorance of

the nature of spiritual beings. Until we know what these are, and the modes and conditions of their existence, we are not prepared to affirm that it is incongruous for them to dwell in a material world.

Further: how do we know but that the change which is to occur in the just at their resurrection is the very and the only thing essential to constitute this world a fit abode for them? We are always assuming that whatever is wrong is necessarily in the world, whereas it seems to me quite as rational to assume that the very reverse is true, and that the wrong is in man and not in the world. Should this be the case, when man is changed, the world will be at least not an unsuitable dwelling-place for him. Still, that, on some ground and for some purpose, a change in the world is necessary, we know from the fact that one is to take place; but on what ground or for what purpose, we can not say. Surely it can not be on the ground that spiritual beings will be unable to dwell in a material world; for even after the world is changed, it will still be material.

But that spiritual beings should dwell on the earth in its unchanged state is as incongruous as to represent God as having material eyes, hands, etc. So thinks our author. Now since God is *spirit* and not matter, we shall certainly not commit the silly blunder of representing him as having *material* eyes and hands. But while we are far from doing this, we respectfully submit to the independent thinker only, whether his conception of God is much exalted by representing him as wholly formless. Is there any thing inconsistent with the truest conception of a spirit in supposing it to have shape? I at least can not think it. I can no more conceive of God as shapeless than I can conceive of him as without a heaven in which he dwells.

Surely in assuming that he has form, we assume nothing inconsistent with any one of his infinite attributes, as wisdom, power, eternity. Is it essential to the true notion of God that we shall conceive of him as being as formless as the ether we breathe? I can not see how this can exalt him. Besides, he created man in his own *likeness*; and Adam begat a son in his own *likeness*. The word is the same in the original Hebrew. If Adam's son looked *like* Adam; then must I conclude that Adam when first made looked *like* his Creator. I have neither the means nor the power of thinking or reasoning otherwise. To some who perfectly know that God has no form, this, of course, will seem very foolish; but their superior knowledge will only enable them the more readily to overlook our childish notions. Besides, from a little boy it has always run in my head that when the Saviour said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he meant something level to the sense of plain people. But in this we may be wrong. We can not, however, but feel that man, though immeasurably fallen, still carries in his face, as in a broken mirror, the likeness of his glorious original. Whence, we should like to ask, originated the conception of the mould in which the first human face was cast? Who or what furnished the type? All beings in heaven and in earth wear it. From the seraph on high to the frail infant of a moment; from the eagle above the clouds to leviathan in the deep—all creatures, mortal and immortal, are impressed more or less accurately, yet perceptibly, with that same grand likeness. Would it not be strange if the expression, "let us make man in our image, after our *likeness*," should contain the hint which leads to the solution? The question is curious and susceptible of wonderful expansion, but we shall speculate no more on the point.

To me the hope that perfected man shall forever dwell on the present earth unchanged and changed is one of the most enchanting that can fill the heart. Even in its unchanged condition I can not feel it to be the incongruous abode which Prof. Stuart appears to think it is. What feature in it, pray, makes it that abode? Is it its fickle, inconstant climate? But that climate can not affect man in a perfect state. Besides that climate results from the operation of the laws of the great, infinite will. Now to man perfected, with his powers of intelligence so vastly increased, it will surely be a chief pleasure to contemplate and know these laws in their marvelous complexity and accurately following results. To inspect them in their wondrous workings, to understand their curious combinations, and to compute their results, as we do the signs and quantities in a long algebraic solution, can certainly be no mean employment even for perfect beings. Climate, then, it seems to me, can be no drawback to earth as a future suitable home for ransomed man. Take the petals of a flower, a drop of water, the wing of a delicate insect, and

place them in the focus of a powerful microscope. What wonders they reveal! Now when all material nature can be examined thus; and all the results of that vast examination can be treasured in a perfect memory, so that not one shall be lost, I can not see why man should sigh for another world than this, The wish to know the world in which he has lived so long, and lived in ignorance so profound, ought, it would appear, to constitute one of the most absorbing passions of perfect human breasts. Only thereby shall we ever be enabled to know the abounding and varied provisions a merciful Father has made for us, and our own deep unworthiness thereof by reason of sin. When we know as we are known, but never before, shall we know how little we now know, and into what a fearful night the fall has sunk us.

We know this earth is to pass away. Still before it goes, I confess to a strong desire to know more of it than I know at present. If it is to be a thing of memory, give me a thousand years to study it ere it evanishes. Before my feet touch that bright new world which yet is to be; give me one exhausting peep into the old wreck. I crave some deeper knowledge of the home in which I was born, before I pass on to spend eternity in the one which is to be. When I know what and where I am, I shall the better appreciate what and where I shall be.

Besides, the present earth in its present form has been the gloomy scene of Satan's triumphs over the frail, apostate children of God. Here have they followed his bad counsels, and been ensnared by his infernal hate. Here have they madly sinned against their God; here spilled each other's blood; here digged the graves of their kin; here heaved their sighs and shed their tears; here groaned beneath crime's great mountain burdens; and here still do they mourn and suffer. Now, Lord, grant me this, I pray, that before the present earth is blotted I may with ransomed feet press its bosom, and shout one wild, long, frantic shout of victory over my life-long foe. The grave in which this mortal form shall lie will one day be empty. Now this would please me much, to lock my arm in that of some boon preacher of the faith, here known, and loved, and worked with, and stand on that grave brink, and waving high my hand taunt it thus: Where now is thy victim, proud, covetous thing, where? Then some unseen band may fill it up; I shall be satisfied.

But whether our crude notions of the millennium shall ever be realized or not, of one thing we may rest assured—that there will be one; and that of all the possible millenniums, it will be the one best suited to us. In hope and trust, then, let us wait for it. Nay more, let us pray for it with a fervor which shall speed its dawning; for then only shall the petition be realized: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

## SUGGESTED TO OUR COLLEGES.

THAT we as a people now feel, and that we have for some time past felt, and keenly felt, the want of a numerous class of preachers among us, more thoroughly educated than any we now have, is something which few of our best informed brethren will deny. And when we thus speak let us be distinctly understood. We are not about to advocate the policy of having a ministry composed exclusively of educated men. Very far from it. We believe in no such policy; hence, we have not one word to say in its defense. We certainly wish all our preachers were educated, and highly, so; but we are far from thinking that they should be sent out of the field because they are not. We confess we are far from seeing, how a want of education can constitute a qualification for preaching the gospel; and we think that no one else can see it. Unquestionably many uneducated brethren preach well; but this is not because they are uneducated. The truth is, they preach well despite of their uneducation, and not because of it. They rise above their misfortune, and become superior to it; but this makes it none the less a misfortune. Had those uneducated brethren who preach well been highly educated, few persons will say that they could not have preached better. Indeed many a man who is now ordinary would, in that event, have been commanding; while many a one who is now commanding would have been unsurpassed. Had John Smith, Samuel Rogers, and George W. Longan been thoroughly educated when young men, instead of the three justly popular and eminently useful men they are, we should now have in them one of the finest reasoners, one of the most thrilling orators, and one of the most accomplished writers this or any other age has produced. No one who is just to truth can fail to lament the fact that these brethren were not made the peers of Bro. Campbell by their early training. Had such been the case, instead of a single Christian Baptist, a single Millennial Harbinger, what now might we not have had? A score of volumes rich in the rarest wit, the highest rhetoric, and the finest Addisonian literature, might have graced our scanty libraries. While we sincerely wish that all such men enjoyed the benefit of the "highest classic education, we know well that it will never be the case. But for this reason shall they be silent in time to come? Never. Our motto is—Let them preach. We will honor them for what they are, and what they do; but not set them aside for what they are not. We hope never to see the sentiment become prevalent in our ranks, that a man is not to preach unless educated. And we equally hope never to see the time come when the educated preachers shall be looked upon with



envy and distrust because educated. We have a sour-hearted do-tard or two in our midst, who have been trying to give currency to the vulgar notion. We trust it will go as unheeded and die as unwept as its authors deserve to do.

But how shall the deficiency of which we complain be remedied? and the class of preachers of which we speak be provided? It is in view of these questions that the suggestions herein following are submitted.

We propose, then, the creation of a new and distinct professorship in our colleges. This professorship, of course, we would have well endowed, as a first preliminary step. We would make it *sui generis*, that is to say, peculiar in its nature and objects, and different from any thing of the sort of which we have any knowledge. We would create it for the especial benefit of such young men as might have the leisure and the desire for the kind and degree of education for which we would provide. In this school we would have taught, and thoroughly taught, first, the Hebrew of the Old Testament. This we would have taught, not merely for the sake of imparting a knowledge of that language, but for the sake of the sense of that Book. We would have the whole of the Old Testament read and studied in the Hebrew. We would have the Book, as a text book, exhausted both as to its meaning and its dialect. We would have the student made minutely and critically acquainted with the language as a language—with its structure, its peculiarities, its laws, in a word, with everything essential to a masterly use and exegesis of it. We feel that we transcend no bounds of moderation, when we say that the importance to us of the knowledge and men we here speak of, can not be exaggerated. Our peculiar profession is, that we are the people of the Book. Let us, then, know it all; and that we may know it all, let us have all the means of knowing it.

Next, in this school, we would have thoroughly taught the Septuagint. As bearing on the New Testament, no book is of more value to the accomplished preacher than this. Its peculiar value lies not so much in its matter, as in its modes of expressing its matter. Its language is the same as that of the New Testament; it is a book with which the New Testament writers were not unfamiliar; hence, a thorough acquaintance with all its lingual characteristics could not fail to be of the highest importance in questions of explication. The Hebrew Bible, of course, would be relied on as to matter, but the Septuagint, as showing how the supple dialect of the Greeks was used in giving expression to the things of the Spirit. Again: laws of interpretation could be much more successfully evolved, settled, and illustrated by the use of the Septuagint than by the use of the New Testament. In the case of the latter, the sense is **always** interfering; in the case of the former, this would not be. And **where** laws of interpretation are being evolved, the less the sense **interferes** the better; for where the sense is allowed to interfere, the great danger is that rules will become special, narrow, and unsafe.

But the great master-study of this school we would make the **Greek** New Testament. All knowledge we would subordinate to this; and all other studies we would prosecute for the sake of studying **this**. This should be the great daily labor of the department. Its language should be profoundly studied for the sake of the sense; and its sense

for the sake of the more successful presentation of it to the world. Here knowledge should be minute, accurate, complete. Neither law nor exception should be left unmastered. Exposition should be required, and translations in writing demanded, until it became clear that the student was an adept in the science and use of sacred criticism. In brief, the great object of the school should be to send out a class of preachers critically and profoundly acquainted with the whole word of God. The advantages of all this to the cause of Christ, and to the human family, it would be difficult indeed to enumerate. Still some of them are so obvious that we shall attempt to state a few of

1. The great fear arising from educated men is, that they will turn untrue expounders of the word of God, and so become dangerous to the cause of Christ. In the school now proposed this could, in a good degree, be guarded against. Whether a young man was sound in mind, sound in heart, and a safe interpreter of the truth, or not, would here most certainly appear. Accordingly he should or should not be allowed to graduate. Soundness in the faith, and a true, well-balanced mind should be made primary tests.

2. A class of men would thus be created whose social and intellectual position would bring them into contact with the first scholars of the world. A channel of usefulness would thus be opened up, which, previous to this time, has been nearly closed to us.

3. We should at once begin to produce an order of literature which would quickly find its way to the great centres of learning of the world. Our works on sacred criticism and interpretation would command the attention and respect of scholars of every land. Thus would another means of usefulness of unsurpassed importance be rendered subservient to the gospel.

4. We should then be enabled to cope with the learning of the whole combined sectarian world in defense of the truth. Our offensive war on error would be as effectual as our defensive one against it now is. At present, we clearly lack the men to make those grand advances which the cause of truth at times demands.

5. From the learning of these men our uneducated preachers would derive a power which would most materially add to their success. The achievements of the former would be reproduced by the latter to the infinite interest of the truth. Here, especially, would the advantage of the few become the advantage of the many.

6. We could then make the translation and dissemination of the Holy Scriptures our peculiar province. On this depends our ultimate success. No expense or labor should be spared that will enable us to accomplish it.

Such are a few of the results which would follow from the proposed school. I need not add, surely, that the chair in it should be filled by a man eminent for his soundness in the faith, and in all other respects fitted for the task. It would be difficult to find him.

To Bethany College and Kentucky University especially do we commend the preceding suggestion. These institutions have constantly evinced the highest interest in the preparation of young men for the ministry. Hence, they are particularly named. But the suggestion is not designed to be exclusive.

# LARD'S QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1865.

No. 3.

---

## CHRIST AS MEDIATOR.

THE mediatorship of Christ is a subject not treated of at length in the New Testament. It is introduced not elaborated. We must not, however, thence infer its unimportance. Few subjects possess a deeper meaning, not one a more important one. True, the brevity with which it is spoken of may leave it involved in no little obscurity; but this diminishes not its value. The richest pearls often lie buried at the greatest depth; while those mountain peaks which rise highest above the common level afford the grandest views of nature. We are persuaded that the subject can be shown to be something more than simply interesting. It has, we think, both a theoretic and practical value which deeply concerns the human family. Indeed no man can truly know his relation to God without a knowledge of it; yet not one in one hundred of Bible readers can be said to have even the most inadequate conception of it. We feel it to be highly necessary to call attention to it. Besides, many subjects lie round on its margin of great moment, which can be noticed in no light so profitably as in that of the subject now in hand. These shall come in for the attention due

The term mediator denotes a person who stands between two parties, acting for and in the interest of each and both. It denotes a mid-person or mid-actor—a *betweenster*. It does not necessarily imply that the parties are at variance; for in the ordinary affairs of life mediators are often employed where nothing of the sort exists. But ordinarily variance is implied, and in the Scriptures always. In the special case in hand the parties are respectively: God on the one hand, man on the other. Here, of course, the deepest offense exists, God being the offended party, man being the offending.

As soon as man had sinned against his Creator, immediate and sensible intercourse between them was brought to an end. Thus abruptly closed man's glorious fellowship with his divine Father. The event has never ceased since to fill earth with its gloom. It has dimmed our sight, and left all our hearts pierced and bleeding within our

guilty bosoms. Over all earth's facts it towers high in fearful proportions as the cause of grief and tears. Had the sun been blotted from his bright way, the moon extinguished, and all the stars commanded to leave heaven's grand cope—how tolerable would all this have been in comparison with the life-long shadows of the fall! When I think of them, it makes me weep like a babe. God never made man to be absent from his presence. He made him to live forever in the brightness of his own immediate smiles. Home is the place for the child, and God is the home of man. In his innocence and purity man talked with God, face to face, as a child with a loving parent. The Creator built him a garden and there visited him in the cool of the day. He gave him his first lessons, taught him his own celestial speech, heard him utter his first accents, and corrected his mistakes as familiarly as an earthly father does the prattle of his babe. The intercourse was most intimate, in a word, perfect. But sin brought on the separation. From that day no human being has been permitted to look on that bright original face. A broad way now lies between the Offended and the offender, over which man himself can not pass. God can no longer suffer him to approach him, can no longer suffer him in his own proper person to speak to him. He must speak now only in and by his mediator. To this great fact God trained the human family even from the fall. At first Adam acted as mediator for his family; subsequently other heads of families, for their descendants. But the mediation was not perfect. Adam could no more go into the immediate presence of the Father for his children than for himself. The intercourse was carried on rather through offerings than otherwise. Man laid his sacrifice on the altar; God accepted it, at first, the strong probability is, by some sensible token. Thus communion was kept up; and though it was of a most imperfect and unsatisfactory nature, still it was all that remained to the fallen; and even this remained not by right, but by favor. Sin, then, caused the separation between God and man; and thus laid the foundation for the whole system of mediation and mediators. But for sin the conception should never have entered our heads. Surely it is no crime to add: would that we had forever remained ignorant of the thought.

Though man had now sinned and forfeited all, still the Father determined not to abandon him. He determined that he Would visit him again—not then, but in the distant future; not in his own person, but in that of a perfect mediator. But who should be this mediator? Rather who could be he? We venture to think no deeper problem than this ever occupied the eternal mind. Not that it was difficult of solution to him, or cost him any effort. He can not be straitened in himself. But we thus speak of things because we suppose they would have been difficult to us. It is the peculiar glory of the divine Father

that he defeats the counsels of Satan, that he outplots him, and turns, at last, his wicked schemes to good account. Even out of sin good must ultimately arise. When, in the end, the account is footed up and the balance-sheet struck, more of honor must accrue to God from the fall than though there had been none. Even to man the good will be in excess over what it would have been had he kept his first estate. When God repairs a ruin, the second work as far exceeds the first as the infinite exceeds the finite. Clearly we can not see this now, but no obscure hints warrant it.

But who could be that mediator? Could an angel be? We must deny it. If such could have been the case, another being would not have been sought; for in the use of means God allows no redundancy. The fact that an angel was not used is proof that one would not have answered the purpose. On what ground or from what cause one would have proved unsuited or inadequate, we, of course, have no means of knowing. Still we feel justified, from the simple circumstance of non-use, in our inference. We may venture to jot down a few conjectures in the premises; but we must bear in mind that they are but conjectures.

A perfect mediator is one who perfectly and adequately represents both parties. In order to this he must be in perfect sympathy with both; and this requires identity with both as to nature, and sameness as to experience and circumstances. On these grounds an angel could never have been successful as mediator. Being as to nature created, and therefore, in that respect, not identical with the Father, and besides differing so vastly in experience and in circumstances, an angel must have failed. Not that he could not have brought with faultless accuracy the Father's messages to man, and borne those of man back again; not that he would not have been sufficiently guardful of the Father's honor and purity, not at all; for all this he might have been; but something more than this is necessary, as we deem, to perfect mediation. To mediate successfully for a party it would seem to be necessary to know him—know him in his nature, know him in his attributes, know him in all that is due him, know him in the countless ways and forms in which an offense may affect him. Here, then, even as to God an angel must have been incompetent. To represent God perfectly in an act of mediation, to do him full justice even up to the extreme of required points, it would seem to be necessary that a being should not only know him, but be in all respects his equal. For if in any respect he should fall below this, in that respect he might fail to take his interests sufficiently into account, and hence might do him injustice.

But the chief point, as it seems to us, in which an angel must have failed as mediator is in respect to man. In nature he may be man's equal, nay, even his superior. In this, then, he might be competent;

but as to sameness of experience and circumstances, it would be difficult even to conjecture his inadequacy. Can that lofty, unfallen spiritual being, who knows only what it is to be pure and do right, even allowing that his nature is forever of a glow with love—can he sympathize with man steeped in sin and fallen as he is? Hardly, we conjecture. To sympathize is *to suffer with*. Surely that high, calm nature can never suffer, much less suffer with the evil-doer. And, then, is he surrounded as man is surrounded? Does a great, treacherous foe lurk beside his path morning, noon, and night? Do trials without and trials within beset him? Do life-long temptations haunt him, which strain his powers of resistance till he screams with fear of falling? Do the verdict of his own judgment and the stings of his own conscience mingle ever with his waking thoughts, and even disquiet his dreams? If not, how could he sympathize with man? The thing is impossible, and being impossible he could never become the mediator we need. In all heaven there is no sympathy with man in the sense in which he needs it in a mediator, save in the person of his glorious Saviour. Here alone he has it as he needs it—without measure. We must, then, dismiss the thought that an angel could ever have answered as a perfect mediator.

But could not some pure and holy man have answered? Ah! when we speak of pure and holy men, we speak not absolutely, but relatively. There is none good, no not one. Compared with some men, others are holy; but who sufficiently so to go into the presence of God and act as mediator? A man might have possessed the requisite sympathy, and the circumstances of all are the same; but could he in an act of mediation have represented truly and done justice to the varied, complicated, and delicate interests of the Father? To ask the question is enough. While as to man he might have been better suited for a mediator than an angel, and doubtless would have been, yet as to God he would have been far less so. Indeed, as to the latter, we can not see that he possesses even one possible trait which could have fitted *him* for the momentous place. Besides, even the best of men need for themselves a mediator; and hence are in no condition to act in this capacity for others. A man, therefore, could never have served the purpose of mediator. We must hence look to some other being. But to what other being shall we look? God could not so act, for he is one of the parties in the affair; man could not so act, for he is the other party, and besides is utterly incompetent. An angel could not so act for the obvious want of qualification. To what being, then, we repeat, must we turn? The universe, at the time when the necessity for one arose, did not contain him. He was neither in heaven above, nor in earth beneath. He simply did not exist. The introduction of sin and the consequent fall were new events; and shall we add, at the time of their occurrence wholly

unprovided for, as well as for long years afterward, except in a shadowy and imperfect manner. These new events created a new emergency—the necessity for mediation; and this new emergency called for a new being to act therein, if not in all respects new, still certainly new. Who is this new being?

He is not the Word, but the being that the Word became. For the Word became incarnate, and dwelt among us; and this incarnate Word is the mediator. Moreover this mediator is a new being, *not creature*, if not essentially and wholly new, yet in fact, in name, and to the eye of faith, new. But let us first speak of the mediator in his Word-state, or in other terms, of the Word simply himself. On this subject we have from Holy Writ the following:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. \* \* \* And 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."

I need not stop to remind the reader that the term Word is simply a name, the name, however, of a glorious person, and doubtless a deeply significant name; but, if so, hiding both its meaning and its reason from us. It is not, however, the name by which our great Mediator is at present called, but the name which he bore in his antecedent state, that is, in his ante-flesh state. Let us carefully distinguish between the name and the Person named, and for a moment consider the latter.

We shall assume, and consequently not stop to argue, that in the expression, "the Word was God," the latter term, *i. e.*, God, or *Theos*, is expressive, not of personality, but of nature. In thus speaking we well know we assume a position hostile to the faith of many, but shall attempt no vindication here. We hence lay it down as truth that, as to nature, the Word and the Father were identical; and since the Father, as to nature, is spirit and eternal, that this therefore was the nature of the Word.

But in using the term nature we are using a dangerous term. Let us be understood. *God has no nature*. The term nature, from the Latin *nascor*, means that which is born or produced. Of nothing in or belonging to the Father can this be said. He is wholly eternal. Hence, in fact, we use the term nature, not to denote nature, but to denote that which is not nature. We use it, however, for want of a better term; and with the qualification here submitted it is harmless. Hence also of the Word, although we say that in his pure Word-state, he was, as to nature, identical with the Father, we yet mean

that in that state he possessed no nature. We use the term, however, of him precisely as we use it of the Father, and in the same sense. In that state, then, he possessed no nature; in this, however, he does. He now has a *body* as essentially nature as the fish of which he sometimes ate. But still further of the Word.

In the passage cited a little back, it is said of the Word: "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." This assertion is pregnant with sense, and furnishes a new ground of argument in relation to the Word. It affords us the opportunity of settling, by a new train of thought, a point which, though not new, is so purely inferential as to escape the notice of most readers. This point is settled by simple intuitions, and is hence indisputable. It is *the eternity of the Word*. We shall now proceed to draw it out.

*All things made were made by the Word.* This is our postulate, or point of set-out. Let us now assume, for the sake of argument merely and not as a fact, that the first thing made or created was an atom of matter. Of course, something was *first* in the list of created things; and we may as well assume an atom as any thing else. This first or initial atom was made by the Word—made not in some secondary sense, but absolutely made. That is, it was not made from pre-existing material; in other words, it was not a mere modification, but an absolute creation at first hand. Now the following are simple intuitions: 1. That the energy which creates must be exerted before it creates. For that which is created is an effect, of which the creating energy is the cause; and a cause of necessity antedates its effect. 2. That he who exerts creating energy must be existent at the time when he exerts it. The mere statement of this is enough. Now the energy which created that primal atom was exerted before the atom began to be. The Word exerted that energy. At the time of exertion, then, he must have been existent; and this was before the existence of the atom. Hence he existed before the first created thing existed; in other words, he existed before creation began, and is consequently no creature, but *eternal*. This is conclusive and final. All of which we had a legitimate right to infer from the *nature* of the Word, but were unwilling to let it rest on that ground alone. For if the nature of the Word and the nature of the Father are identical, and this we have assumed; and if the Father in his nature is eternal, which of necessity must be conceded; then, also, must the Word in his nature be eternal. No conclusion can rest on a firmer basis than this. It rises above disputation.

I must here turn aside long enough to notice a misrepresentation which has not seldom been circulated to the gross injury of my brethren. It is often alleged that we deny the divinity of Christ, and make him no more than a mere created being. What can have put



it into the heads or hearts of men to retail this slander I have no means whatever of knowing. The allegation is untrue in every word and feature. Not only so, it has not even the semblance of a foundation on which to stand. We hold the view in no sense whatever; nor has it ever enjoyed the slightest countenance either from our public writers or preachers; and sure I am that it is no sentiment of our private brethren. As for ourselves, as a people, we feel unaffected by it, and can well afford to treat it with indifference. But we are unwilling that the cause we plead should be checked in its course by a vulgar falsehood leveled against those who are committed to its defense. We hence avail ourselves of the present to protest once more against the imputation and the injustice.

But in the passage cited, it is further said of the Word that he "*became flesh and dwelt among us.*" This saying is susceptible of being misunderstood. It does not mean that in becoming incarnate the Word underwent any change as to his nature; nor that his personality was thereby in the least affected. These remained the same after that event that they were before. The meaning is concisely this, that the Word, remaining both in personality and nature wholly unchanged, took up his abode in a *human body*. This, however, is a mere mode of existence, and not a change of nature. Indeed, we have no evidence whatever that the Word, in the assumption of human nature, underwent in himself proper even the slightest change. The truth is, as we think, that he did not. Further: neither does this mode of existence imply, as we conceive, any curtailment of his attributes, as wisdom, power. These also remained the same. However impossible it may be for us to conceive of the fact, we yet feel fully justified in admitting it, this feeling arising out of the character of the person of whom we are predicating these things. We certainly encounter a difficulty in believing that a little infant, calmly sleeping in Mary's lap, should notwithstanding be endowed with, or rather should possess in and of himself as inherent in him, and not by impartation or derivation, all the marvelous attributes which make up the character of the Father, and in all the perfection in which they exist in him. Yet to this extent must our faith go; and to this extent it does go. But this is diverging rather too far from our proposed line of thought.

Now this incarnate Word is *the new being* respecting whom we inquired a few pages back. In other words, he is *the Mediator*; and certainly there exists no other being like him. Within he is almighty, eternal, and divine as God himself; without he was frail, mutable, temptable, mortal, as the hand which traces this. And all this was and is necessary. On the reverse side to us, he had God to represent, to approach, and to commune with, all in the most perfect and intimate manner, in the great and delicate work of mediation. Hence

the necessity for what he is on that side. On this side, the visible side, or side next to us, he had man to represent, to approach, and to commune with, in the most affectionate, familiar, intimate manner. Hence the necessity for what he is on this side. Between that side and this stretches the line which measures the whole distance between the unfallen divine and the fallen human. All this vast distance our blessed Mediator in himself complements or fills. On the unseen side he touches God and has his abode in his bosom; on the seen or human side he touches man and has his hand on all his nature to save him. On that side it is no robbery to be equal with God; on this it is no degradation to be the son of man and the loving brother of the frail children of earth. On that side he is seen holding his sheltering hand over the stainless character of the Father, keeping the balances of eternal justice ever even, and waking from its hidden depths the whole volume of God's love for man; on this, he is seen pressing a little child to his heart, and weeping with the stricken daughters of our race as if himself a little babe. Such is our glorious Mediator. Well may we exclaim: "Very pleasant art thou to me, my brother: thy love to me is wonderful."

Even to the most superficial it must appear that Christ is, by virtue of his very natures, the only being in the universe, known to us, who can successfully act the part of mediator. Indeed by virtue of these natures he becomes, of necessity, the betweenster between God and fallen man. His divine reaches down from heaven half way to earth; his human reaches up from earth half way to heaven; and there the two natures meet in him, forming the *midwayman*. He is, hence, by nature, really and truly between God and us as mediator. The divine nature fits him to mediate for God; the human, to mediate for man. In that, he is identical with the Father, and has the same experience, and is surrounded by the same circumstances; in this, he is identical with man, and has the same experience, and is surrounded by the same circumstances. That gives him perfect sympathy, so to speak, with the Father; this perfect sympathy with us. These being the great essentials, as it seems to us, of a perfect and adequate mediation, it follows, since Christ possesses all these in perfection, that both he, as mediator, and his mediation, are perfect, completely so. Where, now, in all the realms of God, can a being be found possessing all these characteristics? He can not be found. Christ alone fills the requirements; and he only can be mediator.

We have now seen how eminently Christ is fitted, from the union of two natures in himself, to act as mediator between God and his erring children. But he possesses other qualifications besides this, which in part he has derived from this. He has lived the human life and drunk its bitter cup to the dregs. This experience would give him his deep sympathy with frail humanity. As Captain of our salvation

he has been made perfect by sufferings; and in nothing do we so much feel the need of this special perfection as in his work of mediation. But let us go more minutely into the present feature of our subject.

Why, we may curiously ask, did he begin his career on earth as a helpless infant? We may well afford to wonder at the circumstance, since confessedly we have no solution of it. Can it be possible that it has any connection with infant salvation, or that their salvation was impossible without it. We can not think it. Yet the circumstance was not a superfluous thing. It certainly has its meaning and its value, otherwise it would never have occurred; but what that meaning and that value are, we are without the means of knowing. Why did not Christ assume a body in a different way, and commence life a full-grown man? There must surely be some reason why so much of a life of infinite value should have been passed in cradled infancy, tottering childhood, and youthful inexperience. Was he not in all these periods taking lessons which should enable him to feel the more deeply for and with all classes and conditions of the human race? If this question does not afford us some insight into the reasons of his early life, we shall perhaps remain forever without any.

I have a thought in my heart, call it speculation if you please, I will not chide you, to which I shall venture to give utterance here. Christ is Mediator for all the saved. Now there is a period of indefinite length between obviously irresponsible childhood and the time when admitted accountability sets in—a period which has caused no little silent anxiety to many parents whose children have died during it. These children seemed old enough to know right from wrong, and in many things certainly did so know; yet they seemed not sober and thoughtful enough to justify encouraging them to obey the Saviour and enter on the Christian life. In this state they died. What has become of them? My theory is this: Christ was once a little boy, and lived through the period of which we are speaking. He knows its trials, its temptations, and its inadequate power of resistance. Large therefore must be his leniency toward, and deep his sympathy for, those who blunder during it. May it not be, then, when a child goes out at this doubtful period, that the Saviour, as Mediator, may say to the Father: He is a little boy; I was once one myself. He has been thoughtless and is not wholly free from the stain of wrong. But I pray that his immaturity be taken into the account, together with the subtlety and power of his great foe, and that for my sake he be permitted to dwell with me. If so, we have this consolation: *the Father always hears him*. Truly fanciful! cries the cold exegete, who imagines that the bosom of Christ is as devoid of the sentiments of tenderness and humanity as is the icicle which depends from the eaves of the house. But I have this persuasion, that many

fancies of the human heart in its best and truest moods have far more exact counterparts in the breast of Christ than such frigid exegetical deliverances as the preceding. I love sometimes to think that the dreams of the chaste and longing soul are but shadows dropped on us from the place of Christ as hints of what awaits us. This at least I shall add: When I affect to interpret the word of God, I am willing, nay feel in duty bound, to be strict, severe; but when I assay to interpret the great merciful heart of my Master, I prefer my conclusions to be grand and free. That large numbers of the human family die within the period of which I am speaking, no one can deny. Nor will it be claimed that the New Testament in any of its special provisions contains a clear decision as to their fate. That God will dispose of them in boundless mercy is saying what no one denies; but still it is saying what no heart feels to be a full and adequate meeting of the case. We want something, if not surer, yet more definite, to trust to than sweeping general remarks, however true. We want something which comes leaping out of the nature or life of the great Mediator, and which confronts us like an angel of light when the shadows of death are on us, saying, In me your difficulty is met and doubts solved; trust in me. This is what we want; and I confess when I look back to the time when Christ was a little boy playing in the shavings which Joseph's plane did make, struggling against the besetments of that insecure age, that I draw therefrom a faith and hope which nothing else so precisely gives. All that unwritten chapter of his life is to me eloquent with instruction. Not only is it deliciously sweet, but to the spiritual eye is full of sense. I watch that glorious Word as he lies in the form of a tidy little boy on Mary's lap; I see the mother part the hair on that tender brow, adjust the plain dress, kiss her babe, and hear her say, My pet. Farther on I see that same wondrous child, sitting beside some brook dabbling his feet in its fluent stream, or shouting over his pin hook and dangling minnow. Did he never drive tandem, and muster the boys in the neighborhood as king? Did he never cry for a whistle or shout over a toy? Did he never build his tiny house to be kicked over by some rude foot, and then resist the temptation to resent? Did he never see his mimic boat float off on some cruel stream, and master the feeling of disappointment? Did he never lodge his kite on some defiant limb, and the passing stranger refuse to haul it down, while he was left to quell the uprising emotion? Must we, in a word, regard all that period and the marvelous life lived through it as *nil*? I at least can not so regard it; and I love to bind it up with the life of my own little boy, and some how or other to pin his fate and that of others thereto.

But now comes the great trenching question: *For whom does Christ act as mediator?* The reader will, of course, at once infer that the question relates to the two grand divisions of the human family into

the righteous and the wicked. That he acts as mediator for the former will be at once allowed; but does he so act for the latter? Perhaps if all the professors of Christianity in the world were assembled together, and their voice had in the case, not one in a hundred would be found to answer the question in the negative. *He mediates alike for all*, would be almost the universal response. Of course, we are here leaving out of the account that knot of fatalists, who maintain that from eternity one definite part of the human family was appointed to salvation, and the other definite part to damnation. These we do not count, neither do we reason with them. Their theory defies both reason and revelation, while professing to constitute both these the broad foundation on which it rests. But would the preceding answer be correct? In one sense it would; in another we think it would not. That Christ is the Mediator for all men to the extent of making expiation for all, and of perfecting the scheme of redemption for all, is certainly implied, if not actually asserted in the New Testament. "There is," says Paul, "one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." (1 Tim. ii.) It seems to me clear that the word *men* must here be taken as comprehending all men, whether righteous or wicked; but only as implying that provision has been made for their salvation, and not that Christ is now the special Mediator of all to any greater extent. Thus far we think his mediation now affects all men, but no further. That he now appears in the Father's presence in defense of the wicked, that he urges pleas in their behalf, or in any other way advocates their cause, seems to me to be wholly inconsistent with their relation and utter want of fealty to him, as well as with what is due himself and the gospel which cost his blood, which they reject. If this be true, it certainly is a truth of fearful magnitude and sense; and on what ground it can be denied I am free to say I see not. For one moment let us suppose that Christ, as Mediator, appears in the Father's presence in behalf of sinners. To what end or for what purpose can he there appear? Surely it can not be to ask the Father to accept them. For this he can not do while they live in disobedience to the gospel. Neither can it be to ask him to pardon them. For this he will do only on condition of their obedience to his Son. We repeat, for what purpose does Christ appear, if at all, in the Father's presence in behalf of the disobedient? Few well-taught Bible students will deny that the question is perplexing. Certain it is that Christ stands between us and the Father, that he is *the way* to him, and that no man can approach the Father except by him. No attempt is needed to establish this. At sight the reader will perceive its strict accordance with statements of Holy Writ. Now can it be possible that the Father will, in utter disregard of the rights and position of that blood-stained Son, through the rent veil of whose flesh

he has prepared for us a new and living way, I say can it be possible that he will allow any soul of man to approach him save through obedience to that Son? Surely it can not be; and if not, in what sense or to what intent can Christ be viewed as Mediator for the wicked? Further: if Christ acts not as Mediator for the wicked, what disposition are we to suppose is made of the prayers they frequently present or affect to present to the Father? If those who offer them can not be accepted, how can their prayers be? Will God accept a man's prayer, but not him? Or is the man's prayer accepted, but the man himself rejected? I confess these questions awake in my mind no small fears for the wicked part of the human family, who are laboring under the impression that their spasmodic, irregular, and ordinarily extorted prayers are accepted by the Father. My brethren have been much censured for calling in question the fact that these prayers are accepted; and for expressing the opinion that the New Testament does not decide the point affirmatively. We are not in a condition to admit that the censure has been just; nor that our brethren have been wrong. By these remarks we hope we shall not be understood as discouraging prayer. We certainly intend nothing of the kind; and an inference to that effect would do us the grossest injustice. We are merely calling in question the fact that God accepts the prayers of such as live in the constant rejection of his Son; and the point is questioned on the ground, and as a consequence growing out of it, that as Christ can not act as mediator for such, so neither can he present their prayers; and that they must hence be rejected. The matter is worthy of the gravest consideration. For if those of the world, who rely on their prayers as the means through which they are to obtain remission of their sins, should in the end be found in error, how fearful will the finding prove!

There is one case of the disobedient in which Christ may, perhaps, consent to act as mediator in calling forth the Father's clemency. It is suggested by a circumstance which occurred at his crucifixion. After he had been nailed to the cross, and as his murderers stood round and watched for his last moment, he said in their behalf: *"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."* Although this occurred before the founding of the kingdom, it may, nevertheless, perhaps, justify the conclusion that in other cases where "they know not what they do," he may say, "forgive them." We certainly incline to the opinion that this must be the rule of his conduct; but how far such opinions should guide us in this life, is a question we shall leave to the thought of the reader. It is most dangerous to rely for any blessing, for which we are dependent on the will or appointments of the Saviour, on any thing short of his most explicit assurance. The solution of doubtful cases, or of cases of which he has said nothing, we may seek in his nature or in his abounding

mercy and goodness; but cases of which he has articulately and repeatedly spoken, such as remission of sins, must be decided and disposed of by a direct appeal to his own word. For the sinner, with the New Testament in his hand, to rely on his prayers as the means of procuring his pardon, independently of a full obedience to the expressed will of Christ in the case, is one of the grandest delusions the Devil has ever succeeded in imposing upon the human family. This we say in full view of what we have just conceded; for this is not a case in which it can be said, *they know not what they do*. At least, if the case come under that heading, we may readily admit that the fact lies beyond our knowing. And, let me add, deprive sectarianism of this means of delusion and self-propagation, and it will at once become half extinct. As its augmentation depends on the error, so it could not live without it.

It will not be expected, as it is not necessary, that I should pursue at any great length the subject of Christ's mediation for the saints. Deeply interesting as it is, it still needs no special elaboration. That it is the ground of our hope of acceptance with the Father, and of our highest joy in this life, is a thing felt in every Christian heart. It is while acting as mediator that Christ also appears for us as *advocate*; and on his advocacy hangs our destiny. To know that in the peer of the Father we have a brother, who is ever touched with a feeling of our infirmities, should fill the soul with boundless joy. For who of earth's guilty children dare appear in the presence of God to speak in his own person in his own defense? Not one. On Christ devolves this momentous work. Hence the guarantee we all have that "if we are faithful to confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." In a single detail only I shall notice the probable bearing of the present view of the subject on the fate of Christians. This I do because the point has caused anxiety in many a heart, and has never, that I have seen, been formally brought forward for consideration.

It is not only not an impossible case, but one which we know sometimes occurs, that Christian men are, in an instant, and with no previous notice, stricken down dead. Let us now suppose such an instance. If the man has not sinned since he last confessed, of course his case presents no special difficulty; but suppose he has sinned, the question very naturally arises, what becomes of the man? Let us allow him to be as good as Christians usually are, that he often and habitually confesses, in a spirit of sincere penitence, his sins; but that since he last confessed he has committed a sin, and that it stands against him. In this condition he drops dead. What is his fate? We must feel that through the advocacy of Christ he is saved. The Saviour foresees the stroke that fells him. Now is there aught inconsistent with revelation, with reason, or with any thing else

capable of shedding the least light on the subject, in assuming that the Saviour may intercede in the case for this ransomed child, and ask for the remission of his sin? To me I am free to confess there is not. The large mercy of God, the grand provision of the gospel, and the constant attention of Christ to the interests of all who are washed in his own blood, seem to justify this answer. Still I must add, that where the New Testament is silent, the most plausible of human inferences may be wrong. Let us, then, pray without ceasing, and thereby be always ready.

THE CHARACTER OF OUR ARTICLES. —Correspondents frequently suggest that the *Quarterly* would be more popular if its articles were shorter. This may be true; but would the change improve the work? We can not think it. Could we compress the matter of its articles into shorter compass, certainly we should have pleasure in doing so. But we see not how this can be done. The intention is to make their length depend on the matter. In executing this intention we may not be free from error; and if not, we crave the indulgence due to all human efforts. We have no ambition to write long articles; and we believe few persons will accuse the *Quarterly* of wishing to speak merely to multiply words. We certainly wish the work were more popular, at least that it had a larger circulation; but we must courteously decline to promise the change to secure the end.

Again: we are occasionally admonished, even by friendly hands, that we write at times too severely. If such be the case, we have no defense to make. Our labors are before the brotherhood, and wherein they err we are not their apologist. To be unjust is a thought not in us; and as to our severity, since the charge involves only manner, and has a personal look, we shall decline to repel it. We should like to conciliate even fault-finders by guaranteeing reforms, but must make no promises that we may never be accused of breaking pledges. When the simply erring are to be set right, or a sorrowing child of God needs comfort, our soul is gentle as the whispers of mercy and our tears run unbidden; but when innovation and error are to be hurled back, or a shallow pretender is to be dissected, there is not a nerve in all our frame in which we can provoke a twitch. We much fear that the *Quarterly* in time to come will make no great improvement in respect to the point in hand on what it has been in time past. Yet we ask the charity of dissentients; and trust that when we do our best we shall not be censured for not doing better. We aim to make the *Quarterly* a noble advocate of primitive Christianity, and ask from our brethren, one and all, the generous aid necessary to this end. When we become conscious of faults, we have pride in making corrections; but beg to feel that the matters complained of are small



## MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

THERE is an urgent and increasing demand among our congregations for an educated ministry, and a proportionate longing, among our young men who contemplate preaching, for a ministerial education. The frequent selection of this subject as a theme for studied discourses at our large conventions, and the increasing number of college students who intend to be preachers, are indications of the extent of this feeling. Indeed, our colleges themselves are but a result of the same feeling, for not one of them could have obtained the funds necessary to its existence but for the plea that it would help to supply the churches with educated preachers.

That one who is to preach the gospel, and teach the disciples the whole will of God, should be educated for his work is a maxim of common sense. In every other department of human labor, whether physical or intellectual, a man is expected to undergo some preparatory course of instruction; then why not in this? If to teach the arts and sciences which pertain to earth alone a man must be appropriately educated, how much more to teach that master-science which pertains both to earth and heaven!

We do not propose, however, to argue a proposition which is not doubted. We have had some discussion upon the subject, but the question at issue, when properly eliminated, is not whether our young preachers should be educated, but what kind of education they should have. Perhaps, if we had a distinct conception of what constitutes a proper ministerial education, there would no longer be any dispute upon the subject. We have been dealing too much in vague generalities, for a proper understanding either of our subject or of one another. We have had no formal attempts at denning the exact character of the education demanded, or the most efficient means of securing it. Neither has the subject of an adequate supply of preachers to meet the increasing demands of our cause received due consideration. It is time that our ideas were more sharply defined, and that our educational schemes were rendered more efficient. We propose to accomplish something in this direction, by the remarks which we now submit.

In the course of the discussion which this subject has elicited, our attention has been called to a singular contrast between the labors of those styled respectively the educated and the uneducated preachers. The latter class have undoubtedly been the pioneers of the Reformation, and many of them are still among the most powerful and successful preachers we have. Neither is their influence con-

fined to the rural districts and the more susceptible classes of the community. In the towns and cities their labors are in demand, and the most solid men and women of every community are among their converts. Our successful evangelists are nearly all men of this class, while our educated preachers are often found very quietly passing away their lives in the dull routine of weekly sermons to very weakly congregations. This contrast has led persons of little discrimination to speak disparagingly of educated men. Such persons are misled by a misapplication of terms. It is not education which renders preachers inefficient; but the want of education. What education they have is not of the right kind, or it lacks some of the elements of a proper ministerial education. Now, it is incontrovertible that he who makes the best lawyer, other things being equal, has the best education for the practice of law; and the most successful physician is the one who has in reality the best medical education. That which produces the best results is best. So of ministerial education. The man who can and does accomplish the greatest religious results by his ministerial labors, has, whatever he has learned or not learned, the very best education for a preacher. Such is the true, the practical, the rational standard by which to judge of this subject.

What do we want preachers for, but to convert sinners and edify the saints? What do we want them educated for, but to enable them to do this more successfully? What, then, is the best education for a preacher, but that which makes him most successful in his work? To determine, therefore, what education our young preachers should have, we have but to ascertain the essential qualifications for success in a preacher's life. Whatever these are we must aspire to attain, and in the aggregate they must constitute our standard of excellence.

We now proceed to point out some of the more essential elements of the education which has been demonstrated by experience and by common sense as that best adapted to the preacher's wants. First of all we place a *knowledge of the word of God*. Without this, the preacher is the most dangerous character in the community, and the greater his eloquence and learning the greater the danger. The Bible contains the *only* true light in reference to man's spiritual and eternal relations; and in the absence of this the false lights of human philosophy but lead into deeper darkness, the hapless victim being the more hopelessly lost as he flatters himself that he has found the only way of life.

While it is beyond question that this is the most essential element in a preacher's education, yet it may be safely assumed that the most crying sin of the preachers of this generation is ignorance of that very book which they *profess* to make their life-long study. The experience and observation of all persons who have had the ability

and opportunity to test this assumption, will bear witness to it. But if we examine, in this respect, those preachers who have been most eminently useful; who have most successfully fought against infidelity, sectarianism, and iniquity, we find them pre-eminently familiar with the word of God. In this respect, those who are commonly styled uneducated preachers are frequently the most thoroughly educated. They are sometimes men of but a single book, having seldom looked within the lids of any other book than the Bible; but they are men of power, and whole communities acknowledge their influence. They possess the most essential and effective element of a thorough ministerial education. They began their labors, however, with but a small stock of this element, and their subsequent acquisitions were secured by a slow process amid many disadvantages. Proper educational facilities would have imparted to them at the beginning, within the course of a few months, information which was acquired only through many years of study. Every such preacher, by the remembrance of his own hard experience, can appreciate the value to a young man of a proper preparatory education.

Such knowledge of the word of God as we speak of embraces a familiar acquaintance with its history, its biography, its poetry, its prophecies, and its didactics. It involves an acquaintance with all the leading subjects treated of in the whole Bible, with the passages in which they are treated. It also includes specific knowledge of all the perversions of Scripture common in the sectarian world, together with the correct method of exposing them; and all the points of infidel assault, together with the means of defense. Such an education would fit a young man to enter the world as it is, ready to confront every foe, whether of revelation itself or of primitive Christianity, and to impart to the people at all times the Scripture instruction which the times demand. This department of education alone would suffice for a most efficient ministry, and all other possible education would be inefficient without it.

Next to knowledge of the Scriptures, it is most important that the young preacher should have proper moral training for his work. The foundation for this training must pre-exist in an ardent desire to become a preacher, not for the ease and respectability which may be attained by it, but for the good of men and the glory of God. A young man who begins to prepare for the ministry with only half a heart, is not likely to become more than half a preacher. He must undertake it from that deep sense of duty and that longing, for the salvation of men which the Baptists have dignified into a special divine call. With this foundation laid, he still needs the results, of the experience and reflection of wise predecessors, to prepare him for the details of his work. He should be instructed in reference to the best course of study to pursue while engaged in his labors, so as to outli-

vate most successfully his own peculiar talent. He should be impressed with the necessity of constant industry, and be advised as to the best disposition of all his time. He should learn how to deport himself toward the world, toward the church and its officers, and toward his brethren in the ministry. He should be taught that his field of labor is not confined to the pulpit, but extends from house to house throughout the community, and reaches down to all the little children; and knowing this, he should be fully advised as to the most successful method of cultivating the entire field. In short, he should have all the practical advice and instruction which the experience of wise and useful men has indicated as necessary to early and complete success.

This second element of education is almost uniformly acquired by preachers of eminent usefulness, though often, like their knowledge of the Scriptures, by years of hard experience, and many mortifying mistakes. These two elements combined have formed the entire education of the great majority of our useful men; and this is a demonstration that no other education is positively necessary to eminent usefulness. In devising an educational scheme, therefore, we should demand no less than this, and we should not peremptorily insist upon

The last and least important department of ministerial education is an elementary course in literature and science, such as our colleges usually furnish. If our object were to make authors, or critics, or professors, this department would be indispensable; but for the man who is to go out among the people, and make known nothing but the gospel of Jesus Christ, we have already seen that it is not so. In conjunction, however, with sound Scripture knowledge, and proper moral training, it must be a means of greatly increasing the preacher's usefulness. A knowledge of the Greek language alone enables the student of Scripture to make much more rapid and satisfactory progress, while the mental culture and discipline resulting from the pursuit of the entire college curriculum, enables him both to acquire and to communicate with greater facility. These are its chief advantages; and while they are by no means inconsiderable, they derive all their value to the preacher from the aid they furnish him in prosecuting other studies and in treating other subjects.

The reader will here observe that we do not attribute to a classical education that high rank which has been accorded to it by many writers. When men have spoken of ministerial education, they have too often referred exclusively to a knowledge of the languages and sciences. The term has been so understood by others; and when the importance of an educated ministry has been called in question, it is this kind of education which is referred to. We are confident, that, without demanding any further argument, a discerning public will

justify us in retiring it to a subordinate position, and bringing into the foreground that which is manifestly more important. And we think, too, that this arrangement will enable speakers and writers upon the subject to be better understood, and to advance the cause of ministerial education more successfully.

Having now designated the three elements or departments of a good ministerial education, we next proceed to inquire to what extent it can be supplied by our present facilities. These facilities consist, aside from the private studies of young preachers, exclusively in our colleges and educational societies. These are the entire dependence for education, and they are rapidly becoming our main dependence for the supply of preachers. This latter tendency is by no means free from danger. To the full extent that the people learn to depend upon college graduates for young preachers, will young men who enjoy no facilities for a classical education be discouraged from attempting to preach, and thus we will lose that very class of men who have hitherto been the pioneers of the cause, and the pillars to support the truth in very many communities. The men who learn to preach while working on their farms or in their shops, by reading their Bibles at night and preaching on Lord's day, should have every possible encouragement; for they fill a place which men of more learning can seldom fill so well, and which, indeed, will be vacant unless filled by

Besides the danger of this tendency, our colleges, as a source of supply, have been, and must continue to be, inadequate. Not more than eight or ten young preachers are annually graduated from all of them combined. Nor need we expect, within any brief period, a very great increase of the number. The Baptists have been testing this matter longer than we have, and with much greater facilities, and the result, as declared by Dr. Wayland, is by no means encouraging. He estimates the annual demand for Baptist preachers at six hundred. He says they have twenty-two colleges, and ten theological seminaries, yet the number of graduates per annum who pass through both courses of study, is only some twenty-five or thirty. The entire number of candidates for the ministry who come from all these institutions, including those who have pursued only a partial course, he estimates at from ninety to one hundred; or about one-sixth of the annual demand.

These facts are readily accounted for by considering the expensiveness of a college course, and the length of time required to pass through it. Most of the young men who desire to preach are poor. Many of them are already so far advanced in life that they can ill afford to spend four years at college before entering upon their life-work. To meet the first of these difficulties, a few benevolent brethren have contributed liberally, some education societies have been

organized, and some of our missionary societies are extending their operations into the educational field. But the results, under the present system of education, will disappoint public expectation. Let the operations of the Kentucky Educational Society testify. They have a capital of about \$50,000, invested in stocks. Some of their stocks yield but little, yet on the whole it is probably as productive as the most of such endowments. They have been operating since 1856, eight years, during which they have had under their patronage an average of about twelve students continually. Supposing their course of study to occupy four years, and all of these students to persevere through it and become preachers, we would have from this handsome endowment just three preachers per annum! This is fully up to the number now in the field who have been aided by this Society, including some who did not graduate. Other associations of brethren, whether operating by the proceeds of an endowment fund, or by annual contributions, need not expect to meet with success very greatly beyond this. Making these results the basis of our calculation, and supposing that one hundred preachers per annum will be required to make up our present deficiency and meet the constantly increasing demand, we would require, in order to furnish them in this way, an endowment of more than a million and a half of dollars. This is sufficient proof that the scheme is impracticable.

The inadequacy of this source of supply is further evident from another consideration. But a very small number of the young men of the country, even of those who have abundance of means, choose to acquire a collegiate education; and the number of graduates is quite disproportionate to the number of matriculates. With an average of about one hundred students in attendance, Bethany College has seldom graduated more than eight or ten. The disproportion is still greater in our other institutions, where the matriculates are generally younger. If we add to these those who master the principal part of the course before they abandon it, the number is still quite insignifi-

But besides the inadequate supply from our colleges, the education which they have hitherto furnished our young preachers is seriously defective; and we must take the liberty to speak of it very candidly. Where difficulties and defects exist, it is far more manly to speak of them plainly, and make an honest effort to remove them, than to ignore them and still struggle under the burden.

In reference to the literary and scientific attainments of our young graduates, we have no special complaints to file. These are as good as the short time devoted to the course, and the inadequate preparatory instruction so common among college matriculates, will admit. The colleges of the Reformation compare favorably in this particular with any others in the West. But, as we have been above, classical

and scientific attainments constitute the least important element of ministerial education.

It is in respect to the first and most essential element of their education, a knowledge of the word of God, that the preachers furnished by our colleges are most deficient. Our young graduates are better prepared to lecture on some scientific or literary topic, than to preach a sermon. They are more familiar with the odes of Horace than with the Psalms of David; with the adventures of AENEAS than with those of Paul; with heathen mythology than with Christian antiquities; with the solar system than with the kingdom of God. They can explain any problem in Euclid better than they can the apostolic commission; and are far more familiar with the fables of AEsop than with the cases of conversion. On this account, their sermons often have in them more science and literature than gospel. They lecture or declaim rather than preach, and plain men often conclude that going to college has been their ruin. This would all be just as one should expect, if the college course were merely a preparatory discipline, to be followed by some special education for the ministry; but when it is regarded as *the* ministerial education to which young men have devoted years of study with the expectation of being prepared to preach at its conclusion, its deficiency is sufficiently apparent.

There are undoubtedly some exceptions to this general rule, as in the case of young men who had preached sufficiently before going to college, to know what they want, and what they do not want; but the writer acknowledges that his own case is not exceptional, and he can testify the same in reference to many who have become prominent and successful preachers. We were familiar with the Pentateuch; but knew little of the gospels, still less of Acts, and almost nothing of the epistles. As for biblical criticism, it was to us a *terra incognita*. All that we have learned about the practical detail of a preacher's life and course of study, we have had to acquire by our own unaided exertions since we left college. We have spent years, too, in random and sometimes fruitless efforts before we learned how best to employ our time, years which might have been saved to us by a little judicious instruction while we were at school. If some portion of our college course had been omitted, and its place filled with direct preparation for preaching, so that we could have started aright in the work, we would now be years in advance of what we have attained.

This may appear strange to brethren who have heard so much about the Bible being the leading text-book in our colleges, but have had no opportunity to know just how the Bible is taught. These results are really all that we are justified in expecting under the circumstances. The young preacher matriculates for a four-years course, without the amount of preparation presupposed, and in order to get through successfully he finds himself under a constant press to prepare

his daily recitations. He listens to a daily Bible lecture; but no preparatory study is required, and no time allotted for it. Even while hearing the lecture, his attention is often distracted by Greek conjugations and mathematical problems which are forced upon him by the severe examination to which he is subjected in the other departments. Whatever may be his desire, therefore, to acquire Scripture knowledge, he finds the necessity for graduating within a given time an insurmountable obstacle in the way.

Our present system is also defective in reference to the second element of ministerial education—proper moral training for the work. The young preacher at college finds himself one of a small and peculiar class of students, who are not sufficiently influential to form the prevailing sentiment of the school, and he must either fall into the popular current, or maintain with his fellows a clannish isolation. The prevailing sentiment is purely worldly. The universal ambition is for distinction in the world, and the code of honor regulates social intercourse. Vice of almost every kind, and in the most secret and seductive forms, finds its way into the college circle, resulting sometimes in the corruption of young preachers. Even when these influences fall short of their worst effects, they often result in the morbid taste, the pedantic display, and worldly habits, which impair the usefulness of so many young men.

But the worst effects of college life are by no means so rare as one might suppose. Many a young man who has started upon his course of study firmly determined to become a preacher, is turned away to some other pursuit; while some are ruined for life. This result is not peculiar to our own colleges, but is common among all others. Dr. Wayland, for many years President of Brown University, and enjoying ample means of information upon the subject, bears the following testimony: "Of the temptations which beset a young man while pursuing a course of education, few persons are aware; and it requires deeper piety and a more matured character to resist them than is commonly supposed. The beneficiaries of education societies possess, in general, the same moral and religious standing as other young men in college who profess personal piety. Now suppose twenty young men, professors of religion, to enter college, and pursue their course to the close. It will be well if five of these twenty maintain a consistent religious character, attending meetings for prayer with constancy, on every occasion standing up fearlessly for what they know to be right, and bearing testimony everywhere in favor of religion. Of the remainder, a part would rank among the timidly conscientious, willing to be on the side of right where there is nothing to lose. Some would become Christians only in name, known to profess Christ only by their presence at the communion-table; some would be equally active for Christ and for the world, and a few would be known as the



worst enemies of religion, taking part with the irreligious and profane, and furnishing, by their participation in it, an excuse to others for every form of ill-doing. I do not think that in this estimate I exaggerate the facts." \* \* \* "I write these things in pain. I am, however, dealing with facts, and facts which should be in the possession of every one who is called to form a judgment in this matter."

But we have dwelt long enough upon the defects of our present educational system; longer, perhaps, than will prove agreeable to some of our brethren who are deeply interested in colleges. I could have wished to be spared the necessity of making some of these developments; but the facts are well known among many brethren, and our college presidents, professors, and agents ought to know that they are causing a loss of confidence in colleges, and checking the liberality of brethren toward them. Let the facts be candidly exhibited, and then let us tax our ingenuity for the improvement of our system.

To devise a scheme for the removal of all the defects in our educational system, and for a sufficient increase in the supply of preachers, is not likely to be the work of a single mind, or the result of a single attempt. But a beginning must be made, and to this end we submit the result of our own reflections.

1. For the injurious moral effects of college life there is one remedy, which, if not perfect, must, if properly applied, prove highly successful. It is to be found in the religious activity of the faculty. I mean, not merely a religious example, but a constant activity in bringing to bear upon every individual student a constant religious influence. The lectures and recitations in every department should be made subservient to Christianity, and the college classes should be regarded as a missionary field for the most arduous evangelical labor. Those students who are already religious should be made active co-operants in the work, so that, instead of yielding to evil influences, they might be constantly increasing in moral courage and religious power. In this way our institutions could be made recruiting establishments, to swell the number of candidates for the ministry, instead of dangerous resorts for the youth of the country.

This would require at the hands of our college professors a religious zeal which most of them have little dreamed of, and of which some of them are doubtless incapable; but it is certainly no more than may justly be demanded of those to whom the destiny of our young men is so largely committed. The brethren have built and endowed these colleges primarily for the sake of their religious influence; and if they are not to enjoy this, they will send their sons to other institutions, or educate them in more private schools at home. But they must not be disappointed. Let our professors wake up to this solemn and long neglected duty; and let our trustees see to it that no irreligious man,

that no man not an earnest religious worker shall occupy a chair in any of our colleges. Fidelity to the trust committed to them demands this, and the public will not remain satisfied without it.

2. It must be conceded to our colleges, that a much greater amount of Scripture instruction could hardly be expected of them under the present arrangement of the course necessary to graduation. Every professor has his full amount of work, and every student is sufficiently taxed by the regular course. But it is worthy of very grave consideration, whether a certain amount of Scripture study might not be profitably substituted for some part of the course now necessary to the degree of A. B. Why should the history and literature of the book of books be considered less worthy of a place in the college course than conic sections or political economy? Why should ignorance of constitutional law or mental philosophy be considered a more serious defect in an education than ignorance of the constitution and laws of the kingdom of heaven? And why should young men be expected to study uninspired works on moral science, natural theology, and evidences of Christianity, to the neglect of the only inspired and infallible authority on these subjects? If no satisfactory answer can be given to these questions, then let our college curriculum be modified so that an elementary knowledge of the word of God shall be equally necessary to graduation with an elementary knowledge of any other branch of study. This is not only demanded by enlightened reason, but if accomplished would tend greatly both to relieve college life of its corrupting influences, and to increase the number of educated young men who would be inspired with a desire to preach the gospel. When men obtain knowledge that interests them, they feel an instinctive desire to impart it to others. When the knowledge acquired is such that the welfare of others depends upon its impartation to them, this instinct is seconded by every benevolent feeling, and becomes a controlling motive. The most direct method, therefore, of kindling in young men a desire to preach, is to impart to them an appreciative knowledge of the word of God.

3. But all this, though it is the most that we can ask of our colleges, as at present organized, falls far short of the demands of ministerial education. The young preacher should have a course of instruction, in special preparation for his own work, which would not be appropriate for other young men. This can be accomplished only by a separate school, or by a separate department of the same school. Such a department has frequently been spoken of among us, and is now seriously contemplated by all of our prosperous colleges. There is no scheme, the inauguration of which requires more wisdom. Properly conducted, it may prove a source of incalculable good; but it may be inaugurated and conducted in such a manner as to produce consequences the most disastrous. Much will depend upon the character

of the instructors employed, and much upon the course of study adopted.

A professor in such a school would wield a fearful power for good or evil. He should therefore be a man of well-balanced head and heart, and his devotion to pure primitive Christianity should be above suspicion. He should be a model for young preachers, in character and habits, and should be himself a preacher of varied experience and success. No man who has not actively encountered the errors and iniquities of the world, and endured the practical trials of a preacher's life, is qualified to prepare young preachers for the conflict before them. Only he who has done the work himself, and done it well, is competent to say how it should be done.

The course of study to be pursued in such a school should be strictly biblical. Only such books as contribute to a complete and practical knowledge of the Scriptures should be put into the students' hands; and all the lectures delivered before him should be of the same character. The apostle's directions to Timothy and Titus about the matter and manner of their teaching should be regarded as the supreme law in this respect. This point should be guarded with constant vigilance and even jealousy; for a departure from this course of instruction would open the way to endless speculation, strifes, and divisions.

In arranging the course of study for such a school, care must also be taken to avoid increasing the inefficiency of our present system of education in respect to the supply of preachers. If it were so arranged as to require the degree of A. B. previous to entering upon it, it would decrease very greatly the present ratio of supply. It would add at least two years to the four now employed at college, and diminish the number who could be educated upon a given sum of money, at least fifty per cent. It would in a still greater ratio diminish the number of young men who would undertake to expend the time and labor necessary to a ministerial education. It would give us a more extensively educated ministry, but at an expense in reference to number which would be ruinous to the cause.

We must never lose sight of the fact established in a former part of this essay, that a knowledge of the English Scriptures alone is a sufficient education to make a most efficient ministry, and that we are dependent upon men of this degree of education for much the greater number of our active proclaimers. Our course of study, therefore, must be adapted to the impartation of this education, and to the supply of this class of preachers. In order to this, it must be so arranged as to enable a young man with nothing more than a common school education to obtain as thorough instruction in the Scriptures as the limited amount of his education would admit.

While providing for this class of young men, the graduates of the

regular college course should not be neglected; but they should be introduced to such a course of biblical study as would call into requisition all the literary and critical resources which they had acquired. They would already have acquired a good degree of familiarity with the contents of the Scriptures, and would now be prepared to acquire an elementary knowledge of biblical criticism, and to apply the resources of accurate scholarship to all the practical issues of the living age. The cause of truth will ever demand a goodly number of men thus educated, for the more exhaustive elaboration and defense of Scripture themes; and the entire number that can be supplied will not more than meet the demand.

We have now submitted the reflections which prompted the writing of this essay. We have given but a faint outline of the subject, and have omitted entirely to touch some questions connected with it, which are worthy of grave consideration. But we feel great confidence in the value of the suggestions we have submitted, and trust that they will contribute, in some degree, to the dissemination of correct thought upon the subject.

ALLAN

PREACHERS. —That the voice and brain of living men are the great chief instruments of propagating the gospel, can not be denied. Other means, as the press, may be profitably employed, but the effect is small when compared with that of the living voice. Men of the world do not read religious periodicals; audiences do not assemble to listen to their contents. Sinners usually collect their faith from the preacher, and take their first step at his suggestion. Hence the grand necessity of providing a class of preachers who shall combine in themselves, in the highest perfection, the largest attainable number of qualifications for the work—men who shall best preach the gospel, command most of the world's attention, and realize from that attention the largest results to the glory of Christ. Next to the purity of the faith and worship ordained by Jesus, this necessity is paramount. On it and to it the preceding article speaks with emphasis. We ask for the article a thoughtful reading, and for the subject of which it treats the profound and prayerful attention of our whole brotherhood. As long as our preachers are sufficiently numerous, strong, and sound, the work in which we are engaged will move triumphantly on. Hence deficiency here is fatal; especially deficiency as to strength and soundness. If possible, let us mature some plan by which the great want, of which Allan justly speaks, may be met. Let our experienced preachers and experienced educators combine their wisdom to effect the end.

THE WORK OF THE PAST—THE SYMPTOMS OF THE  
FUTURE.

THE prudent man, who has the care of a family, watches well the first symptoms of disease. He does not wait till his wife is helpless, and his children prostrated. He has learned that early cures are easy cures, while late ones often fail. On this experience he resolutely acts, and the world applauds his wisdom. Why should not the same judicious policy be acted upon in the weighty matters of religion? All must say it should. Now that we, as a religious people, may be the better prepared to adopt it and act upon it, it may be well to take a brief account of our work and selves just at this particular time.

We have now added another year of toil to our experience. We call it a year of toil; and justly may we so name it. But it is more than this. It is a year of toil passed in tears. At no time within forty years have the same strenuous efforts been made to uphold the cause of Christ that have been made within the last twelve months. Many brethren in our ranks have, during that time, wrought with a will so steady, purposes so high, success so fine, as to justify us in saying that no term but sublime will describe their course. The work to be done was work on a vast scale; and the work done is work on a most creditable one. Our churches and people now stretch over a tract reaching from Maine to the farthest coasts of the Pacific, and almost from the Lake of the woods to Panama. Within this wide area exists one of the noblest brotherhoods the sun has ever shone upon. Within the hands of this brotherhood, *and within their hands only*, is kept the cause which is the last hope of earth. These widely scattered churches needed more than an ordinary amount of care; these widely scattered brethren more than an ordinary amount of attention. It is certainly a source of grief to know that all the work needed to be done has not been done as the pious heart could wish. Still, perhaps, we have reason rather to be proud of what has been achieved, than to mourn over what has not been. We repeat, many brethren have been fully sensible of the magnitude of this work, and well have they sustained their part in performing it. Not only have our churches been kept united to an extent which even the most far-seeing among us did not anticipate; and our members saved from apostasy to a degree which we believe may be safely said to be without a parallel; but we have actually added to our numerical strength a fraction of amazing proportions. In the first place, the laborers we have kept in the field have not been, except in certain

limited districts, materially fewer than during any single year preceding the war; and in the second, never has labor yielded larger results. We feel safe in saying that the reports of success for the year 1864 will bear a most favorable comparison with those of any other year during the last ten. In Missouri and Tennessee there seems to have occurred the greatest deficiency. Of the still more Southern States we, of course, have no means of speaking with certainty. But even here we have reason to hope, from a few hints which have reached us, that the work has not been wholly checked. Not only have we kept up well our number of laborers in the field, but many other cherished interests have been sustained in a highly satisfactory manner. True, many of our faithful preachers have wrought in surroundings which extremely and unjustly tried them. Their scanty wardrobes, shallow meal tubs, light purses, high rent bills, and anxious countenances, have told but too clearly the piteous tale. Yet on they have steadily moved, if not always smilingly, always firmly. It is a fact to be noted with shame that, while in almost all parts of the land the price of living has gone up at the rate of one and two hundred per cent., the pittance meted out to the laborious preacher drags along at the old rate, with a currency worth less than half its nominal value. Wood and steaks bring three times as much now as heretofore; the preacher's money is worth less than half what it used to be; yet not a mill must be added to his wages. All right, say the miserly; all wrong, say heaven and truth.

But, we repeat, many fondly cherished interests have been creditably sustained. One or two of our colleges, which drooped for a while after our troubles began, revived during the past year; and now, if allowed to hold on their way unmolested, promise to be as eminently useful in time to come as in time gone. Of this we speak with sincerest pleasure. Our great centres of learning must be sustained. Their decline could be looked upon as nothing short of a calamity. Only are we committing this great folly—we are building ten where we should have but one. One great University, with a single well-endowed college in each State where we number fifty thousand brethren or more, will be found, in the end, in our humble opinion, about as near the consummation of human wisdom as we may expect to attain, until we possess an experience to which at present we can lay no claim. Two or three colleges in the same State, under the control of the same body, we regard as strikingly unwise. About the only thing for which they are ordinarily distinguished is, that they are continually begging for money, turning out partisans, and fomenting sectional strife. Indeed, we feel that even in the preceding remarks the latitude we allow is rather too great. Up to this writing not the semblance of a necessity has existed among us for more than one college. Had we only one, and had that one all the money which

from first to last we have spent on colleges, and the control of all the young men we are now sending to eight or ten unbuilt, half-built, and imperfectly endowed institutions, the results, we have no hesitation in saying, would be both far more and far better than we are now realizing. With us a cherished principle is—but few institutions of learning, and these of the highest order.

Our female schools seem hardly to have felt the shock of the last four years. They have not only survived, but flourished. For the first and second year a few of them seemed to stagger a little; but since then they have moved forward as if no war cursed the land. This, of course, is only the general fact, to which a rare exception may be found. It is indeed gratifying to know that though large sections of our country have been overcast with desolation and ruin, this high interest has been allowed to escape. Many of these institutions have been even more numerously attended than before the strife began. For this we have reason to be deeply grateful. When the fire rages over a forest, leaving all crisp and black behind, if here and there some sweet little wild flower has been permitted to escape in its freshness and beauty, we are made to feel as if some special providence had protected the frail thing. Thus we feel in regard to these tender nurseries of our daughters. While the scourge has been bitter on us, they at least have gone free.

Next to our schools, as an interest which has been mercifully preserved to us, must be enumerated our religious papers. Few of these have failed; while of those which have been sustained, most have taken a stand at once enviable and just. But few have catered to the phrensy of the hour, and suffered themselves to become the bloated and rotten channels of the lies and politics of the day. Yet a few have done this. Let them know that when the storm of passion subsides, the day of reckoning succeeds. The time comes when the brethren, recovered from the blind excitement which now reigns supreme, will literally loathe the papers and the men that have helped to urge them on to extremes. While we certainly wish no one harm, we yet pray the hastening of that time. Thousands, of pious hearts will hail the day with joy when oblivion shall hide from hearing and from view the political preachers and political papers, falsely called Christian, that now disgrace our ranks. May their joy soon be complete! But of most of our papers and of most of our brethren these things can not be said. As a general rule their position has been worthy of the highest admiration. When these have alluded to politics and war, it has been to warn against danger and encourage to right. They have certainly not felt indifferent to the result of the dreadful calamity now sweeping over the land; still the cause of Christ and the union and peace of God's children have been matters which they have been unwilling ever for a moment to compromise.

For these they have felt their chief solicitude; hence on them and for them have they constantly spoken. That any one preacher or paper among us should have passed through four years of merciless passion and worse than even savage strife, without sinning, would be next thing to a miracle. We all, perhaps, have reason to feel that as none are left to stone us; so neither may we stone any. But how nobly have our brethren generally recovered and borne themselves! Though greatly differing on purely temporal issues, still their intercourse has been large and free. They have met together in love, magnanimously forgot that a difference existed, and counseled and worked for the great common cause and the vast common good more like men out of the flesh than in it. Many brethren from whom we sharply differ as to worldly policies, we yet love with a love which no word but passionate can describe. From these brethren we never break; toward them never cool.

But we wish to speak of other interests than those merely of the past year. A larger inventory than this is needed of our labors before we proceed to take an account of the hazards we are running, and are likely to suffer from. We must first know the stock we have on hand, before we attempt to compute the losses we may possibly sustain. As a people we have now been at work for near half a century. For what we have worked we know well; but what have we achieved? This is the question.

1. We have triumphantly denied that the existing state of the so-called religious world is the state sanctioned by the New Testament. No party in Christendom has so exclusively denied this as have we. All have more or less either openly sanctioned, or quietly winked at, partisans and partyism. Not for an instant have we countenanced either. This is peculiar to us.

2. From first to last we have claimed for the Bible exclusively and alone that it contains the matter of our faith and the rule of our practice. We fearlessly affirm that not a party in existence holds the tenet, but ourselves. To it others may pretend, but their deeds falsify their pretensions. They accept this standard where it favors; and set it aside where it does not. Only we accept it absolutely. In the case of others, the exceptions are individual, not denominational.

3. We alone claim that the terms of the Bible must be taken in their current, simple, and natural sense, and not in some peculiar sense because terms of the Bible. This again is true only of us. Others spiritualize, that is to say, sectarianize their import, and assign to them mystic double meanings having no foundation save in fancy and in party holdings.

4 We, and we only, affirm that Christianity consists simply and precisely in believing all that Christ says, and in doing all that he commands. To this all others add: first, secret, inscrutable changes



in the inner man, over which the party himself neither has nor can have any control; and, second, external appendages countless as the parties of the day. That in order to become a Christian it is necessary only and simply to *believe Christ and obey him* is now untaught on earth, save in the Bible and in our ranks. Beyond these limits the doctrine is unknown. To eliminate, enounce, and successfully defend this position, we unhesitatingly pronounce the proudest achievement of the present century.

5. With us alone is faith the simple conviction of the truth of what the Bible says. Hence with us alone is it accessible to every human being the instant he opens and reads with an honest heart that book. With others it is a direct gift; in other words, a miracle, a special grace in the soul, which is special nonsense, an inwrought, resistless change effected by a sovereign act of the Spirit. The value to the world of this single truth no human capacity can estimate.

6. With us only is repentance the simple determination of the mind to forsake sin, accompanied by the act. Hence with us only is it the act of the individual himself; and with us only can a man repent in an instant. With all others it is a divine impartation, or a miraculous effect, as much so as would be the gift to a horse of the power of speech; and frequently it is a tedious process reaching through years. According to them no man can repent of his own accord. The work must be wrought in him by another. And this, too, in the teeth of the fact, not that we are commanded to *be* penitent, but that we are commanded to *repent*; that is, to do ourselves the thing which yet we are not to do, but which is to be done for us.

7. With us only is the penitent believer to be baptized in order to remission of sins. Hence, with us only does baptism possess even one particle of value. With Romanists and Pedobaptists, sprinkling (not baptism) is a mere heathen ceremony used in giving names to infants. With Baptists it is a little different; for they make much, at least, of the *mode* of baptism; still nothing of baptism itself. Now, I am curious to know how the *mode* of a thing can be important, when the thing *itself* is not. Of course, Baptists can tell. Assigning to baptism its true value and true place in the great scheme of redemption is another work peculiar to my brethren.

8. That to believe is to be begotten by the Spirit, and, with repentance, is the only change in the inner man essential to becoming a Christian, is another one of these grand elementary truths, discovered and set free only by us as a people. With the apostasy the whole subject is involved in profound mystery. To us alone is the present age indebted for the truth as contained in the Bible touching it.

9. That conversion is the simple voluntary act of an individual in turning to the Lord, and includes only the specific acts essential to

becoming a Christian, is another truth peculiar to the New Testament and to the Reformation. What clouds of mist and mountains of rubbish have been removed from the subject by our labors.

10. That in conversion no power is known to be exerted on the soul, save that of the truth only. That in conversion the Spirit does not enter the sinner, neither acts directly on him; but that after he is pardoned, then it dwells in him.

11. That to become a Christian it is necessary simply to believe, repent, and be immersed; that these are all voluntary acts, and may be performed by an individual, favorably circumstanced, in half an hour. Hence no man need live out of the kingdom even one day; and he who does so, having the chance to do better, does so at his peril, and is guilty of crime.

12. That to believe is to be begotten by the Spirit; to be immersed, to be born of water; that without these, no man, though he were as faultless in heart and life as Daniel himself, is now in, or can ever enter, the kingdom which we have received; that good intentions have no power to set these acts aside, none to substitute others for them; that, in other words, this law is imperious and admits of no relaxation. No party of earth teaches the truth on this point, except us.

13. That to pretend to be specially called to preach the gospel in this day is an arrogant assumption and false, and is the basis of clerical tyranny, and lay debasement. No people has contributed so much to correct this priestly assumption as we. For this the age is deeply indebted to us.

14. That the preacher can exercise no authority in the individual church, either over the church itself or over its members; that he has no power to reorganize a church without its consent; or hear charges against or exclude its members; in brief, that he may preach and organize churches, and after this has no more authority than **the** private member.

15. That no matter of opinion can be made a test of fellowship; but that opinions must be strictly held as private. That an attempt to force on the brethren a matter of opinion is of the nature of heresy, and that he who so acts is to be rejected. Matters clearly revealed, and these only, can be used as tests. In our ranks alone is this distinction recognized and acted upon.

16. That the individual church is the highest and only ecclesiastical tribunal on earth, sanctioned by the New Testament; that being independent and self-controlling, its decisions and acts can be neither reversed nor interfered with by any other church or tribunal. This principle, it is proper to add, is not held by us alone, but by us in common with some others.

Here now are sixteen specifications of leading, fundamental princi-

pies, held and acted upon by us as sacred and true. To these still others might be added, but they are not here thought necessary. Of course, no formal attempt is now needed among us to establish these principles. With us at least debate on them has closed; and they are no longer deemed open to dispute. They are the grand generalizations of truth and duty with which we have successfully fought the good fight of the present age. To them we owe our present proud position; and the moment we lose sight of them, that moment we begin to return to the bosom of the great apostasy. By these our future triumphs must be attained; hence we should guard them with sleepless vigilance. Assuming them to be axiomatic, we should not suffer them to be even impinged by error. If by consent we see fit to call any one of them into question again, for the sake of testing its soundness or the accuracy of our views respecting it—this, of course, is a different matter. As long as error is possible, investigation should be free. But while holding them as the certain deliverances of the Bible, we can not suffer encroachments. They constitute, in our sober judgment, the hope of the world; and when lost, we feel that nothing remains worth contending for. We can not consent to see them placed in peril.

We shall now proceed to point out some things which have for some time past struck us as ill-omened symptoms in our ranks. In doing this, we beg the liberty of being candid. We shall not speak from feeling, but from conviction. If we speak plainly, it shall only be because we feel urged thereto by the stern demands of duty. Neither personal friendships nor personal interests shall sway us.

PHILOSOPHIC SPECULATIONS. —Just at this juncture the danger arising from this source we regard as amounting to nothing, or nearly so. But the time is not more than past when the assertion could be truly made. About the time that Russell was enacting his follies and crimes a number of young men issued from our colleges, and sprang up from other sources, whose heads were miserable transcripts of Cousin and Coleridge. They could speak only the praises of *Le Monsieur* and *Le Bull*; and gravely proclaimed their wish to see the Reformation reformed by their feeble second-hand lucubrations. I shall not soon forget what one of the rankest among them once said to me. "I would rather," was his language, "take Cousin to expound the Bible than all the commentaries in Christendom." You are right, I replied; for the Bible expounded by Cousin does not condemn an apostate and a hypocrite; expounded without him, it does. The last I heard of this upstart, he was a loathsome Universalist in the State of Illinois. The career of these youngsters and *oldsters* (a few old knaves joined in with them) was brief and inglorious. A few knocks from wise old heads sent them under, and they have not appeared since. Still their case is instructive, They were an effect, not a cause. In

them was a wrong, dangerous spirit, else the errors with which they were so rampant could never have taken root in them. *Possibly that spirit may not now be dead, but slumbering.* I would advise the brethren not to be too sure that one or two heads of the monster may not yet contain some signs of life. At least it will do no harm to keep a sharp look out. The source from which danger once came, danger may come again. The best way to destroy a noxious plant is to kill it in the seed. At present we have no need of transcendentalists and hazy dreamers; neither shall we hereafter have. Effeminate sentimentalism, and a diluted, licentious charity, are the carbonic acid gas of the kingdom of Christ. No soul of man can live in them or with them. The truth itself dies under their blight, while the church grows cadaverous and lean. Sound men in the pulpit, sound men at the press, sound men in the field, with hearty elementary teaching and preaching—these are what we now need; and what, by the Lord's blessing, we must have. We want no half-way men or half-way work. We want sturdy men, who can grandly and fully round up every period on the old Jerusalem gospel; men of nerve, who would not shrink to hold high a hand against even a father, if he dared to bring in aught new and uncounseled by the Bible. We want no innerlightists; neither do we want men who erect their morbid sympathies into a standard by which to pronounce their brethren heretics, and the sprinkled sects around us saints. We want neither the crudities of Germany nor the phantasies of France to aid us in the interpretation of the Bible, and in our work of constructing the one body. None of these do we want.

PASTORS AND THE PASTORATE. —The office of pastor we regard as identical with that of overseer. The two are inseparable. Hence the notion of overseer, and as distinct from it, in the same church, also that of pastor, we think without the semblance of authority. There is no such function or position in the church as that of pastorate, to be filled by a special class of men different from the elders. The elders are the pastors, because it is their special duty to look after and feed the flock. This we think so clearly the case that we shall attempt no defense of it here. Now, in view of the truth as here stated, we can not but feel alarmed at the disposition on the part of many of our churches—a disposition which is clearly on the increase, to create a new office in the church, and to fill it with a class of men wholly unknown to the Bible. Our modern pastor is not the pastor of the New Testament; but the simple preacher of the gospel, transformed into a pastor, and performing a function which properly belongs to the overseers alone. If the preacher must act as pastor, let him lay aside his title of preacher, and assume that of overseer, and confine his labors jointly with others wholly to the individual church. Let him not act half the time as preacher and the other half as pastor,

being indeed neither exclusively and both by turns. We have not the least objection to a preacher laboring for the same congregation, if need so require, for one year or ten, as the case maybe, but we want him to do so simply as preacher and not as pastor. The modern office of pastor is an office not known in the New Testament; hence the limit of power which may be claimed to belong to it is not therein laid down. Consequently it is extremely difficult to say when the person who fills the office is usurping power which does not belong to him. Indeed this can not be done. He is clearly a lawless one; and may, if he see fit, go to great lengths, and do great mischief before he can be checked. To me, I am free to say, the points of resemblance between pastor, priest, and pope are more than the mere circumstance that each word begins with a p. From pastor to priest is only a short step, from priest to pope only a long one; still the step has been taken; and, for one, I am afraid to run risks; at least, I think it safest not to run them. Let us see to it that the ancient practice is our model, and the ancient Scriptures our sole guide in this and all other matters. That our churches need the most constant care I well know, and also that without it even the best of them must decline; but let us create no imaginary office, no imaginary officer, in order to meet the case. Better is no church with the word of God unbroken than is the best of so-called churches reared on its ruins.

**TIM NEW TEST.**—No position has been more distinctly enounced, or more firmly held among us, than this: that matters of opinion shall never be made tests of fellowship. The pertinacity with which we have clung to this principle, so obvious and so just, and defended it both for ourselves and for others, is no secret. It has been our pride and our boast. Is it so now? Alas, for the mutability of man! The last four years have seen it changed—changed not in the sacred matters of religion, but changed in the paltry affairs of politics. Many so-called brethren in our ranks now actually refuse to meet with and fellowship their brethren of the adverse political faith. Not only so, but they have gone so far as to advise and counsel their arrest, imprisonment, and banishment, for no crime against any law of heaven or earth, but merely because of a difference in political opinions. Even preachers have not blushed to be foremost in the work. We positively feel degraded by the circumstance. Now the men who have introduced this new test, and who at present act upon it, are heretics in the strictest sense of the word, and are themselves the men who should be put away, and not the men who should put others away. Not only have they violated a great sacred principle, essential to the peace and harmony of Christians, but they have outraged the rights and consciences of brethren, who, under its sheltering force, should have been loved and cherished. Nor have they paused in their madness even here. The hallowed sympathies of the human heart, sympathies over

which men have no more control than over the color of their eyes or the currents of the sea, even these have been made crimes for which men should be expelled alike from the pale of the church and the pale of the state. Neither the infirmities of tremulous old age nor the tenderness of spotless womanhood have been proof against the tyranny of these hypocrites, whom in politeness we must call brethren. In times of extraordinary passion we should certainly cultivate the spirit of extraordinary forbearance, and should with joy embrace the first moment of a return to reason to forgive. But how it is possible for us as a people, without a repudiation of the principle just named, to recognize and treat as brethren in the meek and gentle Saviour these people, unless they deeply repent, I at least can not see. That many who have greatly erred will retract and return is both our faith and hope; but many more will not. Indeed they can not. They have so cruelly sinned against Christ and their brethren that I see not how they can ever propose a return. What then shall be done? Our great rule respecting opinion has been broken. What shall be our guide for the future? And what guarantee have we left? These questions hang a deep shadow on my spirit, and make me guess and fear. I see here the seeds of trouble for which I see no cure—signs of a falling away, which fill me with grief. But as for others I can not speak; as for self I can. The rule with me stands as heretofore—a thing never to be broken, but to be held ever sacred among the people of God. If others will not regard it, by the Lord's help I will. Hence he whose faith is pure and life faultless is my brother, to be embraced and loved, I care not with whom or what form of government he may sympathize. Hypocrites and fanatics may clamor at this, and call it by what name their madness supplies—I am firm. We have many brethren, good and true, who have not bowed the knee to that treacherous thing called *politics*. In Christ and these is our trust; and with them do we propose to work.

THE ORGAN MANIA. —In one of the past numbers of the *Quarterly* appeared a short piece on this topic. Since that writing nothing has occurred to change a single conviction there expressed. Some things have happened to give us pain. The spirit has not been checked; but under the gentle handling it has received, has only grown more bold and defiant. Editors and preachers may write and preach against organs till the last trump shall sound, but while they countenance the churches in which they stand, visit them, and suffer the machines to be cracked over their heads, they are but whistling idly in the air. There is but one way to cure the spirit in question—*crush it*. When a church learns that no preacher will set foot within its doors while it holds an organ; when it sees that its members are abandoning it; that it is fast coming to naught; and that unless it gives up its unholy innovation it is destined to ruin—then will it kick out its organ,

not before. But show us, say these churches, wherein we are wrong; give us reason, give us argument, give us Scripture, not declamation, against our organ, then will we put it away, not before. Hold, shallow talker, hold; it is *you*, not *we*, who propose the innovation. Do you, then, show us wherein you are right; give us reason, give us argument, give us Scripture *for* the innovation. Otherwise be silent, and never more name your wicked hobby. But no argument of the question is here proposed. What we have said before, we say again: wink at and parley with this spirit, and it will, in course of time, screw down an organ in every church in our ranks. As a fitting accompaniment, it will soon introduce a class of *reverend* gentlemen called pastors to minister in its holy things. This will render our churches quite *popular*. Only a few more steps are necessary to complete the return. Divide the *slacks* from the *truees*, as was done in the city of Detroit, write out for the former a creed, and at once the brakeman cries, *Rome!* If now we can only add an occasional soiree in our churches, periodic fairs, receptions, bazaars, with a dance on Christmas and on the Fourth of July, all the exquisites in the land would at once style us beautifully orthodox! Even Beecher, Rice, and Crowell could not reject us then.

The manner in which this spirit effects its ends is worthy of note. It sees no harm in an organ, thinks one would improve the music, would like to have one, wants one, determines to get one, buys it, spikes it down to the church floor, employs Mademoiselle Fouchee to perform on it; and now meekly adds: Dear me, why, had I only known that it would hurt your feelings, I would not have acted so. But now try to put the vile thing out. *Not one inch shall it be moved.* Come wounds, come strife, come division, come what not, —*it shall not go out.* And now to avoid a fuss, confusion, disgrace, good men, who inwardly loathe the thing, but who remonstrate in vain, submit. They can do nothing else. They must yield or quarrel and separate. They, in shame and grief, choose the former, in hope that coming time may possibly bring a remedy. But the remedy never comes. Thus the organ and the Devil find themselves ensconced together in the house of the Lord.

The spirit of innovation is a peculiar spirit. While coming in it is the meekest and gentlest of spirits; only it is marvellously firm and persistent. But when going out, no term but fiendish will describe it. It comes in humming the sweetest notes of Zion; it goes out amid the ruin it works, howling like an exorcised demon. At first it is supple as a willow twig; you can bend it mould it, shape it to any thing; only it will have its way. But when once it has finally got its way, then mark how it keeps its footing. It now calls for reason, for argument, for scripture; but no more has it an ear for reason argument, or Scripture than has the image of Baal. Argue with the spirit

of innovation indeed! I would as soon he caught cracking syllogisms over the head of the man of sin. Never. Rebuke it in the name of the Lord; if it go not out—*expel it*. This only will cure it.

I know that I am accused of writing too severely on these matters. It is idle to so accuse me. I can not change. Others may do as they see fit; but by the Lord's help I will never tamely submit to these innovations. My whole mind, and soul, and strength shall be spent to check them. It is high time that manful and outspoken voices were lifted against them. They are the insidious leaven of Satan, and, for one, can get no countenance from me. If I go down, if my humble paper goes down, be it so. I am immovable. Defeat with truth is better than victory with error. Give me the Saviour and a cross rather than the Enemy and a crown.

He is a poor observer of men and things who does not see slowly growing up among us a class of men who can no longer be satisfied with the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things. These men must have changes; and silently they are preparing the mind of the brotherhood to receive changes. Be not deceived, brethren, the Devil is not sleeping. If you refuse to see the danger till ruin is upon you, then it will be too late. The wise seaman catches the first whiff of the distant storm, and adjusts his ship at once. Let us profit by his

Let us agree to commune with the sprinkled sects around us, and soon we shall come to recognize them as Christians. Let us agree to recognize them as Christians, and immersion, with its deep significance, is buried in the grave of our folly. Then in not one whit will we be better than others. Let us countenance political charlatans as preachers, and we at once become corrupt as the loathsome nest on which Beecher sets to hatch the things he calls Christians. Let us consent to introduce opinions in politics as tests of fellowship, and soon opinions in religion will become so. Then the door of heresy and schism will stand wide open, and the work of ruin will begin. Let us agree to admit organs, and soon the pious, the meek, the peace-loving, will abandon us, and our churches will become gay worldly things, literal Noah's arks, full of clean and unclean beasts. To all this let us yet add, by way of dessert, and as a sort of spice to the dish, a few volumes of innerlight speculations, and a cargo or two of *reverend* dandies dubbed pastors, and we may congratulate ourselves on having completed the trip in a wonderfully short time. We can now take rooms in Rome, and chuckle over the fact that we are as orthodox as the rankest heretic in the land.

Though we thus speak, and though we see the future not in the most enchanting light, we yet have hope. Many noble men are left. Many true hearts are still ready to be offered up on the altar of one Book, a pure faith, and faultless practice. In God and these we put



## THE CONTRIBUTION.

IN the first number of the current volume the readers of the *Quarterly*, in an able article under this heading, have their attention called to a subject of profound interest.

The power and spirit of the gospel in no one of its claims upon the human conscience are seen with greater clearness than in its triumphs over the lust of gain. The Saviour has placed this sentiment before us with all the force of a divine oracle. "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If, therefore, you have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will intrust you with the true riches?"

One feels to pause here, and tremblingly to ask Is it so? *The Scriptures can never be broken*. Is it so? Heaven and earth may pass away, but my word can never pass away. Oh! how lightly we tread now upon these burning coals of fire, which to thousands will never be quenched!

Though we welcome the article with so much pleasure as the beginning we trust of a still further and fuller development of the subject of which it treats, still there are points in the proposition with which the writer sets out, and for the verification or proof of which he mainly labors, which, though clearly stated, lack that fullness of proof for which the mind hungers when dealing with questions of such import.

There is something repugnant to the mind in regarding an ordinance which terminates on food and raiment, as an *ordinance of worship* under the dispensation of the Spirit.

If, however, it could be made to appear that such a contribution or collection should be taken up on the first day of the week, even of every week, are we therefore to place it among the acts of worship, such as singing, prayer, and eating the Lord's supper? Are we mistaken when the ordinances of the gospel are regarded by us as the highest acts of spiritual worship in which we can ever engage in this life? Are they not trees in the garden of God (the church) on which hang the fruit of life? That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Within this sacred enclosure we have no need of the "light of the sun, nor the light of the moon." The Lord God and the Lamb are the light of it. Nothing here terminates on the flesh; it is all spirit, all life. "Not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," he has been constituted a priest.

"The holy kiss," "the washing of the saints' feet," "the Sabbath," the "ministering to the necessities of the saints," and, if you please,

"instrumental music," from our present stand-point, though all of God, occupy one and the same plane. They are all of the "earth earthy," and are founded on the nature and constitution of man in his relations to the present life, and from the nature of things are excluded as acts or parts of worship from God's spiritual temple (the church), where he is worshiped "in spirit and according to truth."

Is it not, may I ask, at the point of positive ordinances that our faith is accounted to us for righteousness, as Abraham, made perfect by obedience? Just here we step off "the foundation," and begin the work of "laying another," which is not another, only as it becomes the "foundation" of "the apostasy;" for in what does this consist, if not in ordinances merely human? In the one centres the power of God for justification through faith; in the other the power of Satan through unbelief.

Have the dumbest observers failed to see the deadly hatred which the latter bears to the former? Hence the fierce conflict through which our brethren have passed, and are still passing. Is the human heart capable of a hatred more intense than "sprinkling" bears to "exclusive immersion?" And is there any thing held in more ineffable contempt than the Lord's supper of the New Testament, as set forth in the weekly commemoration of his death by a "monthly," a "quarterly," or an "annual sacrament." At these respective altars we worship. No strange thing has happened when the one persecutes the other. "Wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." All along the line covered by the positive ordinances of the gospel, with their antecedents and consequents, is the battle-ground of this deadly conflict. But this is a digression. Let us come back to our subject.

That provision should have been made for the wants of such as may not be able to provide for themselves is certainly in keeping with the spirit of the gospel. That it should take the form of a weekly contribution, even to the just designation of "the contribution," would seem entirely in harmony with the spirit and genius of the gospel. But to give it a place as an act of worship, as prayer, praise, and the Lord's supper, is lifting it to the highest point of spiritual communion.

Still, if the Scriptures so place it (which we have assumed they do not), it is all important that we be rightly instructed on this, as on all other vital living points. It is just here that the want is felt, in reading the article of which we are speaking.

If the contribution be an act of worship, as the Lord's supper, when does it become so? The laws which govern it must answer. These are time, place, circumstance. 1. On the first day of the week (every week). 2. When assembled with the church. 3. As the Lord has prospered the worshiper.

I confess there is something fearful in this last qualification. Some

poor widow may drop her farthing into the treasury and meet the full complement of the law in the case; but who has the courage to speak, or write, or even think of the mockery and insult that has been going on, even in our own churches, if the contribution be an act of worship, and these the laws which govern it. "To be guilty in one, is to be guilty in all."

But against it, as an act of worship, may not other objections be urged? If worship at all, the act itself, the contribution, must be the thing performed. Would not this deprive the ones for whose benefit the ordinance was given of all participation in the worship, so far as the ordinance goes? Was there ever an ordinance of religion given of God for one class of persons to the exclusion of another under any dispensation? The Lord's day, the Lord's house, the Lord's table, singing, and prayer are for all God's people; but the "fellowship" excludes the Lord's poor from any participation as an act of worship. Does the gain to the flesh compensate for the loss to the spirit?

Whether the writer of the article has fully sustained himself in other respects may be submitted to those of a more enlarged experience than is claimed by me. The subject, however, needs a thorough handling; deep thought and greatness of heart are the needed elements to master it; our destiny as a people hangs tremblingly upon it. God and mammon are the mighty forces claiming dominion. "If the Lord be God, worship him; if Baal be God, worship him." We can not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. "We can not serve God and mammon."

As the matter now stands, if the contribution is to be understood as a fixed law of God for the supply of the wants of the poor and the furtherance of the gospel, and these the laws which govern it, let the rulers of our churches see to it that the brotherhood are fully taught upon the subject.

I am truly glad that this article has appeared in the *Quarterly* at this early stage of its labors, and, for myself, thank the writer for having led the way in discussing and settling a subject fraught with such immense interests to us as a people. It ought not to be concealed, that there hangs over us—an otherwise great and promising people—a dark foreboding, which, if unheeded, will end in our utter overthrow. I need scarcely pen the words, so obvious is it to us all; I mean the blighting, damning sin worldly mindedness, deep down at the bottom of this monstrous iniquity lies the love of money. It is now eating like a canker at the very roots of our existence; evidently our churches are most imperfectly taught, if taught at all, on this subject.

A power so omnipotent for evil would, if rightly used, be equally strong for good. No being in the universe, better than Satan, knows the prodigious gain to the cause of the victor in this mighty contest. Shall our great and most favored brotherhood be the victors in the

struggle, or will we be led the easy captives "by the world, the flesh, and the Devil?"

As we now stand to the world and each other there seems but one of God's gifts which, by common consent, is to be devoted to the furtherance of the gospel. If any one has the gift of speech, so as to communicate his thoughts with facility and eloquence, all say, and say truly, "you ought to preach." If a man has the gift from God to accumulate wealth ("it is God who giveth to a man power to get riches") we all say you ought to devote the fruits of that power first for your own necessities, and after this to the furtherance of the gospel? Does the man live who can give to God and his own understanding a reason why the two several gifts bear a relation, the one to the flesh, and the other to the Spirit—why the one binds the possessor to devote himself to Christ and the church, and the other is left free to devote himself to the world, the flesh, and the Devil?

No question more vitally concerns us than this; our life or death is in it. If the great surplus fund now in the hands of brethren is to be offered a holocaust to the flesh, then the flood of corruption must flow in upon us. If our brethren will "sow dragon's teeth, then we must expect Satan's armed men to spring up in our midst;" on one side or the other this surplus must fall. No power in the universe can save from the alternative. To the flesh it must go, if not given to the spirit. If to the flesh, then of the flesh we must reap corruption; but if to the spirit it be devoted, then of the spirit we will reap life everlasting, so teach the Scriptures; and Jesus says "they can not be broken." "As you have yielded your members servants to iniquity, unto iniquity, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness, unto holiness, that your fruit may be unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." We have seen that sectarianism has no power in it to "deliver from this present evil world." It is a frightful amalgum "of Christ and Belial," "flesh and spirit," "God and mammon." Is the god of this world to have dominion forever? And are we as a people, like those who have gone before us, to fall down and worship him who once made the experiment upon one mightier than himself? It is his old game, to the perils of which we are fast drifting; but the remedy, let some one mightier than I say in what it shall consist. Meanwhile, there is no subject on which the Scriptures have spoken with greater plainness than this. But we, —like Israel of old, "the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."

A. G.

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

## HADES, OR THE UNSEEN.

WE have been requested to furnish the readers of the *Quarterly* an article on the curious subject of Hades, or the Unseen. If only a single individual were interested in it, or if the request were intended to procure gratification for mere curiosity, we should decline the task. But such is not the case. No Christian can deny that he feels an interest in it. This makes the interest universal. Nor can it be concluded that mere curiosity seeks its solution. The subject is indisputably a Scriptural one. Hence the desire to know all that is knowable about it is legitimate and right. We feel, then, perfectly justified in submitting the thoughts and suggestions herein contained. Not that we expect to present a satisfactory solution of the difficult topic, or to furnish a piece that shall be unexceptionable. We have no such vanity. For the present at least the full solution of the subject may be readily admitted to be unattainable; and as for an unexceptionable piece, a large part of which is confessedly conjectural, the thing is out of the question. What we shall aim at is this: to present the subject as fully as we can by aid of the partial light which the Scriptures throw on it; to notice such other important items as stand seemingly or actually connected with it; to expand somewhat the conclusions which these Scriptures seem to imply or warrant; and to notice some dangerous inferences which have been deduced from the subject and from Scriptures related to or supposed to be related to it. In doing this, if we chance to weave into the body of our piece an occasional flight of an unfertile fancy, or pause to indulge the luxury of some distant, though it may be illusive, view, let the reader not chide us. The soul of man needs its pastimes as well as the body; and the Bible, no less than the world, has its mountain peaks and high outstanding crags, which now and then we like to adventure over; where even the cautious have constant need to watch their necks, and where the reckless are sure to break theirs. We love at times to break away from the inexorable fastenings of logic, and to free ourselves from the pitiless moods of criticism; to wander half idly about the great world of truth, with an eye ever open to catch any straggling ray of light which may in mercy be permitted to go abroad to repay him who peeps therefor. In these wanderings, half haphazard, half thoughtful, would it be any thing strange if now we should be caught napping, and then, after being decoyed off into some long, treacherous reach of thought, we should be found, out of wit and sense, once more seeking to return to the

sober world of truth and fact? We think not. Should we then occasionally follow some adventurous whim beyond the mete which tyrannous common sense lays down, indulge us, reader, in our folly. If not in this piece, then in some other, we promise a return to the proprieties which you coldly dictate as universal laws of editorial cogitating and writing.

It can not be denied that we encounter several dangers in treating a subject like the present. In the first place the subject is very unfully discussed in the Bible; yet in handling it the wish is strong to present a complete view of it. Thus the temptation to make very unwarrantable drafts on the imagination becomes difficult to resist. In this way we may easily be led, not merely beyond all safe bounds, but even beyond all allowable speculation. The subject itself lies a little way out and a long way in the region of the inscrutable. Prompted by curiosity, we with much facility cross the line and are soon hopelessly bewildered in the mazes beyond. When a rich and curious vein of thought crops out into the world of light from the unseen abode of pure spirits, he must be better balanced than usually falls to the lot of men, and possess an iron control over his will, who can trace that vein up to the point where it enters the unsearchable, and there pause with no wish or effort to follow it further. It is trite to say that watchfulness generally fails us here; and that we are seldom checked till we push out far beyond where human thought can safely lead. But the chief danger that arises just here is this: What the writer avowedly sets down as speculation, the reader does not always take up as speculation, but accepts it as truth or as the faith of the writer, and transmits it as such. Thus the speculation of one becomes the faith of many. Again: a mere hypothesis is laid down, laid down expressly as a hypothesis, and to be used only in the search after the true, or the probably true; but when this hypothesis passes into the brain of the reader it ceases to be hypothesis, and is either held as a doctrine of Holy Writ, or as the settled dogma of its original author. It thus at second hand becomes a new and dangerous thing.

Further: in discussing a long and difficult question, many points have to be compared in their minutest shades of agreement and difference, and probabilities have to be weighed with finest skill. It often happens that none but the most practiced eye can detect on which side the truth-lies. The facts for and the facts against seem, to the gross observer, to be exactly equal. The finer shades of thought, and many palpable points of proof to the subtle dialectician, never occur to him. He is in hot haste to pounce down on the conclusion; and among the probabilities and facts in hand the one which possesses the greatest gross weight, though perhaps in itself of least determining value of any in the lot, is the one on which he fixes as

furnishing it. The danger arising in this case is this: that a conclusion, the very opposite of the truth, will often be drawn from premises which not at all warrant it, and which are more than countervailed by the opposing facts. This is one of the most fruitful sources of error in discussions of the nature of the one now in hand. We must caution the reader who stands in danger against it, and request him to rest no judgment on any such grounds. Let his conclusion indisputably result from the premises; otherwise let it be held in check. We are much mistaken if the very subject now in hand has not been abused in the precise respect we are now considering. From it, or from Scriptures supposed to be collaterally connected with it, conclusions have been drawn half subversive of certain truths of the gospel, and wholly subversive of the faith of those who drew them. Let their fate be our warning.

The word *hades*, as most of our readers know, is a Greek word, signifying *unseen*. It applies universally to all things which are not objects of sight, or which lie beyond the reach of human view. But the word is not here under consideration in this large sense. *The unseen*, meaning thereby a particular place, is what we have in hand. Still more fully, we mean by it *the unseen abode of human spirits after death*. It is a well-known fact that among the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans, as well as among the other enlightened nations of the earth at that time, it was held that at death the human spirit leaves the body, and that it exists apart from it as a living conscious intelligence. It is no part of our present business to enter into an examination of this wide-spread faith, or to attempt a satisfactory account of it. That it assumed different forms in different nations, accordingly as it became blended with this, that, or the other national traditions, we know; but this is nothing to the point. It existed as a faith—this is the important fact to us; and that in its simple original form, no matter to whom or what that origin was owing, it embodied the truth is what gives it its value as a faith. Now *hades* is the term which denotes *the unseen abode* of these disembodied spirits—the place where as spirits they dwell. So much for the meaning of the term, of which more hereafter.

But is it a doctrine of the Bible that at death the human spirit leaves the body, and maintains, as the true rational man, a separate conscious state of being? This is the question first in order. For if human spirits do not so exist, then obviously is there no unseen abode of them. But, on the contrary, if they do so exist, then that there is such an abode becomes a necessary inference. An inquiry respecting it would in that event be both legitimate and natural.

The reader will observe that we have not put the question in general terms: Is it true that at death the human spirit leaves the body, etc.? We have specially limited it; and we desire that the limitation

be strictly kept in mind. The question is: Is it a doctrine of *the Bible* that at death the human spirit leaves the body, etc.? If it be a doctrine of the Bible, of course it is true; but we desire to limit the discussion to the Bible in order to avoid resting a conclusion on speculative and metaphysical grounds. We shall now proceed to cite and comment on such Scriptures as in our judgment tend to shed light on and settle the question.

1. "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord." (Deut. xviii., 10, 11.)

A necromancer is one who, aided by intercourse with the dead, foretells future events. In the passage in hand the Israelites are told that no such person shall be found among them. Certainly, then, there were such persons. God does not enact a law against a nonentity. The reality of such beings must be assumed to justify the inhibition. Should it be replied, that the object of the law was merely to prevent indulgence in superstitious practices, we answer, that this does not meet the case. Had the dead existed in an unconscious state, thereby rendering consultation of them impossible; or if not in an unconscious state, still in one precluding intercourse with the living, the proper remedy would have been a simple statement of the case as it really was. This would have corrected the evil at once. If the consultation did not actually take place, then the law against it was by that very fact not only a nullity, but a deception. It accepted as a reality that which in fact was none; and inhibited what never had any existence and could have none. This is wholly inconsistent with our conceptions of God as a lawgiver. We feel compelled, then, to admit that in the days of Moses some of the living held actual sensible intercourse with some of the dead. No conclusion can rest on a surer basis than this. How numerous the class of persons disallowed was, or to what extent the intercourse was carried on, we know not. We have simply the fact that such a class did exist, and that they did consult the dead. From these premises three conclusions indisputably follow, namely, 1. That the spirits of the dead exist after death, out of the body, in a state of conscious intelligence; for no one will contend that the consultation was with the lifeless corpse. 2. That in this state the human spirit has a higher knowledge than it possessed before death; since it knows and is enabled to foretell the future. 3. That intelligent intercourse with the dead did in some cases actually take place. These are startling conclusions; but if founded well, it is an act of weakness to reject them. Whether the consultation was with wicked spirits, or with spirits of the just, we have not the means of knowing. The most natural



conclusion would seem to be, that, as the consultation itself was wrong, none but evil spirits would engage in it. But a case now to be cited stands against it.

2. "And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known to me what I shall do." (1 Sam. xxviii., 15:)

This is a single verse taken from the marvelous case of the woman of Endor bringing up Samuel. The reader should turn to the narrative and carefully examine it again. It is full of wonder. The necromancer and the person possessed of a familiar spirit, though differing it may be in other respects, seem yet to have agreed in this—that each was a consulter of the dead, and both were alike proscribed in the law. The woman of Endor is not called a necromancer, but is said to have had "a familiar spirit." That she possessed an extraordinary power over the dead, indeed a power which we can not distinguish from the miraculous, is evident from the face of the narrative. That this power was satanic, and not divine, is indisputable; otherwise it would never have been forbidden by the Lord. How the power was obtained we know not. We have simply the fact of its possession, and beyond this all is conjecture. But the most marvelous feature connected with it is this: that Satan could endow a living human being with power to evoke from its abode the spirit of a righteous man. Yet such was certainly the case. But we are proceeding a little too fast.

In what light are we to view the narrative in question—as literal, or as not? This, as a preliminary, merits a first word. We reply, without going at length into its vindication, that the narrative is, in our judgment, wholly and strictly literal. Saul was real; so was the woman. Her character was known, and place of residence, to the servants of Saul. These were both given. Saul disguises himself and visits her at night. The reason for this is given. The interview is natural—in brief, the whole scene, its persons, incidents, and drapery; its antecedents and results—all are told in the simplest narrative style; and many of them are corroborated by other parts of the sacred history. We hence feel compelled to regard the whole as a literal statement of what actually and truly took place. Indeed, if the narrative is not literal, or if it is to be taken in some mythological sense, then it seems to me that the whole framework of sacred history stands without a trustworthy basis. I do not see on what ground we can vindicate as true the story of Messiah's resurrection, if the case of Saul and the Endor woman are to be set down as fabulous, or as parabolic, which frequently comes to the same thing.

But after this the points of importance to us are: 1. The notorious existence of a class of persons in that day who had power to consult the dead. 2. The actual reappearance of Samuel after death at the instance of one of these. That the intercourse in all these cases was with *the spirits* of the dead, and not with them in a bodily state, is a proposition of which few will require any proof. Samuel's body slept in Ramah while he was talking with Saul in the Endor woman's house. The necromancer held communion only with the disembodied spirit. Over the mouldering dust of the body they seem to have had no power. They could summon to their presence the living rational intelligence, but over the silent bones and flesh they had no control. For that they had no use; with it they could hold no intercourse eliciting intelligence. With the knowing part only had they dealings. That Samuel appeared as "an old man" "covered with a mantle" is nothing against this. He had so to appear to allay all doubt as to his identity. Hence, as soon as he was described, Saul recognized him as Samuel. Still he was in Saul's presence, out of the body, without "flesh and bones," a still existent spirit after the event of his death. This establishes for the human spirit a separate state of existence from the body, a state in which the past is not forgotten and the future is known—a state of consciousness and intelligence.

But there is another point in the case in hand which we must not omit to notice. It is found in the following from Samuel: "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me." This language can not be construed as referring simply to death. Its meaning is not: To-morrow shall you and your sons be dead. This is certainly implied in it; But Samuel's words reach beyond this. Their natural and obvious import is: To-morrow you shall be with me in the unseen abode of the spirits of the dead. That there is such an abode, necromancy, the case of Samuel, and the language now in hand take for granted. They assume it as a known reality, and proceed in regard to it as a matter of course. Many truths are thus assumed and treated by the Bible; and in deciding several important points, we are compelled to allow the circumstance great weight. So much for the case of Samuel. We now cite the following from the New Testament:

3. "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body, I can not tell, or whether out of the body, I can not tell, God knoweth: such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, whether in the body, or out of the body, I can not tell, God knoweth. How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." (2 Cor. xii., 2-4.)

Paul here represents himself as being caught up to the third heaven; but whether in the act he was in the body or out of it he is

unable to say. But on what ground could he use the language, if the knowing part of man is incapable of existing out of the body? If the spirit never leaves the body, but is always confined to it; or if it can not exist without and independent of it; if, in other words, the materialistic view of man is the true view, and when a man dies all that is within him dies, so that the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, goes into the grave and there lies in a mass together, then Paul's language can never be vindicated. In that view he could not say, "whether in the body or out of the body, I can not tell." He knew perfectly that he was in the body and not out of it; since there is no such thing as a separate existence. Either Paul's language implies what is not true, or the human spirit may and does exist out of the body. Now although this conclusion of itself is not enough to establish for the spirit a separate and continuous existence after death, yet a separate state of existence being once made out for it as an actuality, leaves its continuance after death to be settled as an independent fact. This, then, becomes comparatively easy. For whenever it is shown in one case that the spirit can exist out of the body, and in the same or another that it did exist out of it even one instant after death, we at once deduce the universal conclusion, the fact in question being of the nature to warrant one, that all human spirits can exist out of their bodies, and that they do exist after death. Further: whenever the fact of a spirit's existence after death is once established, its continued existence may be inferred. Its ceasing to exist could legitimately be denied, and would then have to be proved.

4. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. For we walk by faith, not by sight. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." (2 Cor. v., 5-9. 1)

The apostle here speaks of his body as a home or place of abode, and of himself as something distinct from it. That he speaks of his spirit hardly admits of a doubt. This, then, is the true and proper self of a man, the rational man and therefore the essential man. This self or inner man Paul represents as, at the time, at home in the body, and in consequence of that circumstance as absent from the Lord. Again: he expresses a willingness rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord; that is, that the essential self or true rational man should go from home, leave the body, and be with the Lord. That this is his meaning, or the import of his language, we do not admit to be questionable. Paul, then, was constituted of two parts: the body or home, and the dweller therein. This might be in that or out of it, according to circumstances; thus implying that

they were separable, and might exist or dwell apart, the one with the Lord, the other not, but still on the earth. Not only, then, is the spirit capable of existing out of the body and independent of it, but it is here shown to be capable of a continuous state of existence. Nay more, it is shown to be capable of existing out of the body in a continuous state of conscious happiness; for the expression, present with the Lord, can mean nothing else.

How in the light of these Scriptures any man can maintain that the spirit is incapable of existing out of the body, and that it never does so exist, no right-thinking man can see. Indeed there is no way of accounting for the fact, except on the ground that some men are willfully perverse and determinedly blind. Such a conclusion, however unpleasant, we are compelled in certain cases to accept. We reluctantly impeach any man's heart, but in order to avoid having our own head sometimes impeached we must do it.

5. "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (Philip, i., 21-24.)

This passage is, as a proof, of the same import and to the same effect as the preceding. We need not, therefore, dwell on it long. It clearly recognizes the deep laid and ineffaceable distinction between the flesh and the spirit. To remain in the flesh Paul knew to be better for the cause of Christ, and for them among whom he labored; but to be absent from the flesh and present with the Lord he knew would be better for himself, hence he desired it. He expressed no desire to be present with Christ in the flesh, for this he knew he could not be. To be present with the Lord was to leave the flesh, and to live for the time being out of it. Yet this he desired; and this implies the separability of the flesh and the spirit, and the distinct and conscious existence of the latter. For how could Paul speak of being present with the Lord, if there is nothing in man which, at death, leaves the body and goes to the Lord? If all remains in the body after death which dwelt in it before, then after death a man is no more with the Lord than before death. Hence to express a desire to die and be with the Lord, is to express what can never be realized; and implies a false view, both of what man is and what his destiny will be—a thing with which we can hardly charge the apostle. Again: we conclude that man has a spirit which at death leaves the body, and lives in conscious absence from it, until the day in which the mouldering part is revived from the tomb. Then into that new airy thing called a "spiritual body" will the spirit enter, and there dwell through boundless eternity. This will be man's perfection.

6. "And they stoned Stephen, calling on the Lord and saying, *Lord,*

*receive my spirit.* And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this he fell asleep." (Acts vii., 59, 60.)

Now let us bear in mind that Stephen was an inspired man, full of the Holy Spirit; and that he most likely said all this under its immediate influence. He can not, then, be admitted even to imply an error, much less to express one. He does not, then, ask the Lord to receive his body. This he knew would not be done. He asks him to receive *his spirit*, and this only. This request implies that he had a spirit as distinguished from his body; that these two were separable, and might exist apart, the one with the Lord, the other here on earth. Certainly it is not impossible for even an inspired man to make a request which the Lord will not answer. Few persons, however, will be bold enough to set Stephen's down as belonging to this class. If not, then it was answered; and while devout men were carrying his body to its burial, his spirit was borne by angels into Abraham's bosom, where it remains to the present instant. Let us for a moment suppose all this to be denied. Stephen, then, had nothing within him which he could truly call his spirit; nothing consequently which could be separated from his body, and hence nothing which the Saviour could receive. His whole petition was hence a vulgar error, having no foundation in truth or fact. This conclusion the Bible student, at least, will hardly be willing to accept. If not, then the literal answer of Stephen's prayer is the only one that remains.

7. "And he said to Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said to him, Verily, I say to thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii.)

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the language here last used is that of the Saviour to his companion in death, the penitent thief. That it is literal or unfigurative needs no proof. Its face carries the evidence of this. What inference, then, does it fairly warrant? That Christ and the penitent went that day into a place called paradise. This much certainly it warrants. Now paradise and the grave are not names for the same place, but names for different places. Into the grave Christ's body went that day. Let us also suppose that the penitents went there too. The grave, then, was not the place where Christ meant they should meet together. Hence, he must, of necessity, have referred to something else besides their bodies; he must have referred to their spirits. These were denoted by the "thou" and the "me." Hence, the "thou" and the "me," which denoted their spirits, went together into paradise, which is not the grave. Now this proves, in the case of the penitent, that his spirit that day, at death, left his body, and went into a place called paradise. What was true of him in this respect, is true of all at least whom Christ receives. At death, then, their spirits go into paradise. Further:

when the penitent met the Saviour in paradise, he must have recognized him as the Saviour, and have felt in himself that his promise had been to the letter kept. This proves that after death his spirit was not only absent from the body, but in the unseen abode of spirits, and there as a remembering conscious being. This much seems absolutely certain.

Hence, from the foregoing Scriptures, facts, and reasonings, we feel the inference to be not only just, but necessary, that at death the human spirit separates from the body, and dwells apart from it in a state of conscious intelligence. Not only do we profoundly believe this to be the positive teaching of Holy Writ; but we believe it to underlie the whole framework of revelation, and to run through it from beginning to end as a thing perfectly known to its authors, and never to be questioned by any one. To deny it is, in our sober judgment, to put in question the truth of the Bible; because it is putting in question all the laws and rules of interpretation, which render it a consistent book, and one which human reason can accept. We would no more hesitate to deny the resurrection of the dead than we would the conclusion just drawn. We hold both in the same firm grasp.

Since, therefore, human spirits leave their bodies at death, and still continue to exist as intelligent beings, it follows of necessity that they must have some place in which to dwell. This place is called in the word of God *hades*, a word which means, as already stated in this paper, the *unseen*. It is so named, however, not because it is absolutely unseen, but simply because it is unseen to us. The, expression, unseen, as applied to it, can have no reference to our heavenly Father, none to Christ. The unseen all lies open and bare to them. The term has sole reference to men, and to men in the flesh. It is intended, moreover, to express simply a fact, not an impossibility. The place is unseen, not it can not be and will not be.

But where is the unseen located? On this, question' we propose to be as mute as the body whose spirit has entered the place. The speculations of Greeks and Romans on it would, no doubt, appear both curious and interesting to many a reader; but they possess no solid advantage which can entitle them to insertion here. Nor can more be said with certainty of the traditions of the Hebrews. We would naturally expect these, from their intercourse with prophets and inspired men, to have juster views in the case than any other people. Yet we know not that this was so. It may well be questioned whether even the prophets knew more on the question than the common people; and if they did, it is hardly probable that they were allowed to communicate it. It seems to form no part of the plan of our heavenly Father to impart information merely to gratify our desire for knowledge, much less to gratify curiosity. Unless it is in some sense necessary to our faith, or is useful in shaping practice, or has to be

imparted accidentally, in order to communicate something else, information is withheld. It could serve no useful or necessary end that we can see to tell us where the unseen is. Hence it has not been done. To know that such a place *is*, we feel to be necessary; but *where* it is, we do not.

The abode, be it where it may, appears to be divided into two apartments, or to embrace within it two vast separate regions. These regions are respectively the abodes of the righteous spirits and the wicked spirits of the dead. And although they may stand wide apart, and even be to each other wholly unseen, a fact which the New Testament would rather seem to forbid, yet they are both embraced in the meaning of the unseen. With respect to these two apartments the term is general, including them both. A single fact will serve to establish the truth of this. That Abraham and Lazarus were in the apartment of the unseen allotted to pious spirits, no One will question. Now in this same unseen was the rich man also, but in a different department. All three were in the unseen—the two in bliss, the One in torment. But where Abraham was, the spirits of all the righteous dead are; and where the rich man was, the spirits of all the wicked dead are. Hence the expression, the unseen, embraces the abodes of both these.

Into the one or the other of these abodes enters the spirit of every human being that dies. Neither is the one the ultimate heaven of the righteous, nor the other the ultimate hell of the wicked. They are clearly intermediate states, but not states of probation. The future destiny of no man is changed after entering here. The deeds of the present life determine that. The general opinion, even among Bible readers, seems to be, that as soon as a good man dies he goes immediately into the presence of God, or into his eternal home; and that as soon as the wicked dies, he goes at once to his final hell. This opinion is certainly erroneous; yet it can not be denied that passages of Scripture can be found which seem to favor it. As for instance, the language of Stephen already quoted, "Lord, receive my spirit;" and that of Paul, "having a desire to depart and to be with Christ," and again, "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Full force should be allowed to these passages in settling the question, nor the least inclination shown to ignore their meaning. But by doing this we encounter a difficulty. We have two sets of passages to reconcile, the one of which seems to represent the spirits of all as dwelling in the unseen, while the other seems to represent the spirits of some as in the immediate presence of Christ, and not as in the unseen. The only way we have of reconciling these may be a very imperfect one. It is to assume that when the spirit of a righteous man is in the unseen, the vail which now hides the face of the Saviour from us is drawn aside, and that intercourse is free,

and to such a degree perfect as to justify the saying that he is with the Lord. When the character of the parties, and the unknown whereabouts of the unseen, with its unknown nature, are all taken into the account, there is but little that is difficult, certainly nothing that is unreasonable in this. The only other way of reconciling the passages is to assume that one set is literal, the other figurative—a dangerous assumption when things are spoken of, of which our information is confessedly very imperfect.

That we are correct in the most important of the preceding statements will appear from this: The soul or spiritual part of the Saviour entered the unseen at his death, and there remained during the time his body lay in the grave. At the end of this time, however, he left the unseen and re-entered his body. Yet after this he said to Mary: "Touch me not; *for I am not yet ascended to my Father*; but go to my brethren and say to them: I ascend to my Father and to your Father, and to my God and to your God." At the time of thus speaking, then, he had not ascended to God; yet he had been in the unseen. Hence to be in the unseen is not to be with God, except possibly in the sense previously explained. But when the Saviour entered the unseen, the penitent thief also entered it; and as the former remained there during all the time of his absence from the body; so we conclude will the latter. In other words, he will remain in the unseen till the morning of the first resurrection; then he will enter his spiritual body, and ever afterward be with the Saviour. We shall only add, that what we say of the penitent, we hold to be true of all the pious dead. They are not yet in their final and eternal home; for that will be this earth in its renewed form. They are in the unseen, there to remain till the moment when they shall re-enter their new, glorious bodies.

But are the spirits in the unseen in a state of conscious intelligence and activity? To enter upon a thorough discussion of this question is foreign to the design of this piece. Too much space would thereby be occupied; besides many parts of the discussion would be difficult, and ill-suited to the common reader. We profoundly believe the affirmative of the question to be true. We believe the spirits of the dead to be in a state of high mental activity. No more does the spirit of a ransomed man Bleep in the unseen or anywhere else from death till the resurrection, or even for one moment, than does the Almighty sleep on his throne. We have no sympathy with that infernal delusion called *soul-sleeping*. Neither have we respect enough for it to attempt its refutation. We speak for the comfort of good men, not the refutation of bad ones. Still in passing we may jot down a thought or two.

1. The human spirit is continuously active up to death. This is a fact of universal experience. The spirit, moreover, is separable from



the body; and nothing is known of death which will enable us to say that it suspends the active powers of the spirit, or in any other way in the least affects it. Therefore we are compelled to infer the continued activity of those powers. For a state that continues up to a certain point at which, though we may lose sight of it, nothing happens which is known in the least to affect it, is presumed to be continuous still beyond that point by one of the sternest rules of

2. Abraham and the rich man, though in the unseen, were represented by the Saviour as in a state of high mental activity. Nor is this a picture of what shall be after the judgment, but a statement of what existed at the moment of speaking. Now if the soul of man is wholly inactive after death, then this important part of the Saviour's statement has no counterpart in fact. But this can not be admitted. Hence the spirit must remain active after death.

3. The condition of Samuel after death was not different from that of other spirits in the unseen. Yet while there he knew what the fate of Saul would be. This implies mental activity. This, then, must be the state or condition of all spirits in that abode. Samuel did not learn the fate of Saul after he came up; he knew it before. This is curious, and might lead to interesting inquiries as to how far the affairs of the living are known to the dead.

4. Moses had undergone no change between death and the scene of the transfiguration. He hence differed in no known respect from any other spirit of the unseen. He had neither left that abode nor re-entered his body. Yet in that scene his mental powers showed a singular activity. Nay more, he showed that in the unseen it was known that Christ was about to be crucified; for he "spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." This conclusively proves that in the unseen the spirit remains conscious, intelligent, and active.

5. But the following language of the Saviour places the question beyond dispute: "He [the Father] is not a God of the dead, but of the living; *for all live to him.*" To us Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead, but not so to the Father. To him all *are alive*. Hence all will be raised from the dead. The Saviour does not mean that because God is the God of the living, therefore the dead *will be* made alive; but because he is the God of the living, therefore the dead *are alive*, that is, alive to him, alive in fact, though dead to us. And this he speaks not of men in the body, but of men out of the body, and hence of men as pure spirits; and further, he speaks it not of one, but of all. It consequently follows that the spirits of all the dead are now alive; and if alive, conscious and active. This point, then, we shall hold as settled.

But here a curious question presents itself, upon which, in passing,

a speculating thought may be bestowed. The question forces itself on our attention, otherwise it might pass in silence. It is this: Are the spirits of the unseen strictly confined therein all the time, or do they not sometimes leave it and return to their former haunts? If they never leave it, how shall we account for such cases as those of Samuel and Moses? That these returned can not be denied; and if these, why not others. Or if it be insisted that Samuel and Moses never left the unseen, then comes the question, Where is the unseen? Is it here among us, on earth, in our very midst? Samuel appeared in a room in a house in Endor, and Moses on a mountain top in Judea. Are these places within the limits of the unseen? To thinking men these questions will occur. Again: those demons so abundant in the days of the Saviour, and we fear equally so now, what of them? They spoke the language of the people among whom they invisibly prowled about and evinced a strange fondness for human bodies. They had once sinned, their doom was at the time fixed and known to them, and they were looking forward to a time of torment. Could these have been the spirits of wicked men? Why not? To these questions we pretend to furnish no replies; because touching them we have no light. But we shall not deny that some of them awake within us no small fear. We have a persuasion that Satan's time runs not very far hence; and that the infernal powers are singularly active now. Sin at present, like the spray of the sea, riots high over reason and sense; and good men are sensible that a strange, anxious pulse beats quickly within them. They are girding themselves half unconsciously for some great onset mystically defined, but still felt to be approaching. What it is they do not pretend to say, still they are watchful and expectant.

But with a single item more we close this piece, already too far drawn out. It is admitted that at death Christ entered the unseen, and that he there dwelt during his absence from his body. Now it is asked: Do not the Scriptures teach that while there he preached to the spirits in prison; and does not this afford reasonable ground for the belief that he may have held out to the wicked that on repentance and faith in him they would be ultimately saved? When we commenced this paper we intended a more minute reply than we now have room for. Still we snail be explicit.

In the first place, the Scriptures nowhere, when fairly construed, warrant us in believing that Christ, while in the unseen, preached to any one—ransomed or not. That he may have been in constant intercourse with the righteous we shall not question. But it does not consist with our notions of the unseen and of the enlightenment of the spirits there, that they needed any special instructions in the gospel. Our opinion would be that the whole scheme was there pretty well understood. We can hardly think that unclean spirits of

earth would know the Saviour and understand much of his reign, while the favored of paradise would be ignorant of these matters.

In the second place, the deeds of this life determine the character of the next. If a man dies unransomed or unwashed in the blood of Christ, our faith is that he remains so through eternity. No proposition has ever been made to the wicked of the unseen looking to their salvation. Such, at least, is our view. As the spirit stands to God at death, so it stands to him forever. Let DO one persuade himself that if he dies unsaved a chance awaits him in hell. He who leaves earth with Heaven's frowns upon him will never emerge from perdition amid smiles of redemption. Let all, then, hasten to get ready here.

---

CANADA AS A MISSIONARY FIELD. —I am now unable to name a more inviting field of labor for three or four additional excellent preachers than Canada presents. Here all is, at present at least, peace and quiet. The population is numerous, law-abiding, and obviously of a highly religious cast of mind. With the old religious forms many are dissatisfied, and only await a favorable opportunity to abandon them. Methodism exists here in its most carnal manifestations. With its frothings and rantings large numbers of the sober minded and truly pious are literally disgusted. Presbyterianism is as formal and prudish as an old maid, and as lifeless as a pulseless corpse. Episcopacy is as pretentious and haughty as of old, as hollow as an empty cask, and utterly wanting in perceptible vital energy. These religions are neither suited to the age in which we live, nor to the country of which we speak. The living soul of Canada sighs for something deeper, holier, and more divine than it can find in these mongrel systems. It sighs for the gospel, *the pure gospel*. With this at present it can not be supplied unless aided from abroad. Our brethren here are not numerous, and are, for the most part, in humble circumstances; our preachers are few, very few, and generally men who have to depend on their own industry for a support. From these constant labor in the field can not be expected. Yet in Canada we have a noble band in Christ—brethren of ready perceptions, sound hearts, and an intense solicitude for the triumph of the truth. I have never met truer men and women in Christ than I have met here. They greatly need aid, and they greatly deserve it. Can not, then, some of our Missionary Societies extend to them a friendly hand. Two sterling preachers—men of power and character, sensible, sound and laborious, could here do a vast work. They Would be received by the brethren with glad hearts and open arms. Children's children would bless them. The ancient gospel could in a short time be firmly planted in many a worthy locality. Shall it be done /

## ABUSE OF THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

FROM the outset of the great work in which we as a people are engaged, *purity of speech* has been an object never lost sight of. We looked at first and still look upon the mixed and unsanctified dialect current in religious circles, not only as a reflection upon the word of God, but as a fertile source of error and a successful means of propagating it. Long years of observation have only served to confirm these early conviction. All authorized religious notions can find utterance in terms of the Bible, divinely appropriated to that use ; and the\* moment the need is felt for other terms, the fair inference is that views unknown to the Bible are to be expressed. Terms not of the Bible will of necessity impart to the mind ideas not of the Bible; and thus the mind becomes confused in its religious contents. The thoughts of the Spirit inhabiting, as permanent fixtures, the human soul, and expressed, when need requires, in terms of the Spirit, constitute the highest learning and best literature of earth. How long will it be before the world will learn and appreciate this truth? Never, we fear. But purity of speech has two sides from which to be viewed, and a double demand to be satisfied. It requires, first, that the things of the Spirit shall be expressed only in terms of the Spirit; and, second, that things not of the Spirit shall be expressed in terms not of the Spirit. That is to say, it requires that views and thoughts of the world, and pertaining to the world, shall be expressed in worldly terms, and not in Bible terms. To abuse a Bible term is an offense against the Spirit, falling but little, if any, below the remedy of a Bible idea. There is, of course, this--distinction to be observed, that a term may be common to the Bible and to the world; in which case, clearly, it can be deemed no abuse to use the term in speaking even of worldly matters. But in the present connection we are speaking, not so much of this class of words, as of a very different class, namely, such as the names of persons, rites, and other things which have no existence independent of the gospel. As a partial illustration of what we mean, let us take the word just used, the word gospel. This, if not exclusively a Bible term, is yet a term having its true and proper signification only therein. Now, to apply this term to aught else than what it there denotes, is, it seems to me, correctly called an abuse of it, and is unjustifiable. We often hear such expressions as the following: a gospel preacher, a gospel sermon, a gospel feast, etc. Is this correct? We certainly think not. The word "gospel" has no counterpart in a man; hence it can never accurately be applied to one; and so of the other items. A sermon may be an hour long, and yet contain in it

only a single element of the gospel; it is not therefore a gospel sermon. Even allowing it to be composed mostly of elements of the gospel; still it contains human elements, and hence is not gospel. If it contain no human elements then is it the gospel, and not merely something partaking of its nature. Hence the term should never be thus used. To all of which it maybe replied, that perfection in speech is a thing not attainable in our present state; and that therefore it is useless to complain of the abuses of which we speak. This may be true, and yet we may not be wrong; hence we must insist on what we have said. Not even the semblance of abuse should have our sanction. Indeed no more should we sanction the abuse of a term which is Scriptural than we should the use of one which is not, to express an idea which is. Purity of speech consists in the strict use of Scriptural terms to express Scriptural things. This excludes the use of terms which are not Scriptural, and ought to imply the non-abuse of those which are. The nearer we approach this standard, the greater and the more certain will be the effect with which we shall proclaim the truth.

As an illustration of a grossly impure speech we will cite a popular definition of baptism. It is thus worded: baptism *is an outward sign of an inward grace*. If the manipulations of Satan ever approach so near the surface as to be sensibly felt, we should think that even the dullest touch might detect their presence in this. *Baptism is a sign*. In what book or verse of the Bible is it so said? Or, indeed, is any thing said bearing even the remotest resemblance to it? A more perfect figment never emanated from the human brain. Baptism is no sign; at least it is no sign of any thing within us. If a sign of any thing, or if intended to represent any thing; if, in other words, it is either monumental or emblematic, then is it so of the literal burial and resurrection of Christ, and of our own future burial and resurrection, but of nothing within us. But not only is baptism a sign; it *is an outward sign*. Now this word outward was a most necessary epithet in the definition. But for *this*, some orthodox blockhead might have blundered into the conclusion that when a man is baptized really nothing outward has taken place. True, his eyes might have avouched otherwise, but what of that? When the eyes and conclusions of one of the orthodox are somewhat antithetic, what signifies a thing so mendacious as the eye? But baptism is more than an outward sign: *it is a sign of an inward grace*. Ah! reader, in that phrase *inward grace* you have the body and soul of orthodoxy, the ground and essence of its popular delusions, and the jingle which has proved the hoodwink rind ruin of many a soul of man. Baptism is a sign, a mere sign, nothing more; neither in itself, nor by appointment of the Saviour, has it any value or significance—it is only a sign, a mere shadow indicating the presence of a casting substance. Moreover, this inward grace is first

in order of time and first in point of importance. This must first be possessed; then on behind it may come that outward sign, of no more importance in procuring acceptance with Christ, or in giving rest to the soul, than is the flowing of the ink in my pen. But what is that *inward grace*? Ask it not, presumptuous reader. It is orthodoxy; and dare you query as to that? Only this remains for you to know: that it is absolutely necessary to generate that inward grace; and that this, adroitly, but very innocently, lays the foundation for all those hidden impulses and miraculous sensations vulgarly styled holy ghost religion.

Again: take the phrase we have last used—holy ghost religion. Here is an expression unknown in the Bible. What it means can never be determined. Indeed it means any thing and every thing which he who glories in it may see fit to make it mean. If, however, we were called upon to define it, we should not hesitate to say it is a designation for one of the purest forms of superstition. What folly has been committed and gone unrebuked, and what gross error has been and still is propagated under cover of this expression, no living man can tell. Were a pure speech restored to the religious world, what then would become of this unauthorized expression? It would stand as a monument of their folly who use it, and as a proof of their disrespect for the word of God, because they had something to teach which that word does not sanction. Satan is never surer to eclipse the truth and ensnare the soul than when he can induce us to speak of the things of the Spirit in terms and combinations of terms not Scriptural, or to abuse and pervert those which are.

Revelation consists of two parts: the thought, or matter revealed which is revelation proper; and the terms originally selected by the Spirit, in which the thought is expressed. Both these we call divine or sacred; and no more have we the right to abuse or pervert the one than we have the other. In a translation, of course, merely the thought is transferred, and that, too, into terms not of divine but of Human selection. In this process perfection is not attainable, though certainly desirable. But when a translation is once made and accepted as correct, then purity of speech consists in expressing the revealed thought or matter in the exact terms of the translation. This with every Christian should become a rule never to be violated. But the point toward which we are mainly looking is this: whenever a term once becomes appropriated in the Bible to the expression of a particular thought, it should never be used to express any other; and when so used, it is abused. This brings us to speak more particularly of the name Christian.

In regard to the use of this term I have no hesitation in saying that, as a people, we have fallen into an error. This I well know has not been intentionally done. Still it has been done; and the circumstance should make us feel how extremely necessary it is that,

while detecting small moths in others eyes, we do not overlook the large ones in our<sup>1</sup> own. *The word Christian, according to the New Testament, is applicable to nothing but a ransomed human being.* It is there never applied to things but only to persons. To us this should be a suggestive thought. If it be true, and this we shall assume, that nothing but a human being can be a Christian, then it follows that whatever the term denotes is limited to man; and from this again, that to apply the term to any thing else is an abuse of it, and inexcusable. If these positions be correct, they will certainly suggest to our brethren the necessity for some curtailment and reform. I tried not tell the reader that the term occurs but twice in the New Testament, but this is enough to determine the extent to which it may be applied. No use but that there made of it is tenable. Every other is unauthorized and dangerous. We shall now proceed to point out some of the applications of the word to which we particularly

1. *The Christian Scriptures.* We shall not be accused of an inclination to depreciate the word of God, or of a willingness to see its power in the least impaired. Neither do we wish its distinctive character to be in any sense affected. Why, then, it may be asked, do we object to prefixing the term Christian to the Scriptures *a* qualifying epithet? I object to it, first, because it is useless. The expression, the Scriptures, is now the appropriate designation of the sacred writings. No epithet we can use can render it more intelligible or more definite. It is clear and enough, and for more than this there is no necessity.

I object to it, second, because, even allowing the term to be applicable, it is not correct. In no view could it apply to more than the New Testament; yet it is generally understood to embrace the Old as well as the New sacred writings. While the Christian accepts as profitable all these writings, yet it is the New which embraces the matter of his faith, and constitute his rule of life. This therefore is peculiarly his book; hence to this alone could the term apply, if to

It is proper to add that popular usage certainly sanctions the expression Christian Scriptures. This we well know; but in this, as in many other things, we think popular usage wrong. In matters purely worldly the decision of popular usage is generally final, but not so in matters of religion. Here usage is no standard.

2. *Christian church.* With us as a people this is certainly an ambiguous expression. Whether it denotes a meeting-house, or a congregation of disciples, the phrase itself, as used by us, does not determine. Indeed it may mean either or both. This is an evil imperiously demanding correction. I respectfully, then, submit to our brotherhood that we adopt it as a universal custom never to apply

the word church to a meeting-house. Let us apply the word church only to the whole body of Christ, and to the individual congregation. This will remove a serious blemish in our present speech. I would further suggest that our houses of worship be called by the modest and becoming title of meeting-houses. This is free from all ostentation, and to my taste faultless. Purity and simplicity are characteristics of the gospel, and should be of every thing connected

But I shall be asked what epithet I would use to distinguish the church of Christ in a given place from the other churches meeting therein. The expression *other churches* raises a new question, one whose correctness I am free to say is with me by no means settled. Certainly I should first require a case of *other churches* to be clearly made out by the New Testament before I should feel under the least obligation to provide an epithet which should amount to a virtual recognition of them as of the Lord. Confessedly Christ may have two or more churches in the same place, as in a large city, but the phrase *other churches* is not designed to denote these. It applies to the sectarian organization of the day *These we do not recognize as churches* of Christ, but as fragments of the great apostasy. Hence we feel under no obligation to provide a name which shall distinguish the church of Christ from them. But the New Testament furnishes us epithets, the only ones we should use; and if any distinctions exist which these do not mark, then we must insist that such distinctions are unrecognized by the New Testament, and hence should have no name. Suppose, now, that Christ has a church in a given place. How shall we appropriately designate it? Call it simply *the church of God, or the church of Christ*. These are Scriptural names; no others are. But it will be asked: What is the distinction between the expressions church of Christ and Christian church? I answer: that is Scriptural and always will be; this is not Scriptural and never will be. Purity of speech requires that we speak of Bible things in Bible language. Church of Christ is Bible language; Christian church is not. Can we, then, as a people, hesitate as to which we shall use? Rut it may be said: this is becoming unnecessarily nice; there is no necessity for the observance of such minute and trivial distinctions. I shall not deny that the distinction is minute; but I trust no brother in our ranks will call it trivial; and as to whether we should observe it or not—this depends upon whether our speech should be pure or not. We have for some time labored under the belief that our popular vocabulary would be the better of revision; and not merely of revision, but of thorough revision. The work had just as well commence with the word Christian as with any other, 'Let us remember that this term applies only to persons, never to things, not even to organizations when composed of Christians; and we shall have no difficulty in



knowing how to use it. But in thus speaking, do I not pass sentence against many a line of my own? Perhaps so; but, in that a reason why I should not thus write? With me my own blunders can never become a plea for repeating them. When we complain of a fault we complain of it for self as well as for others. It matters not who may have practiced the abuses of which we speak, they are not therefore right, and should be corrected.

But we have other abuses of the word Christian besides the preceding. We have Christian Universities, Christian Colleges, Christian Academies—how many we cannot tell. That a people claiming to be reformers, to have returned to the faith and practice of the New Testament, and to a great extent even to it a pure speech, should have fallen into this flagrant abuse of one of its most important personal designation, proves that even the most watchful have need still to watch and be watched. That a disposition to mark every thing in our ranks as consecrated to Christ, and to render even our institutions of learning subservient to his cause, has contributed to the abuse in question may readily be admitted. But this does not justify it. The thing is wrong and should be abandoned. A college or seminary, no matter by whom owned, or how governed, or for what end conducted, can never be Christian in any sense save a wrong one. There is just as much philosophy and as good sense in a follower of the Saviour calling his horse and his cart respectively Christian horse and Christian cart, as in calling the bricks and mortar which compose a house a Christian seminary, merely because it happens to be owned and managed by Christian men. We have grown familiar with the thing; hence its absurdity affects us but little.

Besides, as I thus write no less than four exchanges lie on my table apportioning this abused term. In thus speaking I do not mean to be understood as delivering any unfriendly judgment against these papers, or as in any way impeaching the soundness of their contents. I have no quarrel with them, except in so far as they wear this common title. In this I think them all wrong, and should be glad to see them drop the word. When about to start the *Quarterly*, most brethren with whom I spoke on the matter, said, call it *The Christian Quarterly*. This would certainly have sounded better, and perhaps seemed less vain than the homely title it now wears. But to this I could not yield. The word Christian belongs exclusively to the children of God. It must not, then, be taken and applied to a mere thing. No matter how excellent a paper may be, it is not Christian, and should never be so called. But we shall pursue these suggestions no further.

---

"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye maybe healed. The effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much." (James v., 16.)

## UNCLEAN SPIRITS AND DEMONS.

As somewhat in harmony with what I propose to say under the above caption, I quote 1 John iv., 1: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

That unclean spirits and demons have, in different ages of the world, anxiously hovered about or gladly entered into men, exerting a wonderful and sometimes desperate influence over them, can not be denied. The thought that possibly some evil and mighty spirit may be near us, intending to enter into and destroy us, is well calculated to excite within us the profoundest concern.

I am aware that any investigation of this subject, or of any subject connected with the spirit question, whether that spirit be supernal, infernal, or human, is attended with the greatest difficulty; nor am I vain enough to hope that I shall be able to invest it with any peculiar interest. But, like Peter and John at the beautiful gate of the Temple, "Such as I have give I unto you." It is not perhaps too much to indulge the hope that a stray thought here or there of mine may touch the chords of some mute lyre, and wake us up some better music.

From the quotation above we learn that we are not to believe every spirit, but that we must test or prove them whether they be of God or not. We, then, have the power of testing them; which presupposes some rule given, or that may be acquired, by which to know or to distinguish them. It may be objected that the spirits spoken of in the passage were but men—false teachers—and that therefore we may not infer from it our ability to test the presence of unclean spirits and demons. The objection, I think, is not well founded; for if we may test the spirit by which a false teacher speaks, by the same rule may we test any spirit, true or false. The Scriptures certainly teach us that we may test the pretensions of any one claiming to be the Christ, or an apostle, or a prophet, or an angel of light. Satan "transforms himself into an angel of light," and we may know him still; his ministers also transform themselves so as to be like the ministers of righteousness (2 Cor. xi., 13-16), and we may still distinguish them from the true ministers of God. Hence it is not at all strange that, having full history of unclean spirits and demons, we should be able to detect their presence. The great rule by which each man tries every other man as to his every pretension—the rule in accordance with which, on the great day of God the Almighty, the judgment will proceed—is the one by which it may be known that any given man had or has a demon: "By their works you shall know them."

It may be thought that *now* we have no need for such a rule as we are contemplating; that the day for superhuman spirit manifestation is past, and that any one who now makes such pretensions is to be condemned as an impostor, simply because he makes them. I am not convinced that such answer is or ought to be satisfactory. That it is not to every one is certain.

That the Wicked One has many other evil spirits operating in conjunction with him is, I believe, not denied. That these evil spirits, one and all, do generally operate upon men through men now, as formerly, I think, may be assumed. That persons under their dominion have in ages gone performed marvelous works, approaching very nearly the miraculous, is well attested. That persons are now possessed by unclean spirits and demons, and being under their dominion do now perform wonders, marvels, even works very nearly approaching the miraculous, ought not to be too sternly denied. If I am right in this opinion, the necessity for the rule to which allusion has been made, and for its rigid application, is as great now as at any former

That I may present my thoughts on this subject in a tangible form I make the following analysis, which, though I claim for it no scientific value, will, nevertheless, set it forth in a form as practically useful as any that occurs to me: 1. Definition. 2. Have unclean spirits and demons in former ages inhabited living human bodies? 3. Do they now inhabit them? 4. Why were they and are they allowed admittance?

1. —Definition. Some spirits are denominated unclean, because, perhaps, the effect of their presence is to render the possessed ceremonially unclean. I say, *perhaps*; for by consulting Mark v., 6-13; Luke iv., 33-36; Rev. xvi., 13-14, it will be seen that the distinction between unclean spirits and demons is not very clear, both appellations being given to the same spirits. If the distinction exist, I shall disregard it, as being of no practical benefit in this essay. What is a demon? It is a spirit. This definition is too broad, including the human and the Holy Spirit. Shall we say that it is an evil spirit? I am inclined to think that there are good demons also. Shall we say that it is a good spirit? I think that there are evil demons. Shall we say that it is an embodied spirit? The human, all angelic, and the holy spirits are embodied. Shall we say it is a disembodied spirit? I think that *all* disembodied spirits are not demons. Shall we say that it is a disembodied human spirit that has taken up its abode in some living human being? If I were certain that no other spirit than a disembodied human spirit ever entered into a living human body, then this definition might be accepted; but this is not certainly known to be true.

Thus it will be seen that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to

give a definition to which an objection may not, with some pertinence and force, be urged. I will, however, venture to suggest a definition which, though it is by no means a satisfactory one, is the best that I can at present devise:

An unclean spirit or demon is a spirit which belongs to hades, or the state intermediate between this and the permanent future. But whether we shall be enabled to give a satisfactory definition of the word or not, we may safely conclude that there are or have been such things. A few references shall suffice to settle this point. I shall cite different parts of both Old Testament and New, for the purpose of showing that their manifestations have not been confined to any one age of the world, nor to any one people.

II. —Have unclean spirits and demons in former ages inhabited living human bodies; or have they come among men and exerted any important influence over them? Josephus, in his "Antiquities of the Jews," Book VI., chap. 14, unites his testimony with that of 1 Samuel xxviii., which assures us that the Prophet Samuel did "come up" and converse with King Saul, and reveal to him what should be in the future.

I cite also Deut. xxxii., 11; 2 Chron. xi., 15; Psalm cvi., 37; Mark ix., 38; xvi., 17, etc. From these quotations, which are not a tithe of what might be given, it will appear that: 1. Idolatrous men sacrificed to them; and inspired men tell us that it was to demons they devoted their victims. 2. Christ and the apostles spake to them and of them precisely as they would upon the hypothesis that the spirits addressed were real entities, distinct from the persons possessed by them, and as they would not and could not upon any other supposition. 3. Unclean spirits "cried aloud," conversed, asked questions, gave answers, expressed their fears, and did many other things which seem to demonstrate that they could have been nothing else than evil spirits and demons indeed, *i.* "They are represented as going out of the persons possessed, and entering the bodies of others;" as walking about seeking rest; as going out and returning; as tempting, afflicting, and destroying men. 5. "The early fathers of the church," some of whom were personally acquainted with the apostles, "interpreted these passages in the same way" that we do. Now the Saviour and the apostles certainly knew whether persons were then possessed of evil spirits or not; hence, since they have asserted the fact in terms most unequivocal, I see no way in which it can be truthfully denied.

In view of the preceding quotations and reflections it can hardly be doubted that spirits, other than the mere human spirits of the men then living, have possessed men from early ages and down continuously to at least the close of revelation.

Now if, during the Saviour's personal presence upon earth, and in

defiance of his and of his apostles' wonderful works in casting out demons and causing the powers of darkness and of death to tremble, these incarnate fiends stalked abroad, and, with poisonous fang and hot, pestilential breath, scattered disease and death, temporal and spiritual, along their way, are we therefore bound to conclude that when John "the divine" yielded to God his vital trust these infernal ones yielded their hate toward man, and hasted away to Tartarus, never to come back? If this be logic, alas for Whately, Mahan, *et id omne genus*. But this must be true; else now, as then, men are possessed by unclean spirits and demons.

I offer this one thought upon the third division of the subject, before regularly introducing it, in order to caution against a hasty decision, and to soften a little the feelings that will doubtless arise in many hearts upon the simple statement of the question.

III. —Do unclean spirits and demons *now* inhabit living human bodies?

From an examination of Eph. vi., 12, and 1 Tim. iv., 1, it is to my mind more than probable that these spirits have operated with unrelaxed energy and power to the present, and that they will continue their incarnate, fiendish work to the end of time.

I incline to think, from Rev. xvi., 13, 14, that they will be the ruling spirits under their great leader in the battle of Gog and Magog, and that then they will make their last grand struggle for dominion.

That some spirits have entered into men that they might make them, like themselves, the children of their father, the Devil, of darkness and of death, I think, need not be further proved. All history, sacred and profane, so far as either speaks to the point, sustains the position. And from observation had, or "judging the trees by their fruits," it is hardly too much to believe that wicked, incarnate spirits are still, like the pilot at the wheel, guiding and urging many a poor, frail, sin-cursed vessel of mortality into the maelstrom of eternal ruin. But is any one ready to say that the desperately wicked conduct of the men of this age is not to be taken as any evidence that they are under the control of demons; and will they cite James i., 14, in proof "that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed?" I think the proof and the proposition are a little apart. The proposition inquires for the primary cause of the wicked manifestations, whereas the proof assigns lust as the proximate cause, and merely asserts that God is not the author of the temptation. In further proof that the delusion, etc., of the text has not God for its author, verse 11 says: "Every good gift, etc., is from above." The thought is, that the power which broods upon the soul hatching out temptation, sin, and death is from beneath—is from the Devil. Hence, while it is admitted that the text is not decisive of an

opposite hypothesis, it is claimed that it by no means establishes the negative in proof of which it is, by supposition, introduced.

That the ancient Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans were firm believers in the existence and incarnation of spirits is well settled. Nor was this faith confined to the ignorant and the vulgar. Their wisest philosophers, sages, and statesmen were firm believers in the existence of demons, both good and bad.

That they held many erroneous opinions on the subject is hardly a valid reason for discrediting their entire creed. Amid the rubbish of ancient mythology and literature, it seems to me it may be gathered that the faith upon which men of all grades and ages, living and dying, relied, can not be entirely false. Nor is it true that faith in the existence of demons has in succeeding ages materially weakened. With the dawn of religious liberty and reformation in the sixteenth century, it is true that a more rational conception of "the faith," and of our duties and obligations to God, was begotten; and that the streams of divine light from that "time to this have but worn the channels of conviction the deeper, yet there has all along been an abiding faith in the existence of demons, both good and bad.

Some of our greatest men in the walks of science, literature, and religion, in Europe and America, have been firm believers in this doctrine. Luther, Melancthon, Wesley, Bacon, Addison, and Tillotson, besides a host of others equally as distinguished as themselves, may be mentioned as examples. I believe that the conviction is unalterably fixed in the minds of at least one-half of the living age, that spirits or demons do enter into some persons, or operate through them upon the outer world; and these are held to be both good and bad.

As before observed, there is no question as to the existence of demons in the prophetic and apostolic ages.

The power to unearth evil demons was, in those times, in active operation; hence their existence was then more certainly known than now. But their subsequent existence and work-ought not to be denied on the ground that, since the close of revelation, they have not been heard to cry out, and been known to come out of the possessed. If it could be shown that the reason why they were cast out in the Saviour's day still exists, and that no counter, neutralizing force exists to prevent it, then the fact that they are not now known to be cast out, and are not heard to cry out, might be taken as evidence of their non-existence. But this can not be shown.

If it could be shown that the Saviour's inflexible rule for all time is, that every one possessed by an evil spirit or demon shall be immediately liberated, then, that spirits are not being cast out at any given time would be evidence of their non-existence in men at or during such time. This can not be shown.

If it were known to be true that the reason why the Saviour cast out demons was that men must always be able to know of their presence when among them, and that this knowledge is impossible unless they should be miraculously cast out, etc., then the absence of this proof would be proof of their non-existence in men. But this is not known to be true.

If it could be shown that the Saviour's character is such that he can not endure that men should be possessed of evil spirits, and he not immediately cast them out, then the lack of this proof would be proof against their existence in men. But no one of these hypotheses is true. The blessed Saviour performed his stupendous miracles—healed the sick, raised the dead, cast out demons, his many wonderful works—not primarily and simply for the purpose of giving present relief and joy to the afflicted, but for the purpose of establishing the "Great Messiahship" of the Emanuel; of laying broad and deep in the minds and hearts of men, the chief, the corner stone of that spiritual temple of God which, though in the world, is not of it. This point once established, the fact that demons are not after that exorcised, and thus made palpable to the perceptions of men, is not to be taken as proof of their non-existence any more than of the non-existence of blindness, deafness, dumbness, etc.

But these negative arguments will hardly be taken, and they are not so offered, as proof direct of our proposition. They are intended as answers, in advance, to objections which will probably occur to some minds, and to open the way for the introduction of suggestions that will, I think, render it probable that demons do now, as certainly they once did, possess men. I speak of evil demons more particularly.

That the great Diabolus had a design in sending demons into men anciently, just as the Saviour had a design in casting them out, I suppose is undeniable. The former wished to destroy men, the latter to save them. Now unless it can be shown that Satan has lost his power or his desire, one or both, of sending these diabolic spirits into men for their ruin, it is certainly fair to conclude that he does it. That he still maintains and nurses into activity the desire we will take for granted. That he has ever lost the power or any part of it, on this subject I have been unable to learn. That there was new moral power against the Devil and demons introduced with the introduction of Christianity I admit; a power distinct from the Saviour's physical power used in casting them out, or expelling them.

But though this new intellectual and moral power, found in the brighter and stronger evidences furnished for man's faith, and in the sweeter and more subduing motives for the control of man's heart, etc., is greater and more glorious under the new covenant than had ever been known before, still it is effectual in no case to the excluding or expelling of demons, of course, unless it be accepted. It is readily

conceded, nay it is really claimed, that where this new power is received into a good and an honest heart, and proves a savor of life unto life, with the new and holy life there is given us a Holy Guest, one of power to help us in time of need; and that when thus blessed we are enabled to stand against *all* the powers of the wicked one. Where the truth of God is not received in the love of it, and with it Heaven's Guest, the soul of man is left open, unguarded, and a prey to the foulest spirit that wings its way from the regions of the condemned.

That there are many men now who love and make a lie, is patent to the commonest observer.

That there are now very many whose consciences are seared as with a hot iron, whom God has given up to work out their own destruction with greediness, to believe a lie, and be condemned, I see no reason to doubt. Now if the demons in the men of the tombs sought residence in the swine, instead of, as their expectation may have been, being cast into outer darkness, would they not gladly enter into such men? And since they would then, find a congenial human spirit, one willing and ready to assist them in their infernal work, and hence would meet no opposition to their wish to enter, is it not fair to presume that they would and do enter into men now?

It is thought by some that Rev. xx., 2, 3, may properly be urged in opposition to the view here taken. But not so. The passage simply assures us that there will be a thousand years of millennial blessedness, during which time Satan shall be bound; that he shall not deceive the nations till the thousand years shall be completed. Now, since the millennium is not yet, we must conclude that Satan is not yet bound, but that he is abroad upon the earth, deceiving its nations still.

But Heb. ii., 14, 15, is relied upon with more confidence by the objector. This, I believe, is thought to be fatal to our theory; to be conclusive against us. Let us examine it with care. The facts are: the children are partakers of flesh and blood, hence the Saviour partook of the same, and by his death deprived Satan of his power in respect to death, and delivered the children from their bondage—the fear of death.

This is a glorious thought, and enough, it seems to me, without pressing the text for a greater blessing. It utterly fails when fairly construed to raise even the feeblest presumption against us.

The rule by which we may know them is simple, and was given by the Saviour to enable us to test the pretensions of spirits of whatever kind. "By their fruits you shall know them," is the simple rule. The Gadarenes had a legion of demons, and they were maniacs; another had a demon, and was dumb; a child has a demon, and is lunatic; another has a demon, and is maniac; the spirit throws him, and cries out; others had demons, who through them taught false doctrines—



doctrines suggested to them by demons. All these effects we now see among us, in variety and strength as great as at any former period. Now I think it not illogical to suppose that, according to the simple rule announced, they are effects produced by the same causes which we know at one time produced them. I verily believe I have seen men who had as many demons as Mary Magdalene—one for every day in the week, the one for Sunday being the most noted. Nor are we compelled to go to the asylums to find them. They walk abroad in open day, in high places; and the whole armor of God is needed to withstand these wicked spirits in places of honor among men. Not to give a further synopsis of demoniac phenomena, as we have them in the Scriptures, suffice it to say that I believe we have, or seem to have, every such phenomena now. There is no one effect unmistakably attributable to the presence of demons in apostolic times, which we have not now, save perhaps a few, incident to the casting of them out, for the absence of which we have already accounted. "You shall know them by their fruits."

1 Tim. iv., 1, is as follows: "The Spirit says expressly, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and teachings suggested by demons, through the hypocrisy of liars," etc. If I rightly apprehend the meaning of this passage, it teaches 1. That in the last times there will be an apostasy from the faith. The last times have come, and the apostasy has occurred. 2. That this apostasy would be introduced through giving heed to seducing spirits and teachings suggested by demons. 3. And, finally, that all these things are accomplished through liars, hypocrites, whose consciences are seared. Fit instruments, these, for such a work. This seems to me to establish the existence of demons, actually at work through or in men, at a time long subsequent to the close of revelation. It also, with many other texts of like import, more than suggests that when men consent to give themselves finally and forever to do the work of the Devil, their consciences being seared as with a hot iron, they are by the great and dreaded prince of the power of the air taken regularly and finally into his service, and bountifully supplied with the spirit, which in Paul's day was actively at work in the sons of disobedience. (Eph. ii., 2.) I advance this view of the passage in hand with some hesitancy, not feeling entirely certain that it is correct. Some of our best commentators advocate a translation and construction very different from the one here proposed. But, unfortunately, the most of them evince as great determination to damage the papacy as to develop the truth. I do not deny that the passage, in its entire scope, is strongly against Rome. I believe it is. But it is not the less, therefore, in support of my theory.

To the foregoing may be added the testimony of the spirit rapper, table tipper, necromancer, and the not less wicked pretensions of the

exorcist. Shall we condemn all these things as impostures, as the work of magic? I am entirely unable to do so satisfactorily. Nor do I believe that science is able to relieve us from the embarrassment. We have startling facts before us; this can not be denied. That many of the actors are impostors I have no doubt, still much that is done can not in this way be set aside. The mesmerist, the clairvoyant, and the magician have done their best, and yet a little girl of ten summers, obscure and poor, without collusion with any one, without even being taught, leaves them all in the rear in the wonders she performs. There is, as it appears, in the spirit manifestations of our century, evidence of superhuman sagacity and power. The phenomena can not for a moment be compared with the majestic and peerless miracles of the Saviour, still they seem to be superhuman.

In conclusion of this branch of the subject, I submit the question: Is it not probable, highly so, that demons and unclean spirits do now enter into men, and work in them and through them actively as at any former period? Hearts are now found foul as ever before, where these malignant spirits would delight to lurk and to work. Where abodes so fitting are unoccupied; where admittance may be had without opposition, whence coveted attacks may be made upon hated enemies to the best advantage, it is but reason to suppose that they would

IV. —Why were they and are they allowed admittance? I suppose the answer to this question to be the same as the true answer to the question: Why does God allow men to sin? God does not prevent men from sinning, simply because he can not consistently do so without their consent. Men will sin, is the alpha and the omega of it all; they will not consent to stop sinning, in which event God can not consistently prevent it. So, I conclude, unclean spirits and demons enter into men simply because they consent to allow them admittance; and this, I must think, against the will of God. Therefore God does not prevent these spirits from entering into men, simply because, be it reverently spoken, he can not consistently do so.

The only means of avoiding intimate communion with demons, known to me, is to become a soldier of the cross, take the whole armor of God, and resist the Devil and all his angels, and they will flee

The foregoing theory and discussion are submitted to thoughtful readers of the *Quarterly*, in the hope of inducing some true and able man to exhaust his strength upon it. I have allowed, as will be seen, no dogmatic spirit to breathe into these lines.

LANFORD

---

" Hell and destruction are never full; so the eyes of man are never satisfied." (Proverbs.)

## SIGMA'S REPLY TO THE EDITOR.

It is possible your readers may expect me to make some kind of a reply to your review of my article on the "Gift of the Holy Spirit." While there is really nothing in your review that presents any thing that has not been considered in the paper you have reviewed, yet you have said some things which may be regarded as demanding some notice from me. All the positions, arguments, reasons, etc., which you have presented, either in your original article, or the review you have given of mine, were considered, I think, in my paper; and I have now really nothing new to offer in reply. The most I propose is to notice some things you have said in your review, nothing as to what you said in your original paper.

You seem to entertain a hope, so confident are you in the correctness of your position, that I will, after reading your review, see "the error of my way," and renounce my heresy. I acknowledge the justice you have done me, in saying that I am honest in my convictions; and I can assure you and your readers, when you or any one else shall leave me no room to doubt of that, when you or they have shown that I am in error, that I will renounce that error as publicly as it has been expressed. Until you have done this you must indulge me in my delusion.

In your review you have taken exception to the manner in which I have treated the subject, and especially complain that I did not make my article a direct reply to yours on the same subject; that I did not notice particularly and *seriatim* your reasons and arguments in support of your position. In reply, I have only to say that the paper which I furnished your *Quarterly* was written before yours was published. It was written with no intention of publication at present, and would not have been sent to the *Quarterly* had not your article on this subject appeared. It was written, however, with the special view to show, if possible, that the doctrine which you and a majority of writers on this subject believe and teach is not supported by the word of God, when that word is correctly interpreted and properly understood. With such an object before me, it was not necessary for me to notice particularly what you or any one else has said on the subject; but it was necessary to consider all the passages of Scripture which have been cited as proof of your doctrine. This I did in the paper I sent you. Regarding the doctrine as erroneous, I offered in that paper my reasons for so believing, and attempted to show what the Scriptures do really teach on this subject. If I succeeded in my object, you, as well as all others who believe as you do, were answered.

By this course error and truth are brought into contrast, and not persons. I think this the best course to pursue, even when a particular article has been the immediate occasion of a reply. I imagine that this mode of reply is more becoming a *Quarterly*, the style and manner of whose articles should have nothing of the *weekly* or even of the *monthly* about them. The manner of reply which you suggest reminds me of the debating societies of college boys, where we hear the constant cry: "Mr. President, the gentleman on the opposite side has not replied to our arguments." I made as direct a reply to your position as I thought the subject demanded; and if I succeeded in replying to the arguments, reasons, and Scriptures which are generally used in defense of the doctrine in question, I imagine that your readers will find enough directness in such a mode of reply. I tried to call before my mind every thing that can be or has been said on this subject, so far as my reading has extended, that I might not omit or seem to evade any Scripture or argument that I had ever heard or could conceive of, which had been urged in support of the doctrine of a "personal indwelling."

I can assure you, then, that I had not the fear of any thing you had said before my eyes. In this, perhaps, I may have been rash. Let your readers judge. I am too firmly persuaded of the correctness of my view of the Scripture teaching on this subject to use any "shrewd indirection," to avoid or parry the force of an argument or Scripture quotation. Let me assure you that I was innocent of such fear or "shrewd indirection."

You have stated correctly my position on this subject. It was my desire to be clearly understood. It has always appeared to me that writers on this subject either have confused ideas or partial convictions as to what the Scriptures teach on this subject, or that they were afraid to state in unequivocal language what they did really believe. I think the first supposition is the one that will account for their confusion of ideas.

But while you are thus correct in stating my position, you are not correct in calling my convictions a faith. I do not so understand the meaning of faith. Faith, as I conceive, has reference to *persons*, not *things*. My *faith* has Jesus Christ as its object; my convictions have things as their object; such as doctrines, propositions, and the like. The subject under consideration being a doctrine, I would prefer that you would say of what I have said, "it is a conviction." The fact that the Holy Spirit is intimately related to the Christian is not in dispute. That he is personally related to the Christian I have plainly affirmed. We have only disputed in reference to the place or mode of his dwelling with Christians. This relation is expressed in the Scriptures by one word, the Greek preposition *en*; and we can never arrive at the correct teaching of the Scriptures on this subject until we determine

the meaning of this word where it is used to express the relation that exists between the Holy Spirit and the Christian. We decide the question as to its meaning in any connection as we decide any question of philology.

You have decided that the preposition, when used to express the relation between the Spirit and Christians, is correctly translated by the English word *in*; and hence you dogmatically affirm that it places the Spirit "literally, actually, and in the severest and simplest sense of the words" in Christians; that it makes the dwelling of the Spirit with Christians "literally and actually," in them. Your conclusion, I grant, follows legitimately from your premises. If I granted your premises, I could not evade your conclusion. But this is what I have denied from the beginning, and still deny. The preposition is never used in its usual signification, viz., *in*, when used to express the relation that exists between persons. This assertion you will not call in question. When thus used, it places God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, where spoken of as persons, and when the language is not figurative, but literal, *among* men, and not *in* them.

It is, therefore, plain that the whole question turns on the meaning we give to the Greek preposition *en*. If *in*, you are right; if *among*, you are wrong. How, then, shall we determine which meaning to give the preposition? It can be easily determined, if we will be careful to make some necessary distinctions. We must determine first whether the objects related by the preposition be persons or things. If they are persons, we must translate the preposition *among*; if things, it must be translated *in*. No better illustration can be given of this law than the following passage from Mark vi., 4: "A prophet is not without honor, except in his own country, and among his own kindred, and in his own house." From this passage you will observe that when the subject relates to persons, we are compelled to translate *ev* *among*; but that when the subject relates to things, we must generally translate it *in*. Nothing can be more easily understood than

Perceiving the necessity of making these necessary distinctions, I was careful to say in the outset that the "gift of the Spirit" was the Spirit in person and as a person. This you also affirm; but when you begin to speak of his relation to Christians you seem to forget this, and speak of him as an impersonal being. You seem to lose all sight of his person, and speak of him as though he were a gas filling the heart of man as vinegar is absorbed by a sponge! Talk no more about the nonsense of the sectarian doctrine of the Spirit's influence

Is the Spirit's relation to Christians personal, or not? Is their communion and fellowship personal, or not? Or does he sustain a relation to Christians at all? You seem to me to have no clear and definite

conceptions on this subject. At one time you say that the gift of the Spirit is the Spirit in person, or as a person, and then you deny or ignore this assertion, by translating the word that defines the relation by an English word which destroys all idea of the relation being personal. You know very well, when this preposition describes the relation that exists between persons, that it must be translated *among* and not *in*. This you really grant, when you say, on page 95: "Granted, when spoken of men; denied, when spoken of the Spirit." And yet you insist that the dwelling of the Spirit is in Christians, and not among them. Now one of two things is perfectly plain to me: either you do not conceive of the Spirit in his relation to Christians as a person, or that you are wrong in translating the preposition *en* in.

You can decide as you please as to which of these you are right. If you are right in regarding the relation as personal, you are wrong in translating the preposition by the English word *in*; if you are right in so translating the preposition, then you certainly conceive of the Spirit as an impersonal being or thing. An impersonal God is Pantheism, an impersonal *Logos* is Unitarianism, and an impersonal Spirit is Rationalism. I conceive of all these as persons, and hence speak of their relation with angels or men as personal; and, in translating the word which describes this relation, I translated it in accordance with this fact, and hence say that God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, when they dwell with men, dwell among them, and not in them. I endeavored to show that such was the relation of God and man in Eden, and under the Jewish institution. And finding that this was the mode of his dwelling then, I inferred that such it ought to be under the Christian institution, and on examining the subject find that such is really the case.

The first passage I quoted in proof is that in John. And here you object to the statement I there make, that *meta* and *para* determine the meaning of *en*, and declare that it is "glaringly" erroneous. You will pity my obtuseness, when I say that I do not see it, even after you have pointed it out. You have not favored your readers with any thing more than your statement or your *ipse dixit*. If you were an authoritative tribunal, this would be all that I could or would ask; but as you make no such immodest pretensions, I must reserve my assent until you furnish the proof.

The first error, you say, consists in translating *ev* among. I am not certain that I understand you. Do you intend to say that *ev* is never properly translated among? Why, it is so translated in the Common Version more than one hundred times. Or do you intend to say that it is translated in this place among "without warrant?" If such be your meaning, I must remind you that this is the question in dispute. The reader has my reasons in the paper you have reviewed, and he can judge for himself as to which translates "without warrant."

I am no little surprised at the *ad captandum* and ridicule to which you resort on page 96. To these, I confess, I can make no reply. I have not now the time nor space to enter upon a defense of what I have stated in regard to your doctrine "contradicting the moral constitution of man, doing violence to the beauty and symmetry of the remedial system, and nullifying the great power of God for the salvation of men." I recede not an inch from that declaration, no matter what amount of ridicule you may heap upon it. With me your doctrine of a literal indwelling does not differ a hair's breadth from the sectarian doctrine of the Spirit's influence in conversion; and would you hesitate to affirm of it, what I have affirmed of yours? I imagine you would not. And yet, if you were to do so, do you not think that the sectarian could ridicule you as successfully as you have ridiculed me? Ridicule, I need not tell you, is no argument. It is only the inky fluid that the cuttle-fish discharges in order to elude pursuit, and give it an opportunity to escape.

You seem to think that I have forgotten the general and primary meaning of *en*. I have never once doubted that its primary meaning is represented by the English word *in*. It is, indeed, most frequently translated, and correctly too, *in*. But what has its frequency to do with the question before us. The word occurs more than three thousand times in the New Testament; and suppose it were translated in every case by *in*, except in one single instance, would that be the supreme reason for so translating it in this exceptional case? If so, I am yet in the dark. I have always thought that it is the meaning which makes the best sense that is to be selected. If, for instance, I was called on to translate Mark vi., 4, I would translate it as I have given it in a preceding page. When the preposition expresses the relation between things, I would generally translate it *in*; and when it expresses the relation that exists between persons, I would translate it *among*. And this law would be my guide when things are impersonated, as in the following passage from Matt. ii., 6: "And thou, Bethlehem, the land of Judea, art not the least among the princes of Juda," etc.

You appear to regard the translation of this preposition as given by King James' translators, in such connections as we have had under consideration, as infallibly correct; and whether it makes sense or not, you still adhere to it. You have more confidence in them as translators than I had supposed. Or if you say it is a translation of your own, or that you indorse it, so that it becomes your own, then you seem to me to regard it as a dogma, and eschew all attempts to criticise it. In this you remind me of Luther's controversy with Zwinglius on Transubstantiation. I can not now lay my hand on the passage, but I remember this much of their conversation, which is all that is necessary for my present purpose. When he had entered the

room and taken his seat at the table, he wrote, with chalk, on the table, these words of our Lord: "This is my body"—" *Hoc meum est corpus.*" From this plain statement of a fact he could not be driven. He stubbornly resisted every argument brought to bear against his literal interpretation of our Lord's language, and closed the controversy with his original affirmation, "This is my body." With him it was not a question of reason or argument, but one of fact, stated in plain and unequivocal language.

So you reason in regard to the Spirit's relation to Christians. Like Luther, you quote, "And shall be *in* you," and ask if this is not plain. Yes; far more plain than Luther's "*is.*" Does the word *eimi* ever mean to represent? Do you find such a meaning in your lexicons? Not, certainly, as its primary meaning. Yet you will say it is properly translated *represents*. Use the same common sense in regard to the passage which speaks of the Spirit's relation to Christians, and I think you will see that the sense demands that *en* shall be translated *among*. When you smile at Luther's obstinacy, do not look at this passage which I have taken from your review of my article. Why don't you believe and defend Transubstantiation as well as the "literal and actual" indwelling of the Spirit of God in the bodies of Christians? To be consistent you must. Transubstantiation is based upon the primary meaning of *esti*, and indwelling upon the primary meaning of *en*. To evade the force of Luther's logic (?), you must interpret. This is more than I have done. I only translate. I give to *en* one of its acknowledged meanings. I arrive at my conclusion by a correct translation; you, in regard to the bread, by interpretation. The argument is all on my side.

You evince an unnecessary apprehension in regard to what I have called the "Providential work of the Spirit," and characterize it as a new theology. I have not the slightest desire or intention of introducing any such a thing. I am perfectly satisfied with the one we have. But is this a new theology? Is there any providence of God now? You seem to think there is not. You say that Christ is now the ruling monarch of the universe—that all things are given into his hands in heaven and on earth, and leave us to infer that you regard all providences that occur now as his. This excludes God and the Spirit from all providential acts, and makes them only the ministers of Christ. Is not this a new theology? You certainly do not believe what your language clearly implies; and yet what do you mean when you say, "Both the Holy Spirit and angels act under him as agents in the work of salvation," and "we have no more authority for speaking of the providential work of the Spirit than of the providential work of angels?" We have in these words an exemplification of the truth of the remark you have made, that "a small departure in a beginning may lead to a great error in the end." You have from the beginning denied



or ignored the personality of the Spirit, and now in the end you have ranked him among angels and denied his divinity!

Of what beings can we affirm a providential work? Of angels? Never. Of either person of the divinity? Certainly of God; you affirm of Christ; and why not of the Spirit since he is equally divine? I leave the question with your readers.

It is an old way of evading the force of arguments or reasons to call them ugly names. It is sometimes equal to their death. There is no easier way of giving them a death-blow. If one use analogy, and you can not parry its force, say of it: It is a deceptive and dangerous mode of reasoning; that it is an edged tool, and must be used with care; and that none but those who wish to deceive ever employ it; and you may rest quietly, and fear no danger thenceforth from analogy. It is dead. You have killed it.

You have thus got clear of a good many difficulties; and your readers can not but admire how dexterously it is done. But will they not ask: Is analogy always and necessarily deceptive, dangerous, and unreliable? May it never be used? If ever, why not in the case from which you have rejected it? Something more is needed to destroy its power and acknowledged advantage than ugly names. Just now it is a

"Thing of evil, \* \* \* bird, or devil;"

to-morrow it may be an angel of light. Then it will be on our side.

I am surprised at your discovery of Rationalism in the quotations you have made from my article, and I think your intelligent readers will be equally surprised. Is it Rationalism to call our reason to our aid in determining questions of translation or interpretation? Is it Rationalism to allow the principles of a system to aid us in determining the relations of certain facts of that system, when that relation has been misconceived or misunderstood? May not the conclusions to which such principles lead us be used as corroborative evidence? This is all the use I have made of reason. I endeavored to show that the Scriptural view which I took of the subject of the Spirit's relation to Christians was corroborated by the deductions our reason drew from the principles of the remedial system. It was not used, or its aid sought, to determine the truth of facts. When reason is so employed it becomes Rationalism. But no one, I apprehend, not even yourself, supposes that the use of our reason in determining the correctness of conclusions is Rationalism. Have I done any thing more than this? Your readers can judge. If I disbelieved a fact because my reason could not understand how such a fact could be, then I would be a rationalist. Can you extract such a thought from what I have said? If the Scriptures positively affirm the fact that the Spirit of God dwells in man, I would have no controversy with you. But I think I have shown that they do not so teach. After having done this, I say that

our reason, enlightened by the word of God, and guided by the principles of common sense, which the Scriptures never contradict, steadily rejects such an assumed or interpreted fact.

The whole controversy is reduced to this: If the Greek preposition **en** is correctly translated *among*, then is it positively certain that the Scriptures give no countenance to your doctrine of indwelling; but if it is properly translated *in*, then is it equally certain that they do teach that doctrine. Here we confront each other again as to the proper English representative of the original in these passages. In determining which is the proper representative our reason and judgment must give us their assistance. This is all that I have done, and this you call Rationalism. We can but admire the keenness of your perception just here, and wonder at its dullness elsewhere, especially in this, that you do not see that your doctrine involves the conception of an impersonal Spirit. This is Rationalism. If you do not so conceive of him when speaking of his indwelling, why do you so emphatically and persistently reject the word personal, and speak of the Spirit impersonally, as *it*? I can not see.

Your criticism on the preposition in composition is not sound. It does not emphasize or strengthen the preposition following the verb. An example is sufficient to show this. In 2 Cor. vi., 16, we have a quotation from Moses in these words: "I will dwell in them and walk in them." Here we have the verb *enoikeo* followed by **en**, governing the place of his dwelling. According to your criticism, the two prepositions being used shows that the dwelling must be within. Hence your conclusion that the Spirit "literally and actually" dwells within Christians. I think you will see that this proves too much.

In this passage we have two verbs, both of which have the preposition in composition, and are followed by the same preposition governing the place, where the action of the verbs terminates. The other verb is *emperipathsw*, I will walk, and, according to your criticism, means, "I will walk within them. The Scriptures do not tell me that it is impossible for one person to walk within another, but my common sense or reason does, and hence we agree that the action of the verb, to walk, positively forbids us to translate the preposition **en** *within*, or even *in*. It allows of no other meaning but *among*, and so have the translators of the common version rendered the preposition **en**. Bro. Anderson translates this passage, "I will dwell *in* them and walk *among* them," and I have no doubt you translate it in the same way. This translation, inconsistent as it is, shows the fallacy of your criticism.

The passages of Scripture you produce in proof of your theory have all been considered in the paper you have reviewed, with one exception; and this, having reference to inspiration, had nothing to do with the question before me. Hence it was not considered. I am

surprised that you adduce such in proof of the Spirit's dwelling with Christians. Do you understand how the Spirit acts on the mind in inspiration? Do you understand how he controls the mind, and yet leaves the mind free to act in all its native vigor? And do you believe that he acts on Christians as he acts on inspired men? If so, do not denounce the sectarian view of conversion. Both views equally supersede the word of God. Is the first a theory? So is the second. And yet you call the view I have presented a theory—body, soul, and spirit, theory. I affirm that the Scriptures teach that the place of the Spirit's dwelling is among Christians; and you, that it is in them. Your readers have my reasons for so affirming<sup>1</sup>, and I believe that their investigation of the subject will lead them to the same conclusion, whether it be a theory or a fact.

In conclusion, I must gratify myself so much as to spoil a happy delusion which now lulls you into happy dreams. In doing this, I do not wish to increase your alarm at the appearance of such a heresy as I have introduced. It is calculated to afford you some consolation to believe that nobody will believe it, and therefore that nobody will be injured by it. I have no doubt the same consolation has lifted burdens from the hearts of sectarians in days gone by, when our brethren first began to shed light on their benighted minds in regard to the conversion of sinners. They have no doubt often said to themselves and to others: "True, we have, as we conceive, one guarantee against its evil tendency—but few persons will accept it as true. Were this not the case, we should not conceal our alarm at the appearance of such a position in our ranks." But this kind of heresy goeth not out by such means; it requires Scripture and logic.

I do not know how the view I have presented of the Scripture teaching on this subject has been received by the brethren. No other notice that I have seen has been taken of it. but the "sifting" you promised your readers. I have, indeed, argued the question with but very few. But one of the best thinkers in our ranks, and one of the best read among preachers, writes me as follows: "I have read your article in the *Quarterly* on the Holy Spirit. With a slight exception, they are the views I have entertained on this subject for a number of years; and I am thoroughly satisfied that they can not be overthrown, either by a correct interpretation of the Scriptures, or by any principle of sound philosophy." This, I am satisfied, will be the judgment of all who will thoroughly, and without bias, investigate the subject.

H. CHRISTOPHER.

Dr. Christopher's Reply is submitted to the readers of the *Quarterly* without comment. Some of its representations are highly incorrect, but will not be further noticed.

## THE OLIVE-TREE ARGUMENT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

OF all the arguments ever offered in favor of infant church membership, the one based upon a part of the eleventh chapter of Romans has been the most serviceable to the advocates of that doctrine. It is my intention, in the present paper, briefly to examine its merits, both because the error still thrives in the minds of many honest people, and also because I do not think it has been met in the best possible way. To do justice to both sides I will first state the argument fairly and in its full strength, and then test its strength by a true exegesis of the passages relied on.

The doctrine of church identity, and consequently of infant church membership, is founded chiefly on the 11th and 24th verses of said chapter. They are as follows: "If some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, boast not against the branches." \* \* \* "For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which, is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches be grafted into their own olive-tree." Here they invite us to observe,

1. That the Jews and Gentiles were not *both* separated from their former religious relations, but only the Gentile, who was grafted "in among" the Jews where they were, and where infants were members of the church.

2. That "some of the branches were broken off" by unbelief—not from the Jewish covenant, for that covenant vanished away without respect to their belief or unbelief, the covenant leaving them and not they the covenant; nor were they broken off from the Christian covenant and blessings, for they had not yet joined the Christian church, and could not be broken from it; but they were in a general sense broken off from being God's people without respect to dispensations, while the Gentiles were "grafted in among" those not broken off whose children had always been members of the church.

3. In Acts xv., 16, it is said: "After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up,"—not a new tabernacle, but the same old tabernacle continued from the Jewish into the Christian dispensation; and hence church identity, and hence infant church membership, and hence infant baptism.

This I believe to be the strongest, or rather most plausible, argument for infant baptism that has ever been adduced, and one which

many a friend of the truth might fail to answer to his own satisfaction, and especially to the satisfaction of a popular audience when confronted by a shrewd antagonist, unless he have the right answer fully in his mind. We will now approach this stronghold of error by regular consecutive movements, and see whether the forces of truth can put us in possession of its heights.

The chief difficulty that has always confronted us in meeting the above argument consists in this, that while we know that the Gentiles were brought into the Christian covenant and associated there with Christian Jews, still it says some of the Jews were broken off from the very thing into which the Gentiles were grafted; and we know those unbelieving Jews that rejected the gospel were never members of the Christian church. How, then, could they be broken off from it? And is it true, then, that the Gentiles were grafted into the Christian covenant or church? Surely not, unless it may also be true that the Jews were broken off from the same, for the olive-tree was the place of meeting and parting. Now if the olive-tree represents a dispensation, or a covenant, in which infant membership existed, the argument for that practice is complete, for the Gentiles are in that olive-tree; but if it represent a dispensation beyond the reach of that practice, then must its friends cease to urge this passage in its support.

To arrive at the true definition of this olive-tree, it is necessary, first of all, to correct an error but too common among us touching the extent of the promises made to the Jews. The common idea is, that the old covenant belonged to the Jews truly and exclusively; but that the new covenant was not theirs especially, and no more the property of the Jews than of the Gentiles. But a few passages will convince all that the new covenant was as much the property of the Jew as was the old covenant; that it was theirs by promise, by the right of inheritance, just as a son owns, in one sense, his father's estate, to be enjoyed as soon as he is out of his minority. "Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all." (Gal. iv. 1.) In this connection Paul shows that the Jewish dispensation was a time of minority to all the Jews, that even then they were "lords of all" the blessings of the new covenant which would be developed in the "fullness of time" when Christ should come, which would be the period of their national majority, and at which time they would have a right to enter upon the enjoyment of their great religious inheritance enveloped in the new covenant. So, then, the Christian religion was theirs with all its blessings, "the Gentiles being accepted as fellow-heirs and partakers only of the promise by the gospel." (Eph. iii., 6.)

All this is more than intimated in Heb. viii., 8, in which God says: "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Then the new covenant, as well as the old, was made

with Israel and Judah, and not with the world at large, only as other nations were allowed to be beneficiaries in the house of Israel. "To Israel pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, both of them, and the promises, all of them." (Rom. ix., 4.) The covenants as much pertained to the Jews as did the "giving of the law and the service of God." Once more: "It hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them, verily, and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." Here the blessings of religion the Gentiles were enjoying are called "their spiritual things;" that is, the spiritual things which belonged to the Jews, and these were undoubtedly the religious blessings of the "covenant in Christ." Thou bearest "not the root, but the root thee." We shall assume it, then, as satisfactorily proved, that all the wealth of the Christian covenant belonged to Israel by promise and direct inheritance, and that they were lords of it all, just as a child is owner of his father's estate.

The only question that remains to be settled, in order to our seeing the full light On this subject, is:

*Was the relation the unconverted Jews sustained to the covenant in Christ intimate enough to justify Paul in using the phrase "broken off," when speaking of their rejecting the gospel?*

The present exposition of the passage admits that they whom Paul describes as "broken off" were not, and had not been, members of the Christian church, for they had rejected the gospel on its first presentation to them. We feel safe in answering the above italicized question in the affirmative. They were not broken off from the old covenant, for it had vanished away, regardless of any thing they might do; they were not broken off from actual membership in the Christian church, for they had never accepted Christ; and yet they were in a sense very precious to them, "the children of the new covenant which God made with the fathers, saying, In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." (Acts iii., 25. ') And from this they were broken off, as indicated below.

May not a son, who is heir to an estate or a kingdom not yet actually in his possession, be broken off from that kingdom on account of bad conduct? History furnishes us with an instance of the kind in the case of Peter the Great, of Russia, and his profligate son Alexis, whose dissoluteness, provocations of his father, and final rebellion against his throne compelled the monarch to arrest and disinherit him. Alexis was driven from a throne he had never really ascended. Israel had a grand inheritance—theirs were the fathers, the adoption, the glory, the oracles of God, the covenants, the promises, the giving of the law, the service of God; they were lords of all the "spiritual

things;" and had they all accepted the gospel, as was contemplated they should, not one of them would have been broken off from entering into the enjoyment of their inheritance. In Acts xiii., 46, Paul and Barnabas being repulsed and persecuted by the blaspheming Jews, said: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you" (since it was yours by promise), "but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Here is an instance of their being "broken off." Again, in Acts xviii., 6, Paul said to a similar set of opposing unbelieving Jews: "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." Here the Jews were broken off, and the Gentiles were grafted in.

Some of the Jews did accept the gospel, as the three thousand on Pentecost, and were not "broken off," but went straight forward in the way God designed them all to go. These just stepped out of the Jewish church into the Christian church, and entered upon the inheritance that belonged to them, their own spiritual things. These were the "first-fruits" of the nation in the new covenant, who Paul says were holy and accepted of God, showing that the whole lump or mass would have been accepted on the same terms.

Now, with these premises before us, let us see what becomes of the master-argument for infant baptism. Observe,

1. We are not now obliged to admit that the Gentiles were brought into a church continued over two dispensations and common to both, for they were grafted in among the "first-fruits" of the Jews in the Christian church, and occupied the places those should have filled who were broken off. The objection to this assertion has always been that the Gentiles were grafted into whatever the Jews were broken off from, and as these were not members of the Christian church they could not be said to be broken off from it, and consequently this can not be what the Gentiles were grafted into. But our previous pages show in what sense those Jews were broken off from the new covenant, and how the Gentiles were grafted in, not among the unbelieving, but the believing Jews, the first-fruits.

2. The whole scene is now laid on new covenant grounds. Those among whom the Gentiles are grafted are Christians in this new covenant, and unless it can be shown that the three thousand Pentecostans, and similar "first-fruits," baptized their children, it would be difficult to see why the Gentile converts coming in among them on new covenant grounds also should be called upon to baptize their children. Hence it is not true that the Gentiles were grafted into a church where infant church-membership was recognized, for the old covenant that did recognize such relation of young children to the then existing church was "done away," and a new covenant by this time made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, which

recognized no such relation. So, then, as neither the converted Jews nor the converted Gentiles were in a church to suit this notion, the doctrine of infant baptism will find but little encouragement in the eleventh chapter of Romans.

3. The entire context under consideration goes to show that faith is an indispensable element in the religion there spoken of. The Jews were broken off "because of unbelief," while the Gentile "stands in the church by faith." These also shall be cut off unless they "continue in his goodness." And the Jews also if "they abide not still in unbelief shall be grafted in again." So, then, the Christian religion is all a matter of faith, never recognizing the "form of godliness" where the "power" of faith can not exist.

Thus the strongest passage Pedobaptists have ever had to rely on yields to the force of a true analysis, and turns its artillery against those who had forced it into an unwilling service. And as for the passage in Acts xv., 16, the reader is referred to McGarvey's Commentary in *loco*; besides which it may be said that even if the expression "tabernacle of David" does represent the church, its being said to be "set up again" would not prove church identity; for it is very common for sacred writers to apply the same word to very different things, or to things analogous to each other in different dispensations. Thus the word *lord* is applied both to man and to God; *Jerusalem*, both to the church below and the church above; the *throne of David*, both to his rule in Palestine and to the dominion of Christ in heaven. And so the phrase "tabernacle of David" might be applied both to the Jewish and Christian churches, without proving them to be identical or giving any countenance to infant baptism. And as there is no prospect of tying the Christian church back to the Jewish, or of obtaining any help from a supposed identity of the two, the advocates of Pedobaptism must look to the New Testament alone for whatever proof their cause is susceptible of. But as this book has been shown a thousand times to contain not a syllable on the subject, and as this has been acknowledged by some of their most artful disputants, the effort will always be hopeless and ought to be abandoned.

CLEMENT.

IT is with real pleasure that we lay Clement's article before the readers of the *Quarterly*. Such expositions of difficult passages, especially where the passages have long been subjected to abuse, can not fail to afford the highest pleasure. We regard the article as a model of clear, sound analysis and precise thought. Possibly, the subject is both capable of and deserves a still fuller elucidation. If any thoughtful brother so thinks, no man will be happier to exchange views with him than Clement. Shall the subject of the olive-tree, now that it is in hand, not receive an exhausting notice?



## PASTORS.

THERE is nothing for which the brethren of the present Reformation were at one time more noted than for their advocacy of a pure speech. They rightly insisted that purity of speech and purity of thought are inseparably connected; that they preserve each other; and that a departure from either involves, with practical certainty, a departure from the other. There is no one of the fundamental assumptions of our plea which has contributed more to the accuracy of our Scripture knowledge, yet there is none which we are more likely to abandon. There is nothing in which men are so imitative as in speech. The very first accents of childhood are learned entirely by imitation, and the habit thus acquired of imitating what we hear is not often among the childish things which we lay aside. It is by the force of this habit that cant phrases and meaningless by-words gain currency with such facility, and that so many foreign terms are constantly gaining admittance into our language, to the neglect of those that are native born. Its force is so great that no ordinary man or party can resist the use of established phraseology, however erroneous it may be.

The sectarian parties of this country and Great Britain have the power to establish religious phraseology, so that whatever comes into use among them gains ready currency among the people. They imitate one another, and are imitated by the world. They have in this way moulded the religious thoughts and expressions of the people into hundreds of forms unknown to the word of God and inconsistent with the truth. In attempting to establish a pure speech, we have hitherto been compelled to stand in opposition to those who make the laws of language, and have therefore waged an unequal contest. If we had control of public opinion in the literary world; ours would be an easy task, and the danger of being diverted from it would be but slight. But as the case now stands we are being constantly seduced into violations of our great law, that Bible things must be called by Bible names. The most unceasing vigilance and the most unrestrained criticism of one another will be necessary to preserve this law in practical operation. We can not think of allowing it to become a dead law, for its observance is necessary to the final triumph of truth, and it is really a law of God. There is no precept of the New Testament more clearly enjoined than these two: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (1 Peter iv., 11.) "Hold fast the form of sound words, which you have heard from me, in faithfulness and love which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. i., 13.)

The term *pastor* furnishes a striking example of the power with

which sectarian usage forces itself upon us. In former times it was not known in our phraseology. This was not because the brethren were ignorant of its existence in the English Scriptures; but because the word had acquired, in popular usage, an unscriptural sense. We had no officer in our churches, and we read of none in the New Testament, corresponding precisely to the modern pastor, and therefore we had no use for the word in its popular currency. We were not compelled, indeed, to use the term at all, and therefore we did not even search into its proper or scriptural usage. But now it has gained a currency among us almost as universal as among the Presbyterians and Baptists, and in quite the same sense. We have had various attempts to reconcile this usage with our practices and principles in other respects, all of which tend to its establishment as a fixture among us. In none of the essays having this purpose in view have we seen an attempt to trace out the exact New Testament sense of the term. On the contrary, the writers have completely ignored this first and most essential of all the means of preserving a pure speech, and have gone on to dogmatize after the most approved sectarian method.

We propose, in this essay, to briefly set forth the Scripture meaning and usage of this term, and to define with entire distinctness the relative position of the office it designates. We enter upon the task with confidence, because there is no real difficulty in understanding the subject by the light of the New Testament, and because we believe that all that the brethren need in reference to the matter is a clear exhibition of New Testament teaching.

The term in question occurs only once in the English Scriptures. When Paul is enumerating the "gifts to men" bestowed by our risen Saviour, he introduces pastors among those which were designed "for the instruction of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ:" "He gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." In this classification, pastors are distinguished from evangelists, and arranged in the same class with teachers. It would be impossible, however, from this passage alone to fully define the term, or to show in what respect the pastors resemble the teachers so as to be classed with them, and differ from the evangelists so as to be arranged in a different class from them. We know enough of them, however, to state in advance that the duties performed by these various officers to some extent overlapped each other. The apostles were also prophets. The evangelists and the apostles were all alike preachers, and all three of these classes, as well as those called teachers, took part in the work of teaching. But all teachers were not evangelists, nor all evangelists prophets, nor all prophets apostles. There was something peculiar to each office which demanded for it a peculiar name, and which equally

demand that the names should not be confounded. How it was with the term pastor we will proceed to inquire more definitely.

Although this term occurs but once in the English version its Greek original occurs in the New Testament eighteen times, and is in every other instance rendered *shepherd*. In seven of these instances it is used literally for the man who attends a flock of sheep; in nine it is applied figuratively to Jesus, and only in this one is it applied to a class of officers in the church. Now there is no good reason for a departure in this single instance from a rendering which would otherwise be uniform throughout the New Testament. If the term is correctly rendered shepherd everywhere else it certainly ought to be so rendered here, unless there is something in the context to forbid, which there is not. This, uniformity of rendering requires.

But, there is a better reason for retaining the term shepherd here than that furnished by the demand for uniformity. When a metaphor is employed in the Greek, fidelity to the original requires that it should be perfectly retained, if possible, in the translation. When Jesus says of Herod: "Go, tell that fox, Behold, I cast out demons to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected;" if the translator had rendered it: "Go, tell that quadruped," he would have blotted out the beauty of the clause, and robbed the reader of an important idea; although it is true that a fox is a quadruped. We can not see the force of a metaphorical use of a word, except as we are guided by its literal meaning. We must, then, have uniformity of rendering to the full extent necessary to preserve the Scripture metaphors. Nothing but positive necessity should ever set this rule aside. But when the term shepherd is applied to Jesus, or to officers of the church, it is used metaphorically, and the metaphor is lost if you render it by any

I may be met here by the objection that the term pastor means a shepherd, and therefore the metaphor is preserved by the rendering "pastors and teachers." But while it is true that the term once had this meaning it has long since ceased to be current in this sense, and its religious usage bears, in the popular mind, scarcely a trace of the original meaning. It also designates, as we will soon see, a different office from that to which the original term was applied in the Scrip-

This is the proper point at which to inquire to whom this term is properly applied; or, in other words, who are the shepherds mentioned by Paul in the passage quoted from Ephesians. We might reach an answer inferentially, by arguing from the office of the literal shepherd; but we have a surer and safer method. Corresponding to the Greek term *poimeen*, shepherd, we have the verb *poimaino*, to act as a shepherd. Now whoever it is that performs the work expressed by the verb *poimaino* is certainly the officer designated by the noun

*poimeen*. In other words, whatever officers are commanded to do the work of shepherds these are the shepherds of the New Testament, just as the man who preaches is the preacher, the one who immerses is the immerser, the one who sows is the sower, and the one who reaps is the reaper. Fortunately for our inquiry, although the noun *poimeen* does not occur in such a connection as to show with certainty who is designated by it, the verb does, and we will have no difficulty in determining whose duty it is to act as a shepherd. The first time it is used imperatively is in the Saviour's command to Peter: "Be a shepherd to my sheep." (John xxi., 16.) The apostles were the first persons, therefore, who, after the Saviour himself, who is pre-eminently the good shepherd, the chief shepherd, were called upon to perform this work. But they are not the shepherds of Eph. iv., 11, seeing that the latter are enumerated in a class distinct from that of the apostles. The apostolic commission really covered all the duties of all the officers known in the church. They were evangelists, prophets, rulers, teachers, and even deacons, according to the demands of circumstances. But the powers and duties thus aggregated in them were also distributed to various classes of laborers, each having its own peculiar gift. Among these classes we must look for the permanent shepherds of the flock.

In the only other instances of the imperative use of this term, its duties are enjoined upon the elders of the church. Paul, in addressing the elders of the church at Ephesus, also called bishops or overseers, says to them: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, that you be shepherds to the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx., 28.) The Apostle Peter also says: "The elders that are among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a sharer in the glory that is to be revealed. Act as shepherds to the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight, not by compulsion, but willingly; not for the sake of sordid gain, but from readiness of mind; neither as being lords over God's possessions, but being examples to the flock" (1 Peter v., 1-3.) To the elders, or bishops, then, is committed the duty of being shepherds to the flock of God. When, therefore, the apostle enumerates among other laborers pastors, or shepherds, and teachers, he means to designate the elders of the church. He means to designate them alone; for to no others is the duty of a shepherd assigned, except to the apostles.

We are now better prepared to determine the duties of the shepherd's office. They include, undoubtedly, all the duties assigned to official elders, yet by this title the mind is fixed more prominently upon one part of those duties. The chief business of a shepherd, as known to the Jews, was not to feed his flock; for they lived almost entirely by grazing. Our translators, therefore, made a serious mis-

take, when, instead of rendering *poimaino*, *be shepherds* to the flock, they rendered it *feed* the flock. Taking the custom of shepherds in the cold climate of England and Scotland for their guide, instead of that which prevailed in Judea, they assumed that feeding was their principal labor, and made this principal part stand for the whole in their translation. It would have been far nearer the truth to have rendered it *rule* the flock. This rendering, indeed, is found necessary in several places in the New Testament, as in Rev. ii., 27; xii., 5; xix., 15; where it is said: "He shall rule them with a rod of iron." Here there is an allusion to the rod with which the shepherds controlled their flocks, and the representation of this rod as a rod of iron compels us to understand the leading term in its severer sense of ruling alone. In only one instance is it properly rendered feed, which is in Jude xii., "feeding themselves without fear;" where the occurrence of themselves" as the object of the participle compels us to so render it.

This fault in our translation has not only obscured the office of the shepherds, but has propagated the idea which led the translators to adopt it, so that feeding the flock by religious teaching is very generally supposed to be the chief duty of the elder's office. The result has been that elders have been appreciated according to their aptness to teach, and have striven to acquit themselves well in his respect to the almost total neglect of the discipline of the congregation. Much complaint has been lodged against our elders as a body, for their want of ability in teaching, while it has all the time been true that you could find among them twenty good teachers where you could find one good ruler. Let us have the word shepherd in its proper place, and let it be remembered that the chief idea in the term is that of ruling, and we shall have a more vigorous effort at proper discipline.

After thus clearing up the rendering and force of the term, we can better see why Paul classified "shepherds and teachers" together. Both terms are employed to designate the elders of the churches, the one term referring to their labor as rulers, the other to their labor as

It is gratifying to state that Bro. Anderson, in his excellent translation, has rendered the verb *poimaino* as we have insisted above that it should be. He has thus thrown a much clearer light upon this important subject, and enabled his readers to trace it out more satisfactorily. We have only to regret that he did not deal with the noun in the same way, giving us "shepherds and teachers," instead of retaining the "pastors and teachers" of the common version. No one by reading his version will be able to see that the elders, who are commanded to act as shepherds to the flock, are officially styled shepherds in Eph. iv., 11.

We now have all the facts before us necessary to a proper estimate

of the term pastor. To apply it to a preacher who is not a regularly appointed elder of the church is a misnomer; as much so as to call the Lord's day Sabbath, or to call sprinkling baptism. It is a violation of the law that we must speak as the oracles of God; it is letting go the form of sound words which we have heard from the apostles. But this is the current meaning of the word, and if we use it at all we are likely to be so understood; therefore it is better to dispense with it altogether, and adopt shepherd as the proper substitute.

Again: to style a preacher "*the* pastor" is still more unscriptural, for it robs the eldership entirely of this title, and makes it appear that there is but one pastor to the congregation, whereas the apostolic churches all had a plurality of them. If we use the term at all we must apply it to the eldership, and may speak of "*the* pastors of a church," and of "*a* pastor," but never of "*the* pastor," unless, indeed, a church is so ill organized as to have but one elder.

It may here be pertinently asked whether a preacher should ever be connected with a church in the manner of the so-called pastor; and if so, by what title is he to be known? We answer, that it is certainly scriptural for a preacher to confine his labors to a single community when the circumstances justify it. The apostles directed all their own labors and those of evangelists under their control by the rule of success. Wherever it appeared that they could accomplish the greatest good they went, and remained at each place as long as the same rule would justify. Hence we find all the apostles confined to the city of Jerusalem for a time, and calling to their aid seven deacons besides; so that we behold here nineteen men of the most gifted order laboring to edify and extend one congregation. They continued these labors until the dispersion of the church opened up more inviting fields of usefulness elsewhere; but at every subsequent period in which the church in Jerusalem is brought into view, we find some of the apostles still residing there. Paul remained three years in Ephesus, not merely preaching the gospel to the world, but teaching the brethren both publicly and from house to house, warning each one by night and by day. (Acts xx., 20, 31.) He labored in Corinth eighteen months; and he and Barnabas, and others, spent two long periods together in Antioch. He left Timothy in Ephesus, to set in order things that were wanting long after the church had been fully organized. He frequently also left Luke and Silas, and other evangelists, behind him where churches were established, to continue the good work both within and without the church. It is right and scriptural, therefore, for a preacher to remain with a single congregation, laboring for their edification and increase, whenever he finds that he can be most useful in this way, and so long as this reason continues to hold good. There are many communities which might profitably engage all the time and energies of more than one faithful evangelist.

But what shall be the title of a preacher thus engaged? It has been assumed by some that this position constitutes him a pastor, and gives him joint control with the eldership of all the affairs of the church. By others he is supposed to be above the elders in authority; and by still another class it is urged that he must confine himself to preaching to the world, while the teaching of the congregation belongs exclusively to the elders and those whom they may invite to take part with them. All of these positions are unscriptural. The truth in reference to all of them, as indicated by the facts above recited, is this:—There is no impropriety in a preacher who has the proper qualifications being elected to the elder's office. Then he has all the authority of that office, and may be designated by the titles, elder, overseer, shepherd. But the disciplinary authority which the Scriptures confide to that office is not his unless he is thus elected, nor can he be properly styled a shepherd or pastor. He is, then, simply an evangelist, or, in purer English, a preacher of the gospel. He is also a minister of the word. By either of these titles he is distinguished and as such his duties are plainly prescribed in the Scriptures. One part of his commission is to teach the disciples all that Jesus commands; and in this teaching is embraced exhortation, entreaty, and reproof, as well as direct instructions. (See 2 Tim. iv., 2; ii., 24, 25.) In performing this work he is required to imitate apostolic examples, and therefore he must labor both publicly and from house to house. So far as teaching is concerned, his duty and that of the eldership is the same, and therefore it is the duty of both parties to co-operate in the work, and to do so in just that manner which will accomplish the greatest amount of instruction; for all things are to be done to edification. All these duties belong to him as a minister, a preacher, an evangelist; and he needs no other title to designate him, no other warrant to give him the liberty of working for the Lord. Let all our preachers, then, be known by these titles. Let them repudiate all others, and teach the brethren to speak of them as the oracles of God speak. So we shall have pure speech and pure thought, that cannot be spoken against; and when we triumph over sectarianism, as triumph we will if we are true to the Lord, our triumph will be the triumph of truth, and no future reformatations will be demanded.

ALLAN

To Allan's article we invite the very thoughtful attention of our whole brotherhood. It is the product of no adventurer, but of a man sound in thought, sound in heart, and deeply concerned for the cause of his great Master. That some of our people are gliding into error, on the subject of pastors, we thoroughly believe. Let them pause a little over the present article.

## LARD'S NOTICE OF THE NEW TRANSLATION.

[From the A. C. Review.]

WE have just read Bro. Lard's article on the New Translation, and noted with considerable care every part of it. It is more than a mere notice of the work. It is an article of twenty pages—the broad pages of the *Quarterly*—evidently written out with much care, and intended for a profound document. We have taken as much interest in both Breth. Anderson and Lard as any other man, and, when we had it in our power, have used our influence to make the extended learning and talents of these great men serviceable to the common cause, as far as possible; and we still feel the importance of their being sustained in the momentous departments in the providence of God assigned them. But great men have great weakness, and when they make blunders they are great blunders. While the *Quarterly*, No. 2, comes to us laden with some of the finest articles we ever read, worth more than the cost of the volume, it contains some things doing no credit to the distinguished editor. We must make a few specifications.

I. —In the complaining tone of the editor, that, while others were permitted to see proof-sheets, publish them, and give opinions in reference to the merits of the work, not even a copy of the work was sent him till a late date, there is a peevishness manifested, a jealousy revealed, and a morbid feeling disclosed incompatible with the character of a dignified *Quarterly*. We feel called on to make some vindication for Bro. Anderson, or it may be that it would be better to say, *explanation*. Bro. Anderson is a man of extreme modesty, and, without doing him the least injustice, we may say, that he has not a qualification in the world to *push his own* productions into notice, or bring them before the people; nor do we believe he had the self-reliance and assurance to have undertaken to lay before the people a New Translation at all, if he had not been warmly urged to do so by those in whom he had confidence. He *knew he could* make a translation, and a good one; but how a man without means, or any experience in publishing or acquaintance with publishers, could possibly bring out such a work he appeared to have no idea.

When we became acquainted with him, talked with him, and became satisfied of his ability to *do the work*, we told him that we had the means of bringing it before the people; and that if he would undertake it, furnishing us specimens of his manuscript and proof-slips, through means of the *Review*, we could and would bring it before the people, and thus prepare them for the work when completed. This



work we did, and when other editors saw the interest being elicited, several of them copied specimens from the *Review*, as also the entire discussion on translation with the Corresponding Secretary of the Bible Union. Besides this, the printing was looked after, the stereotyping, etc., by Bro. Rice, so that the manuscripts, proof-slips, and correspondence passed through our office. This is the way the matter came to us, and not by any special favoritism. Besides, Bro. Anderson did not, as is common with men getting out new works, send specimens of manuscripts and proof-slips, *seeking notices*, and thus trying to pave the way for the sale of his work. We do not know that Bro. Anderson ever sent copies of his work to any one, seeking editorial notices. He may have sent some portions to some of his most intimate friends; but we do not know that he did even this. But this we know, that he is above offering any indignity to, or slighting, Bro. Lard, or any other worthy man.

II. — *The compliment to the editor of the Review.* Bro. Lard, in that peculiarly authoritative style of that class of men who pronounce on poor, *unfortunate*, and *unlearned* men, informs the readers of the *Quarterly* that the editor of the *A. C. Review* "makes no pretensions to scholarship." What an important piece of information! Marks from the pen of the *Review* were before the people many long years before the *Quarterly* was ever heard of, and before the editor ever saw Bethany College, and are now going before the people several times as wide as the *Quarterly*. Certainly the people have had an opportunity to find out that the pen of the *Review* "makes no pretensions to scholarship." Why, then, did it become necessary for this to be announced again? Several of our learned men have taken particular pains to announce this before, and we do not see the necessity for repeating the announcement. The *Quarterly* adds, that "It" (the pen of the *Review*) "knows nothing of Greek." Why announce this additional item of information? Was anybody likely to be deceived, deluded, and led to believe that the editor of the *Review* made *any* pretensions to scholarship, or knew *any thing* about Greek, that this benevolent and oracular information should have been imparted? Kind reader, all this valuable information is graciously furnished that you might know that the editor of the *Review* had no right to give his opinion on a translation of the New Testament, or a translator, and that his opinion is worth nothing. It requires about as much learning to entitle a man to the right to give his opinion of the merits of *Lard's Quarterly*, a very able and learned work, as it does to give his opinion of a translation or a translator. Therefore, our favorable opinion of the *Quarterly* is worth nothing, and it was arrogant in us to give it, at least before the people were informed that we made *no* pretensions to scholarship and *knew* nothing of Greek. Thus, in our ignorance, we may have led many to take the *Quarterly* who ought not and would

not had this valuable information been laid before the people sooner. We, therefore, take pleasure in giving this important information much wider circulation, to prevent any further mischief from the same source. We shall not, however, take much trouble about the matter; but shall continue in the opinion, conceit, or whatever it may be, pretensions or no pretensions to scholarship, knowing *something* about Greek, or *nothing*, that we know pretty near what an English translation of the New Testament ought to be, what a *Quarterly* ought to be, and what the bearing of truly learned and noble-minded men ought to be toward those who honestly and unostentatiously labor without envy to do all the good they can, without any regard to *pretensions*, and shall take the liberty to give our opinion without any fear that it will not be regarded according to its real merit. It is not *pretension* to scholarship that is needed, but *real scholarship*, such as Bro. Anderson has and Bro. Lard, for which we are thankful, connected with good hearts, sound judgments and minds.

But we felt a little queer, after being thus unceremoniously set aside as unfit to give an opinion touching the New Translation, to find our name paraded in the *Quarterly* with the names of Breth. Pendleton, Milligan, and McGarvey, all speaking favorably of the work Bro. Lard, himself, speaking "of the excellences of the work," says, "Certainly they are many and varied. In places beyond mention we think it stands high above any thing in the language we speak." Thus, then, our poor and feeble opinion, made without pretensions to scholarship or any knowledge of Greek, and the first one given in the prints of the brotherhood on the New Translation, is now backed up by the weight of the names of learned men. We did not wait to hear how many, nor whether any, of the priests had believed on him, but gave our opinion from what we regarded as sufficient ground; and are sustained in our opinion by as good learning as the country affords, not only in the names mentioned, but a vast number more. We did not say that the New Translation is perfect, for this we could not expect, much less know. But we did say that it is the best English translation in the world. Of course, that is only *our opinion*, but we entertain but very little doubt that it is a correct opinion. The *Quarterly* says, p. 151, No. II., of the New Translation, "Yet at this writing his work in faultless dress lies before me. And now, without expressing any opinion as to its absolute merits, I lay it on the stand of the Final Committee, beside their corrected work, and proudly challenge for it a comparison with the finest thing they have done."

But now, if it will not be invidious for one so illiterate and incompetent as the editor of the *Review* to speak on so profound a matter, we beg permission to be heard a few words on Bro. Lard's criticism of the New Translation.

I. —His first adventure is in reference to *untranslated words*. He speaks of the circumstance of there being untranslated words in the New Translation as ground for "a grave charge against the work," "not entitled to escape censure at once severe and just." In reading his remarks introductory under this head, one feels impressed with the idea that something very serious is coming. But when the worst is brought out, not a word is produced in the work not fully canonized in the English language, and defined in the common dictionary. True, the English language has in it some acquisitions from the Greek, and defined properly by Webster and Worcester. Whether these are given in an English translation is merely a question of *taste*, propriety, and expediency, and no *grave* question, as nothing of importance in history, truth, doctrine, or principle is at stake. If an English word not derived from the Greek, meaning the same as the Greek, more familiar and better understood than one derived from the Greek, in a given case, can be used, it is preferable. But the mere circumstance that a word is derived from the Greek is no objection to its use in a translation. Where words are derived from the Greek, though they may be incorporated into the English, and come to have a different meaning from the original, they can not be used without misleading the English reader. In such cases they are not admissible.

The first example Bro. Lard furnishes under this head is the word *hades*. He speaks of the use of this word with a degree of warmth amounting almost to censoriousness. "That the word is translatable, H. T. A. himself will not deny," he says; and "that *hades* means precisely and simply *the unseen* we venture to say no living scholar will deny." Very well; let us, then, translate *hades* "*the unseen*," and see how our translation will read: "And in *the unseen* he lifted up his eyes in torment," etc. (Luke xvi., 23.) "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *the unseen*," etc. (Acts ii., 27.) Again: that "his soul was not left in *the unseen*," etc. (v. 31.) "O, *the unseen*, where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv., 55.) "And death and *the unseen* delivered up the dead which were in them," etc., "and death and *the unseen* were cast into the lake of fire," etc. We think such a translation would be hard to understand, even with Webster's Dictionary.

The next specimen he gives us is *paraclete*. On opening at this he says: "At this we grow sick, lay the volume down, and cry, Out, false thing, out!" What is there *false* about this? Certainly nothing. It might be claimed, possibly justly, that a better rendering could have been given, but that does not prove that there is any *thing false* about it. It may be that a better rendering could have been given, but we do not know that this could have been done. But we do know that Bro. Lard has proposed nothing better, nor has he proposed *any thing*, as a translation of the word in question. He finds also *Magi*, *Rabbi*, and *Rabboni*, but proposes no rendering in their stead. Under this

head we think he has gained nothing, and certainly not what might have been expected from his flourish of trumpets.

II. —Under his second head, styled "*Errors in Translation*," he has succeeded better. His first specimen is in translating the word *biblos*, "book," in the phrase, "The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ." We are inclined to the opinion that it is the *record* or *list* of the genealogy, etc., and not the *book* of Matthew that is meant.

His second specimen is the phrase, "But Jesus Christ was begotten thus." He thinks the passage, when translated correctly, only describes his birth, and not how he was begotten. We incline to his opinion, but not with sufficient dogmatism to pronounce it an *error in translation*. It is only probably so.

He may be correct in one or two other points; we say he *may be*, as he *may be* in those just specified, but *he is not certain* of even this. We are inclined to the opinion that several of the alterations pointed out by him would be improvements. But when we read an article of such great length from a man of such strength and learning, with a disposition to criticise with such severity, sum up all that is in it, measure and weigh it in all its length and breadth, and find *how little fault it really discloses in the New Translation*, it greatly strengthens our confidence in the high degree of perfection attained in the New Translation, and the immense value of the work. No notice has been taken of the work so strengthening our confidence in it as this one. No translation in the world will stand criticism like this one.

We are pretty well settled in the conviction that no convention of men can make a translation. A translation must be the work of *one man*. It is a mere show to give popularity to a version, to announce that a large number are engaged in a translation. A large number might assist a translator, but after all one man must be at the head and be *the translator*.

We have written this, not as a review of Bro. Lard, but as a notice of what is going on, as well as to call attention again to both the New Translation and the *Quarterly*, both of which ought to be widely circulated.

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

THE last number of the *Quarterly* denied of Bro. Franklin *that only* which he himself does not claim; and dissented from the propriety of his course in a single case. This was done in terms dignified, respectful, and kind. For this act he publishes me to the thousands who read his paper as a man possessed of "great weakness," as capable of "great blunders," and as being actuated, in a given case, by "peevishness," "morbid feeling," and "jealousy." Yet he has not given to his readers the piece on which he bases these hurtful charges. Now, I respectfully decline to comment on a document containing such unbecoming personal reflections. His piece is published as an act of justice to himself.

## PEACHING.

If callings are to be estimated by the results they yield, then is preaching the first calling of earth. Of course, the reader does not understand me to speak of pecuniary results. Estimated by this standard, preaching is the last of callings. I speak of such results as are best for man, best in the highest sense of the word, best for time, best for eternity. Estimated by these results and preaching claims the palm; and by these results alone is preaching to be estimated. Now if such be the character of the calling, and that such is its character none who understands it will deny, then, all that pertains to it deserves to be done in the most perfect manner attainable. This proposition is self-evident. How, then, may the gospel be best preached? To the consideration of this question the present piece will be devoted.

It is Whately, I believe, who defines the best orator to be him who carries his point. If carrying the point always depended exclusively on the highest skill, and if the possession of this constituted the highest excellence, then the definition might be accepted as correct. But such is not the case. Now, certainly, he who possesses the highest skill in rhetoric, and who is most expert in the use of what he knows, is fairly entitled to be denominated the best orator, whether he carries his point or not. For, in the first place, he may be on the wrong side of the question, and may fail to carry his point from this circumstance. In the second, he may be on the right side of the question and may still fail to carry his point from ignorance or prejudice, or both, in his hearers. Yet I should still insist on his claim to be styled the best orator.

But be this as it may, can we denominate that preacher the best who carries his point? If so, then the preaching which he does would certainly be entitled to be called the best preaching. Are we prepared to accept this as the standard? Far from it I think. With me that preaching is the best which, including the most truth and excluding the most error, results in making the most Christians. If this be not the best preaching then is my conception of the best erroneous. Few brethren, however, will dissent from my definition. Our previous question, then, a little modified, amounts to this: How shall we so preach as to include the most truth, exclude the most error, and make the most Christians? No graver question than this can fill the soul, or engage the thought of the preacher. If it cost him nights and days of anxiety and countless prayers—these are not too much.

Before proceeding to comment further on my definition of the best preaching, several preliminaries demand each a short notice.

First, as to the motives which should prompt men to preach. On this I hardly need make a remark. The reader anticipates me, and makes it unnecessary. Still, as this article is not for those who are already successful preachers, but for the inexperienced, and for such as may be thinking of adopting the calling for the future, a few suggestions can hardly be considered out of place. *That the great, leading, guiding motive of the preacher should be the salvation of the lost, no one, perhaps, need to be told.* By this Christ will be most honored; and whatever honors him most will in the end be best for us. But this motive will exclude several other possible, and in some cases even actual, motives.

It will wholly exclude the consideration of personal ease. Let no man who sets out to preach, as preaching deserves to be done, flatter himself with the delusion that he is about to enter on a career of ease. If this be his expectation in the outset, and if he follows his calling faithfully, it will not be long before disappointment will confront him in the form of a life-long reality. I will not say that preaching is the most arduous of all callings; but I will say that no calling should be more so than preaching. Yet it is much to be feared that many view it as little more than a pleasant pastime; and I am sorry to add, that the life of many a preacher would seem to justify the view. No indolent man can be a preacher; nor should such a man be countenanced in the calling even for a day. A man who is not intellectually and physically industrious should select some other vocation than preaching. At least let him never think of disgracing the work of Christ by attempting it. The numberless ways in which both mind and body are taxed, in the case of the faithful preacher, render it absolutely necessary that he shall be most laborious and industrious in his habits. Hence, unless a young man can obtain his consent to a life of unremitting toil, let him at once banish all thought of preaching from his mind. But of this subject more a little further on.

It will exclude the motive of mere worldly honor. I do not mean to say that a preacher should not wish to be honorable. This he should be, with no wish about it. What I mean is this: No man should undertake to preach even in part for the mere distinction which it gives him in the eye of the world. He who seeks worldly distinction will in the end prove a time-server, and in the hands of such the gospel is never safe. He will ultimately mould it to suit the carnal tastes of those to whom he ministers, and thereby weaken or wholly destroy its power. The vanity to become a popular public speaker, to sway great audiences at will, and to be puffed in newspaper paragraphs as *the distinguished so and so*, is a dangerous

vanity, which preachers may well afford to decline. Study, deeply study, your heart, my dear young preaching brother, to see that no motive of this kind is actuating you to enter on the clean, delicate, and sacred calling of preaching. If any other than the one lofty motive already named control you, you may succeed in the estimation of men; but within, your conscience will never cease to upbraid you, while a life-long work will procure you not even one smile from heaven. I will not say that you should cultivate a feeling of positive indifference to the good opinion of mankind; but I do say that you should never use your vocation as a preacher to obtain it. Do your whole duty well, as *to your Master alone*. If the world applaud, it is well; if the world scowl, be it so. That is a golden margin to a fleecy cloud, which will soon pass away; this is a speck on the sun's bright face, eclipsed by his overpowering splendor.

As to the ability which a young preacher should presumptively possess, or with which he should set out, a few words may be in place. If the calling be the first in the world, we can not think it going too far to wish that it were sustained by the best talent with which the human family are blessed. Yet we know from experience that this will never be so, save in exceptional cases. Yet no young man should ever think of preaching, unless he is endowed with broad, fine sense, an active mind, and the power of concentrated, persistent thought. This much at least he should possess, as a basis on which to begin. Besides this, he should be eminently free from all eccentricities, crotchets, and other noticeable oddities. A man possessed of these is almost certain, at some time, to turn a knight of hobbies, and to do the cause more injury than he ever does it good. In other words, the young preacher should be possessed of a large share of that sterling stuff the world calls mother-wit, and withal should give proof of a naturally well-regulated brain. We never admired those curious, mental oscillations which cause a man to sparke like a genius to-day, and show him a dunce to-morrow. We like the mind which exhibits solidity, uniformity, and trustworthiness. These traits will always command respect, and, where skillfully directed, will never fail to prove highly useful. Where a young man is pre-eminently endowed, he is too apt to trust exclusively to his parts, and to neglect the minute and constant study of the Scriptures, which uniformly results in his becoming simply a declaimer and in ceasing to be a preacher. This is an extreme never to be encouraged. There is yet another, still more to be deprecated. It is the vain stupidity which never aspires to any thing more than merely to be the wick which absorbs the oil and bears the flame supplied by another. When the former ends his career, Christians too often have reason to lament the demise of an apostate and a sot; when the latter dies the world is glad at the exit of a bore. The young preacher will do well to study to belong to neither of these extremes.

Respecting the education or mental training to be possessed by a young man before he enters on the task of preaching, I shall here say nothing. Elsewhere in the present number of the *Quarterly* will be found an article initiating the discussion of that important topic. To this article I shall for the present content myself to refer the reader, and pass on.

Neither do I mean to speak now of the moral or spiritual training a young man should have before engaging in this high calling. On this he will also find some valuable suggestions in the article just referred to, which I would commend to his thoughtful attention. I may be allowed, however, to add that no other qualification should be suffered to take the place of a deeply religious heart, and that none, not even the most brilliant, can compensate for the want of it. The preacher, if not above all men, still certainly the preacher should be a Christian from highest principle, and from an inextinguishable devotion to the truth. His piety should be deep, and his zeal burn with a never-abating force. These combined with commanding abilities to preach the gospel, in the same person, constitute earth's noblest man.

But I now come to speak more particularly of preaching proper. This I shall distribute into topical preaching and contextual preaching. By the former I mean preaching on a particular topic or theme, as faith, with a view of exhausting it; by the latter, preaching on a particular section or chapter, with a view of presenting a connected exposition of it as a whole. Each of these divisions has its advantages. Topical preaching is, as a general rule, best for the world, contextual, best for the church. But neither before the world nor the church should either be used exclusively. No rule can be laid down as to when the one is preferable to the other. This must depend on the object the preacher has in view, and on the assumed or known necessities of his audience.

But by a young preacher contextual preaching is, with hardly an exception, to be preferred. In the first place, such preaching is almost wholly unmethodical, all that is necessary being, to present a succinct, clear explanation of each word, clause, and sentence, as it occurs. This renders wholly unnecessary the oft-recurring firstly, secondly, thirdly, and so on, always tedious and frequently distasteful to audiences. The points to be presented being numerous, no single one need occupy much time. This to the beginner is very important. His stock of information is not expected to be large, and then his powers of elaboration are yet in their immaturity. It is hence dangerous for him to attempt long and difficult excursions. Far-reaching, consecutive trains of thought are for minds which have been long in training, and are thoroughly disciplined, and not for the inexperienced. Besides the beginner is sure to be less coherent than



the practical speaker. This defect will remain wholly unnoticed in contextual preaching. He may feel it himself, and it is not desirable that he should not, but then it is best that himself alone should feel it, as otherwise embarrassment and a possible failure might be the result. Nothing so much confuses the beginner as to know that others see his confusion. This, then, he should constantly endeavor to keep out of sight. A young man who seems self-possessed and connected, if these spring not from vanity or self-conceit, will never fail to command respect; and even to command the respect of an audience is by him an end not to be despised.

In the second place, contextual preaching leads to contextual study of the Scriptures; and this, beyond question, is the best for the young preacher. He does not want to know the Bible as a mere book of topics or disconnected themes, but as a perfect whole, complete only in its entirety, in all its parts dependent, and never to be understood except when studied in its numerous and complex connections. Years should be devoted to its study in this way; and while studying it in this way, it is best to preach it in this way. When the Bible is somewhat understood as a whole, its individual parts are comparatively easy of comprehension. Then topical preaching may with propriety be engaged in. A man need then have no fear that any part of his speech will be contradictory of the Book; since the whole lies visibly before him as a guide. I would, then, for the reasons now assigned, especially commend to the beginner the subject of contextual preaching.

But let me now suppose it to be given out that a young brother is going to preach on the following Lord's day; whether it be his first or his one hundred and first attempt is immaterial. Many preliminaries demand our notice. He has determined not to speak on some particular topic, but on a chapter or paragraph. *What kind of one shall it be?* No more important question than this can be asked. On the answer to it will almost certainly depend his success or his failure. By all means let him avoid an intricate passage or section, especially one that has been long in debate among learned men. Nothing looks worse in a young man, just setting out to preach, than to hear him delivering judgments and criticisms in cases where the great and learned of earth have paused and declined to risk even an opinion. All such passages should be studiously excluded from his early efforts. He will hence not select a section involving such questions as predestination, foreknowledge, will, regeneration, etc. All these he can safely, and will most creditably, leave to the discussion of the experienced preacher, whose talents, age, and high standing will justify him in undertaking their solution. As a general rule, the young preacher will find it best to select a paragraph abounding in incidents which afford scope for narration and description. These he will usually treat

with greatest ease to himself, and pleasure to his audience. Young men are apt to be redundant in the use of words, especially in the use of adjectives and poetic epithets. These are—best suited to a narrative style. Besides, the power to set the numerous and marvelous incidents of the Bible before an audience in a witching and powerful light, is one of the most fascinating traits a man, whether young or old, can possibly possess. It never fails to be deeply engaging, and to cast the minds of hearers in the happiest conceivable frame for the reception of tough and offensive truths. It is a power for the mastery of which the young preacher can afford to spend much time and large labor. The dialectics of Christianity—its logic, its analysis, its exegesis—these are not usually the topics best adapted to the exuberant minds of young men. A florid sentence over the stiff inornate form of a syllogism is intolerable. It is hence better, as a general thing, for the beginner to confine his early labors to such themes as correspond with the vivacity, ease, and bounding life of his own young heart. As he solidifies and becomes more a thing of earth, he can venture on the harder and dryer subjects of the gospel.

But now let me suppose my young brother to have selected the paragraph or chapter on which his speech is to be made. I need not remind him how necessary it is that his comprehension of this should be complete, reaching even to the minutest circumstance. The topography of the place where the scene is laid should be perfectly familiar to him; so that it can be alluded to and spoken of with all the ease and readiness of a home spot. If important historic events stand connected with it, these should be known. But, above all, *the sense* of the passage, as an integral part of the sacred narrative or book, should be thoroughly understood. Its terms should all be studied, so that, if need be, they may be defined and their meaning illustrated with the utmost readiness and precision. No study will more become or more improve the young preacher than the close study of terms. All the light and all the obscurity in the Bible are contained in them. The ability to bring out that light, and to remove that obscurity should be an object of his life-long ambition. To the acquisition of it he is almost certain to devote too little attention, and very certain not to devote too much.

His paragraph being mastered as now indicated, the important question will present itself: *Should he speak from notes?* To this question we emphatically answer, *No*. The mind never works easily and naturally over notes. Its effort is too strictly an effort of memory. It is hence stiff, cold, and mechanical. Men that preach from notes seldom or never weep. There is no heart in note-preaching. A severe effort of memory is the sure suppression of the sympathies and kindlier feelings of the soul. If the mind now and then gleams forth in outbursts of grand thought, or the heart streams out in subtle,

searching flows, it will be when both are in perfect ease, and wholly unconstricted by an effort to remember the stale words of a note. The subject to be spoken on should be so thoroughly understood, that not even the semblance of a note is needed to keep each minutest part in view. Then and then only can the mind work over it with the masterly ease necessary to success. Thought is then sportive and high; the soul is self-possessed, confident, and muscular; the feelings are free, liquid, and obedient—such must the preacher be who bears all down before him.

But when we insist that the young preacher shall not use notes, we by no means wish to be understood as teaching that he is not to be methodical and orderly. Very far from it. Order and method are accomplishments in which he should strive to become an adept. But, then, order and method neither depend on note-taking nor on note-using. In many instances they depend on the original constitution of the mind; but, as a general rule, not less on training. The order and method which result from severe, constant mental discipline, are the only order and method the preacher need ever aim at, but these he should constantly aim at. His mind should be taught to work orderly as a matter of habit. Then his preaching will be even to himself a delightful exercise. Years of unremitting attention may be necessary to attain the end; but he should never unbend his purpose till it is attained. He should so regulate his mental habits, as not to be nonplused even by the most unexpected emergency. If suddenly called upon to speak on a subject not wholly familiar to him, the training of his mind should be such as to suggest to him at once, and as if by intuition, the true starting point. This found, he should then be enabled to call up each consecutive step as though it occurred to him naturally and without effort on his part. But this the young preacher must not expect to be able to do at first. Only after long years of sedulous attention to his intellectual training can he expect to be competent to the task.

But before the young preacher begins his speech a few collateral items will demand his attention; and although they belong not strictly to preaching, yet they belong to preachers, and hence should not be overlooked.

First, his personal appearance. I lay it down as a rule in dress that the young preacher should be faultlessly neat and faultlessly plain. A slovenly, ungainly appearance in the pulpit is insufferable. It is indicative of coarseness of nature, and of an inexcusable disregard for the good taste and refined sense of his audience. It should hence be studiously avoided. I do not mean to say that his dress should be fine. Not at all. It may be, where his circumstances will allow of nothing better, of the most ordinary material; and no truly cultivated Christian man or woman will ever esteem him the less on

that account. But, then, the most common fabric can be neatly cut and neatly made, can be kept clean, and worn becomingly on the person. This is all I mean. Especially should the young preacher avoid all odd cuts and odd colors in his dress. Any thing of the kind is sure to provoke the criticism of the public, and to mortify the feelings of the very brethren whose good opinion he should most value. His hair should be kept of the proper length, and show that while it is not an object of special care, it is not in the least neglected. Where a young preacher's hair is, on the one hand, long, bushy, and undressed, it is too apt to arouse suspicions in the minds of the polite to which they are extremely reluctant to give expression; and where it is, on the other, long, sleek, dangling, and curly, it may lead to the conjecture that the sacred calling of preaching is to be made subservient to the interests of reduplication, in other words, getting a wife. These are both unpromising extremes in young preachers.

The same degree of propriety should be observed in regard to the beard. It should not be cut in eccentric forms, or worn after the rakish fashion of rowdies. A young preacher with face all shaved except a ring half an inch broad around the mouth, the hair of which he is continually fingering, twisting, and stroking, presents an appearance excessively repulsive and vulgar. But a simple hint here is deemed enough.

The young preacher, whose circumstances will permit him to dress finely, should yet be in dress a model of simplicity and purity. He should scrupulously refrain from every thing gaudy and showy. Let his necktie be of modest black, his other clothes of grave allowable color, and perfectly plain; let all gold chains, gold seals, and costly pins be kept completely out of sight; nor even so much as the plainest ring be seen on his hand. Sectarian preachers can afford to sport these trinkets. For the most part they are propagandists of the heresies of the great Mother of harlots; and there is perfect consistency between such gewgaws and their calling. But on the person of the conscientious and humble preacher of the primitive gospel they are strikingly out of place. It will be well, too, even for the young preacher who can afford something costlier, to provide himself with a plain silver watch. The silver is just as enduring as the gold, is unostentatious, and comports better than a more glittering thing with the deeply serious work in which he is engaged. Especially must I guard my young preaching brother against imitating the studied carelessness and slip-thrift manner of a certain type of dandies. The wristband is worn unfastened and allowed to dangle about the hand; the vest is left unbuttoned; the hat is slouched and sits jauntily on the head; the shoe is untied; or the watch-key depends from a tow string. All this is not only in bad taste, but indicates a worldly state of mind wholly at variance with the purity and spirituality of Chris-

tianity, and hence with the sacred calling of the preacher. To play the dandy even by accident is utterly unallowable in him who serves in the things of the Spirit. He must scrupulously guard against gliding into such unpreacherly ways.

Next, his conduct in the pulpit. Much will depend on the appearance and manners of a young preacher in the pulpit. Of course, I do not refer to these as determining the excellence of his discourse, but the impression he may make on his audience, which, in an indirect way, may seriously affect the result of his efforts. Few people hear any thing amiss in a man toward whom they are affected with a high personal regard and polite pleasurable feelings. Hence the young preacher should, as far as a pleasing manner can accomplish the end, endeavor to enlist in his behalf the most cordial and agreeable emotions his audience is capable of. An inferior speech addressed to laughing eyes, or delivered into warm well-wishing bosoms, is immeasurably more effective than the most compact and powerful argument delivered to sour, repelling hearers. A manner at once dignified, easy, graceful, and perfectly natural, will of itself usually insure attention and respect; and if a young man can begin his speech with these he should feel satisfied.

On rising to go into the pulpit the young preacher's walk should be neither too rapid nor too slow. The former looks excited, and indicates defective breeding; the latter seems artificial and affected. On entering the pulpit he will neither sit down stiffly nor drop down heavily. All his movements should point to a mind, not indifferent, but in perfect repose, and a manner supple and unstudied. His eyes should not be constantly downcast to the pulpit floor, nor wander impertinently and blankly over the house. His look should appear confident, subdued, and modest. In the pulpit he should never loll, lie down, nor assume any other lazy or unseemly attitude. Such exhibitions are utterly unallowable in a young man.

When he arises to pray he should stand perfectly erect, and not commence till the audience have all risen and become still. Then he should begin, but not in a loud, boisterous, and rattling tone. Nothing is more offensive in prayer than bluster. To the truly refined and spiritual minded, few things are more painful than to hear God addressed in a loud, hollow, cracking tone of voice. Equally objectionable is a voice quaint, familiar, and irreverent. Neither should the voice be so low as to render the words inaudible; nor yet should it be sepulchral and ventral. In prayer, the voice should be full and soft, and every word be distinctly heard. The tone should be solemn and profoundly respectful.

Let me, in the height of earnestness, warn my young preaching brother against all attempts to make *fine prayers*. Such vain exhibitions are shocking beyond measure. In praying, his words should

all be most dignified, but the simpler the better. His sentences should not be too long; neither should they be involved and intricate. As a general rule they should be short, inartificial, and faultlessly chaste and pure. All attempts to be eloquent in prayer, to be sentimental, dramatic, or in any other way affected, are deeply blameworthy and to be scrupulously avoided. When you hear people commenting on a prayer, and saying of it: Was it not fine, was it not grand, was it not eloquent! with no fear of missing the mark you may reply of him who made it, *verity, he has his reward*. Especially let the young preacher avoid making *long* prayers. No matter how excellent such may be, they are generally felt to be a bore. It may be laid down as indisputable that there is not one prayer in a hundred which could not be improved by being shortened. Moreover, a prayer should never be delivered in a rapid impetuous manner. Its delivery should be measured, earnest, and sufficiently animated to impart to it vitality and make it penetrating, but nothing more. Comprehension, simplicity, earnestness, and brevity may be safely set down as the true characteristics of a good prayer. On these, therefore, the young preacher will bestow his constant thought.

When about to commence his discourse, several items will demand his attention. He will be especially careful not to intend, and hence not set out to make a *great* speech. Should he purpose any thing of the kind, he may count with infallible certainty on a failure. Hence, let him not bestow one thought on the nature of the effort he is about to make. Let that be left to be determined wholly by the activity, fertility, precision, and glow with which his mind may work. He should, as already said, know his subject well. Then he should begin to speak in the most simple, unstudied, and natural way. It will be easy then to rise. As his mind quickens and warms, and his emotions begin to play, his altitude will gradually and, if he is careful, gracefully increase up to the desired height. One constant aim of the young preacher should be to sustain himself well throughout his effort. This he can never do if he commences in a pompous grandiloquent style. Better far that his commencement should be confused, bungling, and excessively commonplace. Below this he can not fall; above it he is almost sure to rise. But especially let him avoid a magnificent beginning. Nothing is more fatal to his success. He will hence have no preformed, eloquent sentences with which to greet his audience on rising. At first the ear of his hearers is cold and dull; he will do well to remember this, and touch that organ accordingly. As his own mind becomes more fervid, expansive, and opulent in thought, that ear will become more appreciative and voracious, and will receive, in kindlier mood, both his enlarged conceptions and his richer style. The speech and the hearing will thus improve together—a circumstance always essential to success in any high de-

gree. We would hence suggest to the young preacher, as aforesaid, that he should first thoroughly master his subject, and then in all the stages of his speech trust to the moment and the circumstances to supply him both with manner and words.

No more important item is likely to engage the attention of the young preacher than *the tone of voice* in which he opens. On it will most certainly depend, however he may think to the contrary, *the effectiveness* of his effort and *the pleasure* with which it will be listened to. Not more important is the key-note in a tune, than is the key-note of a sermon. If the *pitch* of a tune is wrong, no matter how accomplished the musician who executes the piece, the performance must prove a failure; and so with the pitch of a speech. Further: if a preacher sets out on the wrong key, his whole discourse will be affected and marred by the circumstance. He is sure never to get right during that speech. It is difficult to indicate intelligibly and with exactitude the precise tone of voice in which a discourse should be commenced. Perhaps no more correct and specific direction can be given than to say that the tone or pitch should be simply that in which we would commence a rather loud unexcited conversation. On this key the sound of the voice is natural, and the voice itself perfectly manageable; and to keep the voice natural and manageable are the points of chief importance in a public speech. When it is too high it becomes monotonous; and nothing is more disagreeable than a high, strained, horizontal tone running throughout a discourse. If in all other respects the discourse is good, this tone of itself will spoil it. Neither should the voice be too low; since here again it is certain to become monotonous; and what is worse than all, to have a dull, lifeless ring which would render ineffectual the best of speeches. If a young preacher sets out on a natural key, both these extremes will be avoided; and besides whatever of native musicalness his voice may possess will be preserved. He will then speak with ease to himself, and this will impart a sense of ease to his hearers. And an object never to be lost sight of by him is to keep his audience constantly in an easy, pleasant mood. If a speaker's voice is strained and painfully out of key, his hearers will sympathize with him to a degree utterly destructive of their pleasure, and which nothing can relieve but the end of the discourse, which end they are sure to pray for with unwonted fervor. The trait to be most desired by the speaker in his voice is *range*, that is, the ability to rise or fall at will. If he lacks this, or sets out on a key which forfeits it, no other trait will compensate for it; he must never lose sight of it. Further: the sharpest points in a speech, its finest strokes and deepest touches, will usually depend on *emphasis*. This can never be employed except when the voice is under the most perfect control of the speaker; and this it never is except when on a perfectly

natural key. But when thus under his control, even the most subtle emotion of the soul or attenuated feeling of the heart can be darted through an audience with perfect ease. And on these finer and more delicate characteristics of a speech, more than on its gross matter of thought and logic, will depend the admiration and deep pleasure with which it is received. Nor does it matter on what key the young preacher sets out, he must be careful to avoid a stiff, rigid tone. His voice should always appear and actually be voluble, flexible, and liquid. Nor should it ever have a hollow, barking ring; but always seem somewhat hushed, as if freighted down with thought. Besides, if possible, he should endeavor to infuse into it a soft, coaxing intonation, and to avoid the opposite grating, repelling one. I feel satisfied that if one-fifth of the time which is usually spent on inditing notes and otherwise pre-arranging and cogitating speeches were spent on the voice, that three out of every four speeches we hear would seem one-half the better by the circumstance. Let me impress its importance on the mind of the young preacher.

But other important pulpit items still demand our attention. While delivering his speech, the young preacher should neither stand perfectly still nor be constantly in motion. As a general rule, too much action is worse than not enough. The best of speeches when over acted loses much. Still it is best to keep some part of the body in pretty constant motion; only should the young preacher be very careful that the motion is natural, easy, and graceful. Especially should he refrain from all violent gestures. Throwing the arms wildly about, pounding the pulpit with the clenched fist, stamping the foot violently on the floor—all these are in very bad taste, and indicate a rude, unmanageable nature in the speaker, but poorly under the restraints of education. Again: elevating the voice to a scream, and then suddenly depressing it to a whisper, rolling up the eyes, and other theatrical practices assumed for the sake of imparting to the discourse a sort of dramatic effect, are exceedingly reprehensible, and to be scrupulously eschewed by the young preacher. Above all let him refrain from spitting on the pulpit floor and rubbing<sup>1</sup> it up with his foot, spitting in his handkerchief, etc. Such filthy practices are positively sickening. This remark, however, is not intended to apply to old speakers whose habits, it may be, were formed before they ever entered a pulpit. No criticism of them or their manners either in or out of the pulpit is herein meant. I am speaking to and of those only who are just entering, or have just entered, on the calling in hand.

The young preacher must carefully guard against both too slow and too rapid a manner of delivery. His speech should be measured, but not lifeless; animated, but not impetuous. He must preserve that mean which leaves him master of inflection and emphasis. His



articulation should be distinct, his pronunciation full, his manner fluent and varied. Especially should he guard against seeming to talk at random, or seeming to talk merely for the sake of talking. Every thing he says should appear to be studied, intended, and consecutive. A shower of hollow words is one of the sorest inflictions to which a congregation can be subjected. Nor is a boisterous and rapid manner ever attended with deep impressions. If you wish to touch an audience to the quick, let your thoughts flow out in words well spaced, as the printers say, and in a voice full, melting, and completely under your command. Give the soul time to fill every word and even every space with its mystic magnetic force, if you wish to reach feeling's deepest seat. But to attain this requires years of thoughtful practice. The young preacher should constantly aim at it, but he must not feel discouraged if he is not at the very first successful.

A stammering, hesitating manner in a young man is to be carefully avoided. It keeps his audience constantly uneasy lest he should trip and let down. A style which is smooth and flowing begets confidence in the speaker and pleasure in the hearer. Still more should the beginner be on his guard against a very common and a very reprehensible fault in speakers—the fault of repeating his words and sentences. If a word has been distinctly uttered, and a sentence is clear, no sort of necessity exists for repeating them. Sometimes, I grant, it may be done for the sake of emphasis; but it is an emphasis which should not often recur in the same speech.

But once more, in regard to the management of the voice. Some preachers fall into a sing-song manner in preaching, which the beginner should carefully guard against. It consists in the rising and falling of the voice at regular intervals, accompanied by a peculiar cant. Few things are more unpleasant to a truly cultivated audience. On very rude, untutored feelings it sometimes has an effect; but the aversion it causes in other quarters demands its complete disuse. We know some excellent preachers who effectually spoil their exhortations by it. In venerable old men, whose habits were long since formed, it is needless to criticise it; but in the young it should be utterly discountenanced. A word on it, however, is deemed enough.

But here these suggestions and hints are suddenly brought to a close for want of space. What has now been said will therefore be submitted to my young preaching brethren without more for the present. Perhaps they will deem this enough for one reading. We ask for it their careful thought; and hope in the next number of the *Quarterly* to add an end to the foregoing.

## THE CRISIS OF THE QUARTERLY.

As we approach the end of the second volume of the *Quarterly*, we feel that we approach its crisis. If it can be handsomely sustained through the third volume, we confidently believe it may be looked upon as permanently established. Shall it, then, succeed or fail is now the question for decision. Its fate we soberly commit to the brotherhood. If it has real merit, on that ground alone we ask for it the countenance and support essential to its future existence; if it has not, we shall not lament its end. Three thousand subscribers would guarantee its success. With you, brethren, is left the question: Shall it have them, or shall it not?

In the providence of God we now seem near the end of our great national strife. In this strife, while we as a people have, on the whole, sustained ourselves well, we still have suffered much. It now, therefore, becomes every Christian man, in the noble spirit of the Master, to put forth his best effort to repair the injuries of the past, to improve the prospects of the present, and to push ahead the grand work in which we are engaged. In this labor the *Quarterly* would like to bear its part. It proposes to forget the bitterness of the past, to forgive as it asks to be forgiven, and magnanimously to work, in time to come, only for the honor of Christ and the good of frail humanity. The defense of the gospel in its purity, the union of all God's children on the simple basis of the one Book, and determined opposition to every type of error, will constitute in the future, as they have in the past, the matter and burden of its pages. On these grounds and none others it asks the aid of those whose assistance it once more most earnestly craves.

In the next number of the work I hope to be able to announce to the brethren that I have returned to Kentucky, and to name the Post Office at which, for the future, I shall be so happy to receive their subscriptions and mail to them the *Quarterly*. My removal to Canada injured the circulation of the work some. But now shall the past be remembered no more, and the future alone absorb our thoughts and enlist our energies? We trust so.

Beloved brethren, is it going too far to ask you to procure for me 500 subscribers more to the present volume? How badly this number is needed I shall not say; but shall feel deeply obliged to you for the favor asked. A slight effort on the part of each person who sees this would accomplish the end. I entreat that the effort may be made.

# LARD'S QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. II.

JULY, 1865.

No. 4.

---

## THE MIRACULOUS AND THE PROVIDENTIAL.

"As the progress of mental cultivation mainly consists in the gradual recognition of a chain of causes and effects connecting natural phenomena with each other; so the mind, in its development, becomes ever increasingly conscious of those mediate links which are indispensable to the realization of the ideal; and hence the discrepancy between the modern culture and the ancient records, with regard to their historical portion, becomes so apparent that the immediate intervention of the divine in human affairs loses its probability."—STRAUSS.

There has appeared, in every age of human history, a class of thinkers who were unwilling to acknowledge the existence of "more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in their philosophy." Whatever conflicts with their notions as self-constituted judges of the manner in which it becomes Jehovah to act on any occasion must be stigmatized as "essentially unscientific," and the product of a crude and "uncritical age." But when an author affects a competency to criticise the methods of the divine procedure, we may well suspect that his own performances are not altogether free from those defects which render criticism especially necessary. Accordingly, we submit the following critique upon the above paragraph from the *Leben Jesu* ("Life of Jesus"), of Dr. Strauss, in which he affirms the existence of a discrepancy between the historical portion of the Bible and the state of perfection to which modern science has attained. The parts of the Bible to which reference is more especially made are those which exhibit "the immediate intervention of the divine in human affairs," or the miraculous events of sacred history, and the ground of the alleged inconsistency between these events and the revelations of modern science is a "recognition of a chain of causes and effects connecting natural phenomena with each other." The whole series of events composing the wondrous history of this planet are upon this hypothesis but the constituent parts of this grand chain, and hence the supposition of miraculous interposition in the affairs of this world is scientifically absurd.

Now we readily grant that the index of science points to "a principle of order inhabiting the universe," and recognizes a certain uniformity in the operations of nature; but suppose that at certain points of material existence the voice of science is heard loudly proclaiming a want of "mediate links" in nature's great chain, what, then, according to the principles laid down by Dr. Strauss, are we to infer? Why, that science herself inculcates a belief in the miraculous, and recognizes the principle of immediate divine intervention, and this we proceed to demonstrate.

To establish fully and completely the truth of this assertion we need only consider a single class of natural phenomena, but the class selected is the most interesting in nature, viz, the history of *life*, or the phenomena descriptive of the various forms in which "animated nature" has manifested itself in the history of our planet. If it is susceptible of scientific demonstration that life did not flow on uninterruptedly in one continuous stream throughout the past ages of the earth's existence, but that each succeeding race of living beings had a separate and distinct existence, and a beginning independent of any preceding race, then the philosophic maxim of an unbroken "chain of causes and effects" is at once set aside. But if there is any thing abundantly clear and incontrovertible in the science of paleontology—the science which traces the history of life on the earth—it is the fact now under consideration. So strong, so clear and convincing is the testimony of science upon this point, that, according to Hugh Miller, "no great paleontologist was ever yet an asserter of the development hypothesis."

Now as this hypothesis is but a special form of the general theory under consideration, the refutation of the former involves the refutation of the latter, and accordingly we propose to subject it to a careful examination in the light of scientific facts. The following extract is from the "Principles of Zoology," by the celebrated Agassiz, who stands, we believe, without a rival in the department of comparative anatomy: "It is evident that there is a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the earth. This progress consists in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and among the vertebrates especially in their increasing resemblance to man. But this connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the faunas of different ages. There is nothing like parental descent connecting them. The fishes of the paleozoic age are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the secondary age, nor does man descend from the mammals which preceded him in the tertiary age. The link by which they are connected is of a higher and immaterial nature; and their connection is to be sought in the view of the Creator himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to undergo the successive changes which geology has pointed out, and

in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce man upon the surface of our globe." There is thus a "progress" in the history of life upon the planet, but not by development. "The succession of beings" through the successive ages does not constitute a chain of connected links. The existence of each succeeding race does not depend upon that of the preceding. "There is nothing like parental descent connecting them," and hence the fact of their existence, instead of being explained by the operation of uniform natural laws, can be accounted for only upon the supposition of "immediate divine intervention."

The late eminent Scotch geologist, Hugh Miller, has elucidated the interesting point before us with that clearness and force which the brilliancy of his genius and the splendor of his eloquence have rendered conspicuous throughout his productions. From his last and best work, "The Testimony of the Rocks," we transcribe the following paragraph: "We can not link on a single recent shell to a single extinct one. Up to a certain point we find the recent shells exhibiting all their present specific peculiarities. Down to a certain point the extinct shells also exhibit all their specific peculiarities, and then they disappear forever. There are no intermediate species—no connecting links—no such connected series of species to be found as enables us to trace a trilobite through all its metamorphoses from youth to age. All geologic history is full of the beginnings and the ends of species, of their first days and their last days; but it exhibits no genealogies of development." These revelations of modern science put the question before us forever at rest. Were the theory of development correct, we could certainly find somewhere in the rocky beds of the earth specimens of connecting links between the different species—part bird and part beast, or half man and half monster, like the fabled Centaur of the ancients; but such anomalous beings exist only in the realms of fiction, and are not to be created out of the stern facts of geologic science. "Man does not descend from the mammals which preceded him in the tertiary age," and the fable of his gradual development through the lower orders of animate nature was invented by infidels to hide the stupendous miracle of his creation. As the species of any one period are in no respect the ancestors of those which belong to any succeeding age, we are driven to the conclusion that nothing less than the creative fiat of Omnipotence could have been the cause of their existence. "There is no fact," says Dr. McCosh, "that has been demonstrated more completely to the satisfaction of every man of real science than that there is no power in nature capable of creating a new species of animal, or of transmuting one species of animal into another. Yet geology reveals, as among the most certain of its discoveries, the introduction of new species of living creatures at various periods in the history of the ancient earth.

Finding no cause among natural agents fitted to produce the effect, we rise to the only known cause capable of producing it—the fiat of the Creator."

We are thus led by the light of scientific truth to the lofty regions of miraculous agency. The theory of "spontaneous generation" and "the transmutation of species" has no longer an abiding place in the serious thoughts of men of real learning. Law creates nothing, and the elements of every effect must spring from the bosom of its efficient cause. Could life, therefore, be developed, its first appearance would still require the presence of miracle as its only adequate explanation. That same light by which we see successive orders rise and disappear with the circling ages of the past, conducts us further back to a period lying far remote, when universal silence reigned in all the wide domain of earth; when not the feeblest throb of life was felt in all its ample realm; when, cold, and dull, and tenantless, the lifeless globe "swung blind and blackening in the moonless air." Whence, then, came the teeming myriads of animated organisms which fill the vast, unmeasured realms of earth, and air, and sea? Let those respond who idly prate about the unvarying course of nature. The true philosopher finds the real cause in the presence of the supernatural. He recognizes the existence of imperative principles in his own mind, which, with the given data before him, impel him to this conclusion. The intuitive conviction that every phenomenon is attributable to a cause which is adequate to its production, constitutes the solid foundation of that process of reasoning by which we ascend to the higher planes of supernatural agency. Miracles do not, therefore, stand in opposition to this immutable principle. On the contrary, we should never discover the miraculous but for its operation as a fundamental law of the mind. Every argument based upon the supposition of inconsistency between the principle of causation and the doctrine of miracles must either pervert the former or misrepresent the latter. The principle does not demand a natural cause for every effect, and the doctrine does not require the existence of any effect without a cause, but merely without a natural cause; yet one or the other of these important considerations is overlooked in every argument against the credibility of miracles upon this hypothesis.

The rationalists of Germany, while accepting in its integrity the principle of causality, have so defined the miraculous as to destroy its very nature and defeat its only object. With these philosophers the supernatural is only the natural out of sight. A miraculous event is accounted for by carrying it up into the region of a "higher natural law." The only distinction, according to this most whimsical standard, between a miracle and an ordinary occurrence is found in the fact that the former is an effect of a cause unknown, while the latter is

produced by agencies within our view. That which was miraculous yesterday is to-day an ordinary event! An eclipse of the moon was once a stupendous miracle; but science has robbed it of its miraculous character, and it now assumes the modest form of a common occurrence. Such distinctions are mere trifles, unworthy of those who call themselves philosophers. Does any one suppose that the light of science will ever reveal any natural principles by which a dead man can be restored again to life? The restoration of life and the original impartation of life to inanimate matter are identical, as effects, in all essential particulars. The power capable of producing the one is requisite also to the production of the other, and the theory of "spontaneous generation" being scientifically exploded, we must seek that power- beyond the range of natural agency.

The rationalist objects to this conclusion upon the ground that there may be in nature powers and agencies, as yet undiscovered, which are capable of producing the effects in question; and he argues thence, that we are not entitled to refer them to a higher cause without a complete knowledge of all the mysteries of the universe, attended with an infallible certainty that all the combined forces of the material world are inadequate to their production. Granting the correctness of this position, it does not follow that the events described as miraculous in sacred history are referable to the hidden powers of nature, or that such a reference amounts to any explanation of these occurrences. But the truth is, the advocates of miracles, while acknowledging their obligation to show that such events are beyond the capacity of natural agency, are under no necessity of exploring the mysteries of nature in order to fulfill this condition. We know enough both of mind and matter to say, with confidence, what they can not do; while we do not know enough of either to fix the limits of their, respective powers. We may not be able to tell what predictions, with regard to the movements of the heavenly bodies, the highly gifted are able to make by profound and intricate calculations; but we know of a certainty, that no philosopher, whatever may be the extent of his genius, is able to foretell the day of his death except by the power of inspiration. We are not able to determine the possible effects which may be produced by the electrical forces of nature, or the chemical properties of matter; but we feel the utmost assurance that they can not impregnate a lump of clay with the energies of vital power or the attributes of intelligence.

The principles and facts already established afford, likewise, the only true answer to the celebrated argument of David Hume against the credibility of miracles. This argument has been answered in various ways, by various men of various degrees in learning and ability. But it has been said, perhaps with some truth, that it is "a fallacy answered by fallacies." The argument may be briefly stated as follows: It is agreeable to our experience that testimony should

be false, but contrary to all experience that a miracle should exist; therefore, the former is more probable than the latter, and hence no amount of testimony can ever establish the credibility of miracles. The force of this argument lies in the expression, "contrary to experience," and it is just at this point, perhaps, that the majority of Hume's reviewers have misconceived the nature of his principle. We do not understand that this principle applies in the case of the King of Siam and the Dutch travelers. The freezing of water, though common in Holland, was unknown to the warm climate of India, where the king lived; and when informed by his guests of its existence in their own country, it appeared to him incredible, simply because it had never been submitted to his personal observation. But it did not conflict with any law of nature. It was marvelous, but not miraculous; and it is strange that Abercrombie, while distinctly recognizing this important distinction, should still insist that the argument of Hume is "the same mode of reasoning which induced the King of Siam to reject the statement of water becoming solid." "A marvelous event," says the same author, "is one that differs in all its elements from any thing that we previously knew, without being opposed to any known principle. But a miraculous event implies much more than this, being directly opposed to what every man knows to be the established and uniform course of nature."

Now the distinction here drawn between the marvelous and the miraculous exhibits precisely the difference between the principle upon which the King of Siam reasoned and that upon which the argument of Hume is constructed. Should it be supposed, however, that the nature of the event can have nothing to do with the character of the reasoning, it becomes necessary to observe that it may, when the nature of the event is made the criterion of its credibility, which is avowedly the case in the argument of Hume, and the only way to refute the argument is to show that this criterion is false. Hume rejects, as unworthy of belief, every thing of a miraculous character, upon the ground that it stands in direct opposition to "the established and uniform course of nature." That this antagonism actually exists, no intelligent defender of miracles will deny, "for what renders an occurrence miraculous is precisely the fact of its being opposed to the established order of events." It could not otherwise answer its purpose, which is to testify to the presence and power of an agent superior to all of the elementary principles of nature. "The works," says Messiah, "which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." Hence the conclusion at which Nicodemus arrived: "We know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him." How preposterous the opposite conclusion of John Stuart Mill, that "the doctrine must prove



the miracles, and not the miracles the doctrine!" What conceivable end could miracles answer, upon this hypothesis? Equally useless and absurd do the miraculous events of Scripture become in the hands of that class of German theologians noticed above, who attribute their existence to the undiscovered springs of action lying in the higher regions of natural law. This perverse method of explaining the miraculous is doubtless attributable to a general impression, which is, in some respects, strengthened by the revelations of science, that every event belongs, as an integral element, to a harmoniously adjusted and unalterable system. In fact, "the uniformity of the course of nature," or, as Strauss expresses it, "the chain of causes and effects connecting natural phenomena with each other," is the fundamental principle which lies at the basis of all objections to miracles, as such, and the moment that science recognized the existence of facts which do not belong as "mediate links" to this great chain, that moment all such objections disappeared forever from the horizon of cultivated

Having now established the fact of "immediate divine intervention" in the affairs of this world, and having considered the various objections through which it has been assailed, it remains to draw the important distinction which obtains between this agency and *providential interposition*. He who intelligently prays that the heavens may give rain, and the earth bring forth her fruit, does not expect his prayer to be answered by an exertion of power similar to that by which those ordinances were originally set in order; yet his very act is a confession of faith in something more than "a chain of causes and effects connecting natural phenomena with each other." The mechanical theory of the universe, due to the influence of a sensuous and materialistic philosophy, is necessarily anti-devotional. He who discerns only the uniform operations of cold, inflexible material agents, can never exclaim in the true spirit of supplication, "Give us this day our daily bread." If the universe is wound up as a clock or a watch, and left to work out its own grand results without the presence and immediate superintendence of its glorious Author and Creator, all entreaty for his divine assistance is of the essence of superstitious folly. Prayer is thus a practical acknowledgment of providential interposition.

Now, in order to determine the true nature of this agency, and to distinguish it from the miraculous or supernatural, it is necessary to discuss the comparative merits of the two different theories of providence, which are respectively denominated *general* and *special*. These two theories of providential agency are simply corollaries of two general theories which are entertained respecting the constitution of the universe. We shall see that events fall into one, two, or three classes, according to the various methods of interpreting this consti-

tution and of explaining the established system of general laws. With those theologians who hold the mechanical theory of the universe, no event whatever is contingent in the sense that it possibly might not have happened. They consider the very fact of its existence a proof that it constitutes an essential part of a fixed and unalterable plan. Such is the Calvinistic view. In the language of one of the ablest writers of this school: "Every particular being and event in the universe has that connection with something going before it, by which it forms a part of the plan of providence; and although known to us only when it comes into existence, was certain from the beginning, and was known as certain to Him in whose mind the whole plan originated." It is evident that a predetermined "plan of providence," or what is commonly called "a general providence," is the only kind of providential agency consistent with this view of the constitution and course of nature. Notwithstanding this, many have strangely imagined that the doctrine of special providence involves the Calvinian theory of the universe. There is not only a Want of logical connection, but a mutual repugnance between the two theories. No Calvinist believes in the doctrine of special providence, except in a perverted sense, to be hereafter criticised. Meanwhile we will consider the opposite theory, together with the philosophical theory of the universe, with which it stands inseparably connected.

Now, if "every particular being and event in the universe has that connection with something going before it, by which it forms a part of the plan of providence," then is the existence of evil, in all its diversified forms, an essential element of the established system, and directly attributable to the will of Him "in whose mind the whole plan originated." God is thus, upon this hypothesis, the real author of sin, and man is simply a "mediate link" in the vast series of beings and events through which the divine will is ever manifesting itself. But this conclusion is utterly repugnant to all our conceptions of the character and perfections of the Divine Being, and no one is bold enough to avow it in its naked form, while no one is able to deny that it logically follows from the theory under consideration. Nor is the theory less at war with our views respecting the character of man. He is treated, both in the divine government and in all human governments, as the real author of his own actions, and he is conscious of a freedom in the performance of those actions which reconciles him to the fact of being thus treated. He is not, in his own view, a mere instrument employed in the execution of another's will, but possesses within himself, and in the highest sense, a will of his own, to which he ascribes all his actions and volitions as the source alone from which they emanate. The unwillingness of the necessarian to acquiesce in this view of freedom and moral agency grows out of its supposed inconsistency with the sovereignty of the Divine Being. "If it shall

appear," says the author quoted above (Dr. Hill), "that this emancipation of the actions of the creature from the direction of the Creator is an unavoidable consequence of the character of reasonable beings, we must acquiesce in what appears to us an imperfection in the divine government. But until the inconsistency between the providence of God—I mean not merely his foresight, but his determination—and the freedom of his reasonable creatures be clearly established, we should be led, by all the views of the sovereignty of the Creator which reason and Scripture give us, to suppose that no part of the universe is withdrawn from his control, and the harmony of the great plan of Providence must appear to us inconsistent with the motley combination of natural events appointed by God, and actions of his creatures contrary to his purpose." Now this appears to be sacrificing the moral perfection of the Deity in order to preserve intact the attribute of sovereignty; yet of the two phases of the divine character, the former is undoubtedly that upon which we dwell with the greater degree of interest. There is nothing about mere sovereignty calculated to excite love, and we deem it far more consistent with the character of God that some things take place "contrary to his purpose" than that his divine will is the fountain of all the abominations which pollute and disgrace the history of humanity.

But, in truth, the whole difficulty in the mind of the author is founded upon a rational misconception of the true nature of sovereignty. It is not essential to this attribute of a ruler that no event should ever come to pass independent of his will, but only that he is in possession of power sufficient to punish every departure therefrom. There is therefore no inconsistency whatever between the sovereignty of God and the free agency of man, and we have already seen that any theory of providence and of the constitution of the universe which fails to recognize this great fact of moral agency involves consequences the most irrational and absurd.

The theory of a special providence, on the other hand, is the only one consistent with the facts of the universe properly explained. Now, in order to the production of a special effect, on a special occasion, and for a special purpose, there is requisite a special volition, and this implies freedom from any established connection with a system of general laws. To define the exact character of this agency, the utmost care should be exercised, especially that it be not confounded with the miraculous. From a failure to discern the distinction between the two, the doctrine of special providence has been scouted by some, and has degenerated into the follies of superstition with others. Of the former, the following lines from "Pope's Essay on Man," are a sample:

"Think we, like some weak prince, the Eternal Cause  
Prone For his favorites to reverse his laws?"

Shall burning *Ætna*, if a sage requires,  
Forget to thunder and recall her fires?

Oh, blameless *Bethel*, to relieve thy breast;  
When the loose mountain trembles from on high,  
Shall gravitation cease if you go by?"

In reading over these lines we are forcibly reminded of a certain memorable occasion, when the same profound philosophy was expounded by him, who, seated with the Saviour on the lofty pinnacle of the Jewish temple, broke forth in the following amazing discourse: "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone!" There was some excuse for Pope, but really the Devil ought to have known better. He could not, on the one hand, have supposed the Saviour ignorant of the ways of Providence, and on the other, as a close observer of the method of God's dealings with men, he ought, we should think, to have been better informed himself. The Supreme Ruler of the universe is under no necessity of "reversing the laws" of nature in order to compass the ends of Providence. The miraculous and the providential are not to be confounded; yet even the firmest advocates of the latter have adopted a method of explaining it which necessarily involves the supposition of the former. This method of explanation was first suggested, we believe, by the great and learned Chalmers, and amounts substantially to this; that "in the vast scale of natural sequences which constitute one connected chain, the responsive touch from the finger of the Almighty may be given either at a lower or higher place in the progression; and if it be supposed to be given far enough back, it might originate in a new sequence without doing violence to any ascertained law, since it occurs beyond the reach of our experience and observation." Now this would simply be a miracle out of sight. It can not be supposed that a miracle is any less miraculous when it is wrought "beyond the reach of our observation." Every event superinduced by the violation of a natural law is essentially miraculous, whether that law be "ascertained" or not. The futility of the distinction here implied has already been exposed by what was said concerning the rationalistic explanation of miraculous events.

Rejecting, therefore, this method of explaining the agency in question, and agreeing with Dr. McCosh, that "it is not needful to suppose that God interposes to change his own laws" to secure the ends of his providence, we shall see whether he, as a believer in the doctrine of *special* providence, has furnished an explanation of it, which is based upon principles more philosophic and satisfactory. "How is it that God sends us the bounties of his providence? How is it that he supplies the many wants of his creatures? How is it that he

encourages industry? How is it that he arrests the plots of wickedness? How is it that he punishes in this life notorious offenders against his law? The answer is, by the skillful prearrangements of his providence, whereby the needful events fall out at the very time and in the way required. When the question is asked, How does God answer prayer? we give the very same reply: it is by a preordained appointment, when God settled the constitution of the world, and set all its parts in order." In this exposition of providential interposition the miraculous certainly disappears, but with it also disappears the peculiar agency demanding explanation. A general providence is all that is left us. The supposition of nothing more than "prearrangements" and "preordained appointments," all set in order "when God settled the constitution of the world," we look upon as wholly incompatible with the theory of special providence. Nor do we wonder at the error into which the learned author has here evidently been betrayed. It is a necessary consequence of his views respecting the nature of the distinction between the two theories of providence which he presents in the following language: "The general providence of God, properly understood, reaches to the most particular and minute objects and events, and the particular providence of God becomes general by its embracing every particular." Hence, he supposes that "there is no necessary antagonism between the doctrines themselves." Now a general providence does not differ from a special or particular providence, just as a general truth differs from the subordinate truths that are comprehended under it; yet this is always taken for granted, when it is loosely said, with reference to the distinction before us, that "the general includes the special." An act can be regarded as an act of special providence only when it results from a special fiat of the divine will, and it is distinguishable from the miraculous only when it takes place in harmony with general law. In our reflections hitherto upon the various theories of providential interposition and the constitution of the universe we have discovered but two classes of events—the miraculous and the purely natural, or such as result from the mere mechanical operation of the various forces existing in nature. We have now reached a third class, which can not be regarded as miraculous, since they are in strict accordance with the general laws of nature, nor can they be regarded as purely natural, since they result from a cause which does not belong to the established order of things. In this case, the effect produced, instead of flowing from the commencement of the present order of things through a connected series of causes and effects, is attributable to the agency of a higher cause, acting directly upon the established system, and without the suspension or counteraction of any of its essential parts accomplishing the specific end in view, in perfect harmony with the uniformity of the course of nature. How this is done is inconceiva-

ble, of course, but the fact itself is not on that account to be denied or disbelieved, since the same mysterious combination is found in every material organism whose movements are regulated by the dictates of a presiding will. All the actions of the human body take place in harmony with general laws, yet they flow in every instance from a special effort of the will. The relation which the human soul sustains to the organism in which it dwells is analogous in some respects to that which the Divine Being sustains to the material universe, and both must remain alike inexplicable till we can comprehend the general relations of spiritual to material existence. How God operates in and through the "laws of order," which, in the beginning he saw fit to establish, we pretend not to explain, but the human countenance does not more impressively manifest the presence of the human soul than does the beauteous face of nature reveal to the eye of Christian faith the presence and power of that august Spirit, without whom the whole universe would appear as dull and lifeless as a cold and paled corpse. Well did the Psalmist exclaim in the deep fervor of his enraptured soul: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork;" for animated with his living presence, the works of his hands glow with divine beauty, and deeply impress the earnest heart and thoughtful mind with the great and fearful truth that God lives and moves through all the universe which he has made.

He that studies the workmanship of Jehovah with a proper degree of "mental culture" has no room in his soul for cold and lifeless speculations upon "the uniformity of the course of nature." He "sees God in the clouds, and hears him in the wind," and feels the influence of his presence and the spell of his divinity in all the scenes of Nature's wide domain. It was thus that the Saviour was wont to contemplate the wondrous works of God in their mysterious connection with their still more wondrous Author. He communed with the birds of heaven and the flowers of the field, and drew from them the lessons of instruction which he imparted to those who gathered about his sacred person. "Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are you not much better than they?" The argument is manifest. There is a providence for the fowls of heaven; how much rather, then, for the worthier objects of divine solicitude? "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." He saw in these the skillful hand of a divine workman spinning the delicate fibre, and weaving in beauty the elegant texture that far transcended the princely apparel of the most luxurious monarch. "Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass, which to-day is in the field and to-morrow is cast

into the oven, will he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?"

Such is the divine philosophy of Him who was present when the morning stars sang in a concert of praise, and all the sons of God shouted for joy, over the organization of the heavens and the earth.

---

THE MIRACULOUS AND THE PROVIDENTIAL. —Philip's article inaugurates in the *Quarterly* the discussion of a subject which every thinker will readily admit to be at once important and difficult. That there have been miracles, the Bible affirms; that there is a providence, no Christian denies. This makes the topics important. Yet neither that nor this is the subject of formal Bible decision. This makes their discussion difficult. Yet we believe they should be discussed, and that, too, in a more direct way and on a more extended scale than Philip has adopted. In order to this, the first thing necessary is the true *definition* of a miracle. I have never yet seen one that I felt to be satisfactory; nor do I believe that such a one is in print. What is a miracle? Who can answer precisely, giving neither too much nor too little? Again: what is the exact definition of the providential? What are we talking about when we are talking about the thing? If definable, let us have the definition; if describable, let us have the description. Then let the line, deep and bright, be drawn between the miraculous and the providential—between the providential and the non-providential. Then on all these definitions and distinctions let the Bible be laid, that we may see how complete the correspondence between the human work and the facts and implications of the divine volume; and if differences exist, in what they consist and how they may be remedied. Then shall we begin to approach the final, and therefore the satisfactory. The popular mind is cloudy, particularly on the subject of the providential. Who will speak to its clarifying? Philip's object was one—the refutation of a subtle infidel objection. In this object we think him successful. We here propose another object in harmony with his—a really antecedent work, and one underlying his. Is there an immediate intervention of the divine in human affairs? If so, where shall we find the proof—in the Bible or elsewhere, or in the Bible and elsewhere? To all these hints and questions we should delight to have a masterly response. An article which should exhaust the subject of the miraculous, followed by another which should do likewise with the providential, would be invaluable to the age in which we live. Can not Philip speak on the one subject, while some other hand shall do justice to the other?

## ORDINATION OF CHURCH OFFICERS.

THERE is perhaps no one subject connected with the reformation we are seeking to effect which has received more attention, in proportion to its importance, than the subject of ordination. I do not, of course, here speak of ordination in general; especially do I not speak of a fancied *fore-ordination* by the Almighty Father of one definite portion of the human family to salvation, and of the other definite portion to perdition. Of this ordination I speak not, for the simple reason that the word of God speaks not of it. This ordination is one of the myths of which Paul speaks in his second letter to Timothy, to which the people's ears were to be turned after being first turned away from the truth. I speak of nothing of the kind. I speak of the ordination of the New Testament—the ordination of good men to the several offices therein laid down; in other words, of the formalities with which these men shall be set apart to their respective works. Of this only do I

As in all other matters, whether of faith or practice, so in this, the word of God is to be our sole rule; and its final decision our final decision. Beyond it we must not go, short of it we must not stop. That the discussions of the subject in hand by our brethren have been generally guided by this high standard we are glad to know. True, their conclusions have not in every instance been completely uniform; yet have they been so to a degree highly gratifying. But the fact that their conclusions have not been completely uniform would seem to argue some obscurity in the mode of treating the subject in the New Testament. I say would *seem* to argue; for I do not admit a real obscurity. But this conclusion is not a necessary one; since the want of uniformity may have resulted from other causes. In the first place, all the facts necessary to a final conclusion, and hence one which all should adopt, may not have been collected. We do not say they *have* not been collected; we merely say they *may* not. We present the case as a possible, not as an actual one. In the second place, from these facts, even allowing the collation of them to have been complete, the exact and only conclusion or conclusions which they warrant may not have been drawn. Now from these causes the want of uniformity spoken of may have resulted, and not from any obscurity in the New Testament's mode of treating the subject. Still there yet remains this to be added, that from year to year perceptibly the views of our brethren are gravitating toward the same conclusion. In the end, we confidently expect the agreement to be complete. Leisurely investigation of all matters, not dogmatically decided in the word of



God in indisputable terms, is the only way to arrive at sound final conclusions. In hope that we may contribute something toward such a conclusion in the present case, we reopen the discussion on the question of ordination.

The following from the letter to Titus will serve to initiate the investigation: "For this- cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." (Tit. i., 6.)

By whom the gospel was first preached in the island of Crete can not with certainty be said. Most likely by some of the Cretans who were present on the day of Pentecost, on which the Spirit descended. The Cretans mentioned as being then present were most probably Jews. Assuming that some of these were among the three thousand converts of the day, and we can readily account for the first introduction of the gospel into Crete. Moreover, assuming that the gospel was first preached in the island by the imperfectly instructed Jewish converts of that day, and we can the more easily account for the *leiponta*, the omissions or things wanting in each church, which it was made the especial duty of Titus to correct; for it is a well-known fact that the early Jewish converts were continually corrupting both the primitive doctrine and the primitive practice. But be this as it may, it is almost certain that the gospel was not first preached in Crete by Paul; and that the things wanting, of which he speaks, are not attributable to him, but omissions which he found existing in the churches of the island when he first visited it. Why he did not in his own person correct these deficiencies, but left the task to the hand of another, we have no means of knowing. Most likely because he lacked the necessary time.

The preceding passage involves three facts or points which need to be made to stand out and stand apart from one another with great distinctness. For this purpose I shall enumerate them separately. 1. In each church of every city which contained a church, *elders*, and not *an elder*, had to be ordained. 2. These elders when ordained were, in each church, the official *episcopoi*, or overseers, thereof. 3. The overseers did not become such in virtue of their age, but in virtue of a special appointment to the office.

On each of these facts or points I shall now proceed to comment, and these comments will constitute the body of this paper.

I. —In each church of every city which contained a church, *elders*, and not *an elder*, had to be ordained.

This conclusion is necessarily involved in the form of speech which Paul uses. That *kata polin* distributes the cities, and is equivalent to the expression each city or every city, the former of which is the better because the more exact, will not be denied. But the distribution of the cities is the distribution of the churches. Now the direc-

tion is not to ordain elders generally in Crete, but distributively to ordain elders in each city, and hence in each church. The plurality of the apostle is not merely a general plurality, but a special plurality. It is a plurality of one kind in a unit of a different kind. In other words, it is a plurality of elders in each single church. This conclusion may not be unanswerable, but I think it irrefutable.

But the conclusion, well founded as I think it to be, rests not on a single premise. The following, from the letter to the saints in Philippi, is strong and to the same effect: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ." (Philip, i., 1, 2.) This passage might be materially improved by rendering it thus: *Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the holy in Christ who are in Philippi, with the overseers and deacons: grace and peace to you from God our father and the Lord Jesus Christ.*

Now that there was in Philippi a single church, and not a plurality of churches, may be fairly assumed. True, if the point were denied, it could not be indisputably proved, though it is most probably implied in ch. iv., 15, of the Philippian letter. But the fact that neither in Rome, in Ephesus, in Corinth, nor indeed in any other of the large ancient cities mentioned in the New Testament, have we any account of more than a single church, goes far to justify the assumption. I shall hence conclude it to be well taken, at least until it is denied.

Now the church in Philippi certainly contained overseers, and not simply an overseer. Whether it contained more than two or not we can not say; but less than two can not be admitted. This, then, establishes that the single ancient church contained a plurality of elders. At least, it establishes it for the church whose officers were regulated by immediate apostolic instruction. And what was true of one such church in this respect we may safely conclude to have been true of all. A difference can not be admitted.

But, in further proof of a plurality of elders in each church, I cite the following: "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." (Acts xiv., 23.)

That this is a statement of what took place in each individual church we hold to be simply certain. It is not a statement to the effect that in traveling over the country Paul and Barnabas ordained elders, but a statement to the effect that *in each church* they ordained them. This passage, of itself, would seem to be sufficient; but when to this we are enabled to join others, their joint effect seems final. A plurality of elders in each church appears to be the necessary conclusion.

But we have still the following to add: "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church," to whom also he said:

"Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx, 28.)

In this passage we have all the elements essential to a final conclusion on the point in hand. Not that the proof arising from the preceding passages is defective. This we can not admit. But simply that the proof arising from this is indisputable, and hence final.

In Ephesus, then, was a single church. Of the truth of this no one can be in doubt. The very form of speech in which the fact is contained admits not even of a question. To this single church Paul sent and called for its *elders*. Of these, then, there was at least a plurality. How many there were we can not say; only we know there were more than one. This plurality, moreover, was established by the Holy Spirit, and was not a mere optional matter of the church, or a matter of simple convenience. It was a matter of right, an order of things divinely established in a single primitive church; and hence, an order having for us all the force of a precedent or rule of conduct.

Consequently, every fully organized church of Christ of the present day must contain at least a plurality of *elders*; that is to say, it must contain not less than two. More than these it may contain; less than these it can not.

II. —These elders when ordained were, in each church, the official *episcopoi*, or overseers, thereof.

This proposition is in reality compound, and properly distributes itself into two propositions. 1. In what did the ancient ordination of elders consist? 2. When ordained, were not these elders *officers* of the church; and if so, what were their functions?

I shall first consider the question, In what did the ancient ordination of elders consist? That to ordain means, in the case of an office, to set apart thereto or to invest therewith, even the humblest English reader need not be told. That this, moreover, is the meaning of the original term will not be questioned. But in what mode were the elders of the primitive churches invested with office? With what formalities, in other words, was their ordination attended?

On this question our brethren have not been completely united. True, the difference has not been great, nor has it led to the least injurious results. Yet it exists, and it is to the interest of all to contribute to its termination. The precise point in regard to which the difference has existed is this: Should elders be ordained *by the imposition of hands*, or not? Our brotherhood are generally settling down in the belief that hands should be imposed, though some are not free from doubt. For this doubt I confess I do not see in the New Testament what I conceive to be sufficient ground. That others think they do I shall certainly not deny. Yet I must regard them as wrong.

With a view to settling the point, it will be necessary to repeat the

following from Paul to Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain elders* in every city."

Now that the word *ordain* here expresses action is Indisputable. Whether it expresses one act, or a series, is not the question. *It expresses* action, This action, or this series, Titus himself performed—performed it by himself, performed it alone. Further: all that is in the word he did. His act, or his series, complemented or exhausted its meaning. When his act was ended, no part of the sense of the word remained still to be enacted. The whole thing called ordination was therein and thereby consummated. Moreover, this act was performed in the church and for the church, *but not by the church*. Titus did the ordaining. From this it follows that the church itself does not ordain its own elders, but the evangelist who labors in it and for it. And this conclusion must stand as final on this particular point, unless some other case can be adduced having the effect to change it or modify it. But from this it can not be legitimately inferred that the church is necessarily excluded from all co-operation in the matter of supplying itself with elders. Certainly it may, for aught that appears in this or in any other case to the contrary, choose the men whom it wishes to be its elders; these it may, and perhaps should, preliminarily, appoint to the work, with the view of testing their qualifications; and in every case nothing forbids that its advice may be had and its feelings consulted. But in the precise point of ordination Titus, and not the church, neither any one by its delegation, did the work.

But now comes the question, In what manner, or how, did Titus perform the ordination? Certainly the term *ordain* itself does not furnish the answer. It has, then, to be sought in something else besides the term itself, or be obtained from some other source. That the history of the term as used in connection with the church, especially as used in connection with the appointment of officers of the church, is the most likely means of supplying the answer I shall take for granted. That this history is exceedingly scant is well known. Indeed, we have but a single instance of the use of the term in such a connection. But since this instance is a very clear one, it may suffice. The following is the instance:

"And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples to them and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and

to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch. Whom they set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." (Acts vi., 1, 6.)

The word which in Titus is translated *ordain*, is here translated *appoint over*. In both passages it has, so far as the act it expresses is concerned, precisely the same meaning. It signifies in both to set apart to a particular office. Now, although the office in Titus differs from that in Acts, still, since they both stood connected with the church, and since the same word is used to denote setting apart to both, I think it but reasonable to conclude that whatever were the formalities of the one case were the formalities of the other. This conclusion, I know, is not a necessary one; but where absolute certainty is not attainable, the Christian will often feel himself called upon to act on the degree of probability which approaches nearest to it.

How, now, were Stephen and the rest formally set apart to office? *By the apostles imposing hands on them*. In this way, then, the seven were *ordained*, or formally invested with office. But the seven were to act as deacons, and not as elders. True; but does the difference in the two offices either involve or call for a difference in the mode of appointment thereto? If not, then the mode of the one may be safely adopted as the mode of the other. The present case at least determines how deacons are to be set apart. Now, even allowing that the mode in which elders are to be set apart is not determined in the New Testament, and that it is hence a discretionary matter, still, would not discretion follow the mode used in the case of deacons, rather than inaugurate an entirely different mode? It seems to me it would. Were I, then, compelled to rest a decision on this single case alone, I should feel it most prudent to set apart elders by the imposition of hands. But, fortunately for us, we are not under the necessity of resting a decision on this case alone. Of this, however, in its proper

But the present case possesses other important features, which we must not omit to notice. It will be observed that the apostles did **not** choose the seven. The apostles merely *ordained* them. The multitude of the disciples chose them, or elected them, for it was strictly a case of election. The disciples elected; the apostles ordained. This, then, viewing it in the light of a precedent, would give the right of election to the church, and take it out of the hand of the evangelist. And this we think the true scriptural course. Were the evangelist invested with the power both to choose and ordain elders for a church, it would inevitably lead, it seems to me, to oppression and ruin. But such is not the case. The evangelist may ordain, but he can do no more. The

church itself chooses those whom it would have, to rule over it. These, when chosen, the evangelist ordains, and here the matter ends. Of course, if a church were to elect a man to become either elder or deacon whom the evangelist knew to be unqualified for the place, I should think it his duty to decline to ordain him. But such cases, though not impossible, are not at all likely to occur.

The case I next cite is the following:" The next, day Paul departed with Barnabas to Derbe. And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. *And when they had ordained them elders in every church*, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." (Acts xlv., 20-23.)

In this case nothing is said of the disciples choosing the men who were appointed to be their elders. Whether they did so or not can not confidently be said. We may allow it on the ground that the case of the seven is the precedent for all similar cases. Otherwise the point must be held as undecided. We are merely told that Paul and Barnabas *ordained* elders for the disciples in each city. But who first chose them we know not; nor, after what has now been said, shall I consider the point material,

But in this *case* we have neither the word which in Titus is rendered *ordain*, nor the phrase *laid hands on them*, used in the case of the seven. Yet we have a term which clearly combines the force of the two, and which consequently both signifies to ordain and expresses the mode of it. The term used in the present case expresses *the act of formally setting apart to office by imposing hands*. And this term is used of setting, not deacons, but elders apart to office. *I hence conclude that the true scriptural mode of ordaining elders to office is by laying hands on them*. This conclusion appears to me to be both necessary and final.

Further: that the praying and fasting spoken of in the passage both had immediate reference to the ordination, I do not doubt. Assuming this to be correct, I make out the following case: that when elders are to be ordained for a particular church, both the members of the church and those performing the ordination should precede it with fasting and consummate it with prayer. And all that is here said with special reference to elders, I should not hesitate to enact as equally proper in the case of deacons.

But to the conclusion that in ordaining elders hands should be imposed, two objections are urged. First: it is alleged that none but the apostles had the right to impose hands; and that consequently the direction to Titus to ordain elders does not mean ordination in

this way. But this objection is certainly invalid. For, in the first place, to go no further, that Paul and Barnabas jointly ordained the elders mentioned in the last preceding extract is actually asserted in the narrative, and hence indisputable. *Now Barnabas was not an apostle.* Here, then, is an instance of a man who was not an apostle imposing his hands in the act of ordaining elders. Moreover, it is the instance of an inspired man, whose act had the sanction of Paul, and was hence right. This utterly refutes the preceding objection. If, then, Barnabas might impose hands, so might Titus; and if Titus, then every other evangelist. Nay, more, since Barnabas actually did impose hands, so, I conclude, in a like case did Titus; and this constitutes their act a precedent, and hence a law to us.

But to the preceding also an objection is urged. It is alleged that Barnabas is called in the New Testament an apostle, and that hence the foregoing objection is to all intents and purposes sound. I grant that Barnabas is called an apostle, but this does not sustain the objection. He was an apostle, but not one of the twelve; neither was he an apostle in the highest sense in which Paul was one. He was an apostle of the church in Antioch; that is, he *was sent out* by that church, and in this sense and to this extent was he an apostle, but in no other. In the same sense also was Paul an apostle of the church in Antioch; that is, he was sent out by it, which is the meaning of the word apostle. But, then, he was also an apostle in a still higher and more significant sense. He was an apostle so made by Christ himself. In this sense Barnabas was no apostle. The present objection is therefore null; and the preceding refutation is to be held as good.

Second: it is objected that hands were imposed only when miraculous gifts were to be imparted; and that, since Titus had not the power to impart these gifts, therefore the direction to him to ordain elders did not imply the imposition of hands. But this objection, like the first, is clearly void. In the case of the seven, hands were certainly imposed; yet clearly no gifts were imparted. The men ordained, were men who, before their ordination, were full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom. But the Holy Spirit was the only gift ever imparted by the imposition of hands. Hence, since, this was not imparted, I conclude that none was. Besides, in the case of Paul and Barnabas (*Acta* xiii.) hands were imposed. This is actually asserted. Yet Paul and Barnabas were already possessed of the most eminent spiritual gifts. To them, then, certainly no gifts were imparted. For what purpose, then, could hands have been imposed? I answer, for the simple purpose of setting them apart to a particular office. Hence for this same purpose were hands imposed, at the first, on elders; that is, they were imposed to set them apart to the overseership of the church, and not to confer on them extraordinary gifts. True, where an apostle was the party imposing the hands, gifts may have

been, and, perhaps, in many instances, actually were imparted; but in the case of the simple evangelist, as in that of Titus, this could not be; and the case of the simple evangelist is to be our criterion. From all of which I conclude the second objection to be of no effect; and, consequently, that it is perfectly legitimate to impose hands on elders in this day, though no gifts are thereby imparted.

By the way, the case of the Antioch church and its teachers (Acts xiii.) is too instructive in another point of view to be passed without at least an additional remark. We have here an instance of men being set apart to office who were to be neither elders nor deacons. The question then is, what were they, and what lesson does this case teach? To bring out the point I now have in view I shall select simply Barnabas, and confine my remarks to him. That he was one of several teachers in the church in Antioch we know—a teacher before the ordination mentioned in the chapter took place. Yet the Holy Spirit now requires him to be separated to a particular work to which he had been called. That this work was simply the work of preaching the gospel, and doing whatever else is necessarily connected therewith, needs no proof. It was, in other words, simply the act of the church, in setting apart one of its teachers to the work of an evangelist. At least, I can see the transaction in no other light. To this work Barnabas was set apart by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of hands. Thus, then, I conclude, should every evangelist be set apart to his work. To this conclusion I know it is an easy matter to raise objections; but that on the whole it will be found the safest ground of action I have no doubt. But the elaboration of the point is not here proposed.

But we have yet another question under the second proposition to answer, namely: When ordained, were not these elders *officers* of the church; and if so, what were their functions?

On the first point here raised we need not say much, and on the second shall not. Not that they are not important, for certainly they both are. But the first can be briefly disposed of, and the second is a subject for an article by itself. It hence deserves more space than we can here devote to it.

That there was in the primitive churches an office called the *episkopee*, which literally means overseership, can not be denied. To this office men were not born, neither did they assume it of their own accord. It was an office of the highest consequence to the church; hence it was to be filled with the utmost care. In the individual church no office was above it and on it more than on any other did the welfare of the church depend. That those who filled this office were officers of the church, in the only sense in which we use the word officer in this day, no man who has any regard for his judgment will deny. They were as truly officers as is he who fills the governor-



ship of a State, or he who fills a professorship in a college. Not more certainly was he who filled the *apostolee*, an apostle, and hence an officer, than was he an officer who filled the *episkopee*. To deny the one is to deny the other. To the office of overseer, I think it most likely, men were in the first place elected by the members of the church. But after being tried, or after giving full proof of their fitness for the office, they were then formally set apart thereto in the mode already described. From this time forward they were officers in fact, officers by a divine arrangement, and hence officers in the strictest sense of the word.

As to the functions of the overseers, as already intimated, I shall Bay but little. It is a subject which has occasioned not a little controversy in our ranks, most of which has been temperate and profitable. Still, it can not be said that we are even yet all of one mind in regard to the main point in issue. That unanimity will ultimately prevail I have no doubt. Perhaps enough has already been said to bring the result to pass without the addition of more just now. Yet a few words can hardly be thought out of place.

It appears never to have been the intention of the Saviour to invest uninspired men in his kingdom with much power. Of the wisdom of this, the most imperfectly read in church history will need no proof. Even ransomed man, unless under the immediate restraints of the Holy Spirit, can not be trusted with great power. He is certain to abuse it. With this general principle before us, we are not to feel surprised that the powers of elders in churches are very small. Only when they become usurpers can they lord it over the children of God. We should hence be extremely careful not to invest them with powers which the New Testament does not clearly allow them to wield. A few of our brethren have shown an inclination to lodge in the hands of the eldership the power of trial and exclusion in the case of offenders. This, I think, a dangerous extreme, and hope that, as a people, we may never reach it. Elders have no power to exclude from the church; neither, in my opinion, can the church, even if she would, delegate it to them. With the church alone, and when acting in her church capacity, resides the power to expel. Such, at least, is my conception. I well know what advantages can be taken of the position, and how easily, in individual cases, a church can be involved in confusion. But even allowing the point to be indeterminable by the word of God, and I still think it safer to reserve the power of final expulsion to the church than to confer it on the elders. The former course may sometimes allow a cunning offender to escape, but it will breed no popes, and the latter has. Whenever our churches begin to delegate their own inherent rights and powers to elders, the day of their degradation has set in. Certainly I have no fear of any such result; but we can not be too watchful. Its incipency is the time in

which evil can be most effectually checked. Ruin has a stealthy approach; and he is a wise man who detects it in the distance, and hedges against it.

III.—The overseers did not become such in virtue of their age, but by a special appointment to the office.

After what has now been said on the two preceding propositions, but little need be added on this. Few, if any, will require formal proof that elders became overseers by special appointment. Elders they became by age ; and this they had to be before becoming overseers. But overseers they did not become by age: The mere circumstance of age gives a man no authority in the church. It may add weight to his counsel, and entitle him to great respect, but it confers on him no authority. He may not “ rule” the church merely because he is an aged man. To this work he must be consecrated by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of hands. True, this is the ordination of an elder ; but it is the act of ordination that makes of the elder an overseer. Before the ordination the man is an elder, and after it an elder ; but before the ordination he is an elder without authority, after it an elder with authority. It is the act of ordination that gives office, that gives authority. The elders whom Titus ordained were something more after the act than they were before it ; not as to age, not as to qualification, but simply as to office, as to authority. After the act they might rule ; nay, it was their solemn duty to do so, but not before. Such, in brief, is my conception of the point in hand. Here we close, and submit the foregoing to the thought of a watchful and discriminating brotherhood.

MCGARVEY'S LETTERS TO BISHOP MCILVAINE ON CHRISTIAN UNION.—Such is the title of a neat little tract of twenty-three pages, just printed by Bro. Holman. These letters originally appeared in the *A. C. Review*, but are now reproduced in tract form, in hope that thereby they may secure a more extended circulation. This they justly deserve. We wish that a copy were in every family in our broad land. Let every brother who can spare it send 00 his dollar to Bro. Holman, and in return receive a thousand pages of his tracts, including the present one. It will be long before he can make a better investment. The tract is on the *union of Christians*, and is designed to show, first, that the sects, as such, can never unite ; and second, that Christians alone can, and the grounds thereof. The subject is worthy of a volume, and the tract is worthy of the subject. It is clear, compact, and written, in a fine spirit. Let brethren buy it, read it, and then hand it to their neighbors. As sure as it speaks the truth, the result will be good.

## WHO OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED.

THE present paper does not propose to detain the reader upon the old and well-settled question of infant baptism—not to inquire whether infants or adults are proper subjects of baptism. All infants are unfit for this ordinance, and many adults are not less prepared than they. I do not desire to indulge here in mere platitudes, for none need be told that the unbelieving and impenitent should be denied this ordinance. Other questions, scarcely less important, spring up. Is every man that understands the gospel prepared for baptism? Should we baptize all who apply, or, like John the Baptist, reject some? May we not sometimes be too hasty in administering this ordinance? Is it right on all occasions to baptize the same hour of the night? May we not as seriously violate both the letter and spirit of the law of Christ in baptizing some adults as the sects do in baptizing a child? These are questions to which the attention of all the brethren is most earnestly solicited, but especially the attention of all our preachers.

No elder, no pastor of a church, can have failed to notice the different effects produced by different preachers during a protracted meeting, both upon the community at large, upon the church, and especially upon those baptized during the effort. In the one case the whole community are solemnized, go thoughtfully to and from meeting every night; the common vices, if not eradicated, are restrained, while a deep regard for Christ and his people is felt by all; the church are more prayerful, more humble, more thankful, and the young converts prayerful, devoted members ever after. In this instance the preacher has a deep sense of sin, knows its curse, has felt its burden in his own soul, has rejoiced in deliverance, and now feels for others. He preaches the holiness of God and heaven; holds up a broken law; convinces them of sin and its punishment; dwells affectionately on death, and eternal judgment, and the worm that never dies. Now he points out the love and sorrows of the Saviour; explains his sacrifice, the resurrection, the commission, the terms of pardon, the rapture of heaven; and so captivates the sinner's mellowed heart, that he joyfully exclaims:

**"I will not, I can not refuse;**

**His goodness has conquered my heart."**

This is thorough work; these are fit subjects for baptism; they will make good members of the church, will be at the prayer meetings, will read their Bibles and pray in secret, will work in Sunday school, will give the elders no trouble in the way of discipline, for they have been soundly converted.

But now observe that other meeting. The preacher sets out on

faith for his first sermon; shows that faith is the belief of testimony, that faith comes by hearing, and that a man is not justified by faith only; all very true, but is this what a hardened sinner needs to soften him? The next sermon is on repentance—a very good subject; but see how he handles it. Instead of dwelling upon the sins to be repented of, the necessity of repentance in order to holiness and heaven, and other like views, he proves that repentance comes after faith, that the word *metanoia* should be translated reformation, instead of repentance, and that repentance does not mean sorrow, simply—a sermon of definitions, criticisms, and so forth. Next comes a sermon on immersion, one on infant baptism, one on the design of baptism, another on the creeds, and if he has any other speeches involving verbal criticism, they all are forthcoming into the ears of men who care little for their own salvation, and much less for the views of any particular church. All the preacher says on these themes, very important in themselves, especially when delivered to those who need them and are prepared to appreciate them, may be very true; but an impenitent sinner is seldom, if ever, prepared as he should be, by such preaching, for the ordinance of baptism. He may be buried in baptism, but not "buried with Christ in baptism." Having but a shallow sense of his own sins, the fallow ground not broken up, it is not possible for him to love the Saviour of sinners; and going down into the water without Christ in his heart by faith and love, he is buried alone, and rises alone, and walks alone through a cheerless, fruitless life. This shallowness of conviction is sometimes further promoted by a careless way of correcting the sectarian error in regard to sinners praying. While desiring to show that a man has no promise of pardon by prayer and penitence without obedience, some have spoken against a sinner's praying at all, even for a deeper sense of his own sins and a better preparation for baptism. Too many careless remarks have also been made against a sinner's mourning and agonizing a long time over his sins, for, besides correcting the sectarian blunder at that point, an impression has often been made adverse to a deep, thorough repentance and conversion, the sinner understanding from those careless lips that he need not trouble himself a great deal about the past, provided he can get his own consent to make the confession and be baptized, striking a bargain at the rate of so much obedience for so much mercy. The sinner ought to pray, for "it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the Lord shall be saved." (Acts ii.) Here are persons not saved that are to bring in prayer as one of the conditions, as has been shown by President Milligan in his work on prayer. Sinners ought also to agonize, for Jesus taught them, saying, "Agonize to enter in at the straight gate." Let them pray, mourn, and agonize, and their baptism will mean something, and not be found to them a cheap formality.

We are happy to know that so large a per centum of all the preaching indicates a thorough appreciation of the necessity of a heartfelt conviction of sin as the indispensable antecedent to baptism. Indeed, all will admit this, for we are not imagining that we are controverting any one's views of this subject. The thing aimed at chiefly is to suggest to young ministers, and any others who seem to have studied no further than "the baptism of John," that a deeper knowledge of the human heart and its sins, a better knowledge of sin itself—its nature, deceitfulness, heinousness—is necessary. That not only must a preacher admit the correctness of these views theoretically; he must learn how to "preach repentance," convince men of sin, create a concern in their hearts about their own salvation, that they may feel "weary and heavy laden," and all this before they are prepared to be baptized, or even to hear much about it. I am aware it may be said that many honest sectarians ought to hear first principles at the very outset, and need to hear much on these elementary themes. Very true; and why should they hear these things? It is because they have already become penitent, weary, and heavy laden by hearing from their own pulpits the very subjects I have been recommending, and now need to learn how to obey. For all such penitents, still ignorant of the law of obedience, there is no Scripture equal to the great commission, and the second chapter of Acts of Apostles. But few words will be necessary to teach such penitents as these, and such as were before Peter on Pentecost. Had he begun at the wrong end of the story, as some of us modern preachers do, preaching baptism first, or discussing definitions of words, and addressing the intellect merely, he would have failed as disastrously as we often do when we fail to preach sin, the Saviour, and obedience in their true order.

It is possible for even a good preacher to turn his mind so exclusively to faith, repentance, and baptism, outwardly considered, and to study Christianity in its machinery and mere objectivity, as to impoverish his mind on the subjects of sin, its sinfulness, the Saviour, *faith with all the heart*, *repentance unto life*, *buried with Christ*, mourning, agonizing for sin, being "weary and heavy laden," and the whole subjectivity of religion. Such was the case with a preacher of my acquaintance. A man who had been hearing him explain the laws of induction into the kingdom, came to him and said: "Sir, I believe all you say about how to become a Christian; I think that is the Bible teaching; no doubt of it, but I confess I feel no particular desire to become a member of the church, and do not know why I should feel so indifferent about it. Now what am I to do? What is wanting? I do not feel that I am fit to join, having so little concern of conscience." "Well," said the preacher, "yours must be a singular case; if you believe that I have preached Bible truth, showing the true *plan* of coming into the church; and if you believe that a man

must be born of water and the Spirit to enter the kingdom, I do not see what hinders you, really. If you understand these things, why not obey." What quackery! Is it enough to understand the truth? Is there nothing in the sinner's way but a want of understanding? Is not the heart, the conscience, and the will more seriously involved than the head? A disease in the stomach often shows itself by painful sensations in the head, and the unskillful physician sometimes falls to blistering the head instead of applying the remedy to the real seat of the disease. But in such cases the surest and readiest way to cure the headache is to heal the stomach; and had my friend, the preacher, been a good doctor in divinity he would have, at once, discovered the man's trouble to be seated in the heart—a want of conviction of sin, and of penitence that would at once have led him to the Saviour and to the church.

To this it may be replied: if the head cease to ache the stomach must be healed, and why not prove by the same illustration that if a man's mind is once cleared up, the heart will all come right. The answer: no diseased stomach ever was cured by applying sinapisms to the head; and not only so, but even the head itself was never cured by such process. Even the man of whom I have spoken was all in mental bewilderment as to what was wanting in his own case, and the preacher no less mystified than himself. How much a well-adjusted heart has to do with the accuracy of mental action is frequently and clearly intimated in the Scriptures; for example, Paul says in reference to a certain matter: "I give my (own private) judgment, and I think I have the Spirit of Jesus Christ." Now what influence could his having the Spirit in his soul exercise over the operations of his intellect? It was not the extraordinary, but the ordinary influence of which he spoke, and yet his heart of love, his spiritual mindedness simply, was considered as having in some sort a determining influence upon his own natural "judgment." The thought to be enforced by this illustration is, that a sinner whose heart is wrong, whose will is opposed to God, who is not convinced of sin, will fail to form even just mental conceptions of truth, for the mists and clouds of sin hovering around the heart will blind the "eyes of his understanding." The first thing to be done in all such cases is to convince of sin, to produce penitence of soul, to have him feel "weary and heavy laden" with sin, to feel himself a lost sinner, disposed to pray, and to spend less thought upon the imperfections of others than upon his own. Now he will hear your *good news* that offers relief. He will drop a penitential tear upon Mark xvi., 16, and Acts ii., 38, will feel no self-righteousness, will not talk of non-essentials, will not wait for a second exhortation and a second invitation, nor wait to become better; but, as a believing penitent should, he will say:

*Who Ought to be Baptized.*

*"Just as I am, without one plea  
But that my Saviour died for me,  
And that thou bidst me come to thee:  
Oh, Lamb of God, I come, I come!"*

A good illustration of this frame of mind so becoming for a sinner in yielding to Christ may have been read by many in some of our Sunday-school literature. In a village out west there lived an ungodly old man, named Jack Gordon. He had but few qualifications for any thing, except to drink whiskey and swear. Passing along the street in front of a house of worship he heard them sing a curious chorus to one of their hymns:

*"I'm a poor sinner, and nothing at all;  
But Jesus Christ is all in all."*

These lines caught his attention; he pondered them; what does this mean?" I'm a poor sinner; a poor sinner!—and nothing at all I" Does it mean me? The arrow had reached its destination. His soul sickened at a retrospect of his life. When almost sinking to despair in view of his past sins and hopeless future, the other part of the distich came to his mind—"But Jesus Christ is all in all"—a ray of hope. "Oh! is there yet a chance for me?" he cried. He became serious, prayerful, and after a while desired to join a certain church. But before they could receive him they must question him on his views of theology. "Well, brother," said they, "tell us what are your views about the Trinity?" "I know nothing about the Trinity, I only know that

*'I'm a poor sinner, and nothing at all;  
But Jesus Christ is all in all.'*"

They thought this rather a short experience to give, and tried him again. "What are your views about the decrees of God?" "I know nothing about the decrees; I just know that

They at last perceived that these are the two grand essentials preparatory to church membership—to feel our own sins and danger, and to behold the Lamb of God. I fear the poor old man did not hear from his spiritual guides the words of Ananias to Paul, but was not he in the right state of mind to be baptized? And should not every minister aim at such a preparation for baptism, instead of simply asking the sinner, as a few careless men have done, whether he "understands the gospel" and "knows his duty." Thousands of sinners know their duty, and understand the gospel as well as the Devil does, and are about as well prepared withal to be baptized as he. It has been but a few weeks since one professing to preach the ancient gospel taught the people that whoever "knew the difference between right and wrong was well enough prepared to join the church." He had much to say

about Acts ii., 38, but that part which shows how they were cut to the heart, and cried out for the way of salvation, was but poorly exemplified in the converts he baptized, who came forward without a tear, and apparently without feeling, with an unsubdued look, who seemed to spend the time between their confession and baptism with but little seriousness, and apparently no prayerfulness. We desire not to discount the value of obedience, but to raise much higher in some minds the importance of a scriptural preparation for it, and so secure both the "form and the power" of godliness.

We will now proceed to solve the mystery of nearly all the excuses made for not coming to Jesus when the gospel is fully preached and fully understood. This can be done best by individualizing several of said excuses, and tracing them quickly to their source.

I. *The moralist.* —What hinders his obedience, but a sense of his own righteousness? Or, which is the same thing, a want of conviction of sin? He thinks, because he can compare favorably with some lukewarm professor, his prospects are pretty fair. Says he has committed but few sins, and these of a very pardonable kind; counts up his good deeds to the poor, but fails to remember his many sins, his daily disobedience to God's commandments to believe, to repent, to pray, to confess, to be baptized, to live, not only a moral, but a Christian life. How often we hear it said that Mr. Such-a-one is all right —all he needs is to be baptized and to join the church. Sad mistake. Most mischievous blunder! He needs most of all things a penitent soul, needs to feel himself a poor sinner and nothing at all, and to be so humbled on account of his sins of thought, word, and deed, as God sees them on his book of remembrance, that he can heartily adopt the

"A guilty, weak, and helpless worm,

Be assured, until he be convinced of sin, he will always entrench himself behind his goodness of life and character, as his excuse for not joining the church; and should he formally obey the gospel, it will be a curse to him, for it will be but a mere mechanical obedience.

2. *The sects.* —The influence of divisions among professing Christians is bad enough, but the friends of Christian union should not concede too much to the world at this point. If every denomination on earth would abandon creeds, accept the Bible alone, accept the one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one name, the disobedience of millions would still be witnessed. The church was all united at one period of its history, and never met with more decided opposition than at that time; and if the church were now a perfect unit, representing the golden age of humanity, were Jesus already here in millennial glory, all unconvinced, unhumbled sinners, Gog and Magog would be gathered together to battle against him. The preacher, frequently,



in the hearing of the most obdurate sinners will say: "Ah, if the churches were only united, all these people would soon obey." "That is so," says the sinner; "that is the preacher for me; whenever you all get right yourselves, then come and preach to us;" and so he may curse on, encouraged somewhat by the preacher's well-meant but unguarded remark, assuming that the proper circumstances for his conversion have not yet arrived. The predestinarian tells him if he is not one of the elect he can not be saved; the next preacher tells him he can do nothing till electrified by the Holy Spirit; another excuses him because the churches are not all unified, and so, his disobedience seeming upon the whole pretty well apologized for, his conscience is quieted, his fears allayed, and the work of conviction checked. Now why not press upon every man his own responsibilities before God, until he is willing to turn his eye from others and see his own sins; till he gathers spiritual momentum sufficient to overcome the pebbles in his way, and go through floods and flames if Jesus lead. They used to say that Jupiter threw a wallet over every man's shoulder, with his own faults in the hind end, but the faults of his neighbor before; hard to see his own errors, but easy to see his neighbor's. Now this wallet must be turned round, and always is in the case of every sound conversion; for then one's own sins seem greater than the sins of sects or neighbors, or any one else, while no excuse for disobedience is ever sought for or desired.

3. But not to dwell tediously upon all the excuses about hypocrisy in the church, about having bought a piece of land, or five yoke of oxen, or about having married a wife; simply noting that these and a score of cognates take their rise in an unhumbled state of the heart; it should be observed that all shallow pretenses to religion, made on what are supposed to be death-beds, or under deep sorrows and bereavements, or made through mere sympathy, when others are joining the church, are traceable to a want of a proper sense of sin in the pretenders. Spurgeon has said somewhere in his sermons, that out of twelve hundred cases of supposed conversions, on what was supposed to be dying-beds, only two of them ever showed any evidence of pious lives afterward, when, contrary to expectation, they were raised to health again. This is a fearful induction, and shows how many may go into eternity with the delusion that they have repented of their sins, whereas God sees it to be a mere alarm in the presence of death, or a mere suppression of sinful passions resulting from the weakness of the body. The Lord accepts no victory of this kind. Sin must have a fair chance in a sound body, when the heart is full of blood, and the bones full of marrow, and if then subdued, the victory will be complete.

The propriety of urging people to join the church, in view of the fact that their parents or their children are Christians, or to induce

others to join, to give the force of their example, or for any other tenth-rate reason, may be well doubted. I once heard a young preacher, an immersionist, recommending them to obey then, inasmuch as all things were ready; even the weather was fine and the water was warm. While conducting a protracted meeting last winter, in very cold weather, we were told that a number of ladies would like to join the church if their baptism could be deferred till a warmer season. To this suggestion we paid no attention, well knowing that whenever they were suitably prepared for the ordinance, they would go through floods if Jesus lead. We preached right on, dwelling on heaven and hell, life and death, time and eternity, sin and its punishment, the death and love of Jesus, the commission, the necessity of obedience, of a pure heart, of a Christian life, and filled their hearts so full of a sense of their own need of salvation, that there was no need of parleying at all about the coldness of the day, or the cross of "making the confession, each willing to say:

Not a nerve trembled that day as they went down with me into the water; firmly, and calmly, and prayerfully did those otherwise timid, delicate sisters yield to their Lord's command, proving that an humbled, mellowed, loving heart, is the real grace that helps in that time of need.

An incident in the life of that man of God, the lamented R. C. Rice, of Kentucky, is told, that illustrates our meaning. A young brother came to him, saying: "Bro. Rice, I want to ask your advice about a very serious matter. Do you think I ought to prepare myself for the ministry and preach the gospel?" "Not if you can help it," said the preacher. This reply was neither expected, nor, at first, understood by the young man. He repeated: "Do not be a preacher if you can help it. If you can follow any other business without feeling that you are neglecting your duty or without any compunction, do so; for a man should preach only when he can not help it." How suggestive, how voluminous this remark! We not only indorse it, but extend the principle to the work of conversion. No one is fit to be baptized until he "can not help it," until it is easier to come than to stay away, until obedience is easier than disobedience. We always should, and always do, obey the stronger forces physically, mentally, and spiritually. We live as long as living is easier than dying; whenever dying becomes easier than living, then we die. Whenever repentance is easier than the sinner's unreconciled condition, then will he flee to Christ; and happy is that preacher who can so alarm the guilty soul, and render its condition so uncomfortable, as to compel it to seek a refuge under the wings of the Almighty.

From all that we have said it is not improper to suggest that due care be taken in certain cases, lest we be found baptizing those who are wholly unfit for the ordinance. It is not sufficient that a man merely understand his duty. Very often even those who are humble enough do not understand why they should be baptized, or fail to have the great notions of sin and the Saviour, the leading ideas, in their minds at the time. A baptism may be performed too hastily, just as a man may be sworn into office, or a marriage ceremony performed without due preparation in the subjects. In most cases there need be no hesitation; but how often a little private instruction would be beneficial. We read of their being baptized "straightway," the "same hour of the night," and of being added "the same day;" but we also read that some were rejected until they should "bring forth fruits meet for repentance."

"He that winneth souls is wise." To undertake to guide a single soul from earth to heaven is a heavy responsibility which none should ever assume but under the most solemn conviction that he understands and is preaching sin and salvation so as to meet the deep wants of the sinner's heart. We must not cheapen this religion, this medicine for the soul, by allowing the patient to think his case a not very dangerous one. The sinner himself does not respect the preacher who does so; for he knows his own sins, and will not submit to the guidance of one who does not make him feel his unworthiness. A physician is never called in till the patient or his friends believe there is danger. The secret of true earnestness in the minister is found in his own conviction of the sinner's danger; but if he have shallow views of the nature of sin, and of the atonement, he will fail of heartfelt earnestness for the same reason that a Universalist is deficient therein. Cheap views of these subjects make cheap preachers, a cheap gospel, cheap converts, cheap Christians, and a cheap heaven.

Our failure in convincing men of sin arises from two causes: *First*, we do not often enough, nor thoroughly enough, handle those themes calculated to do this work. And who is sufficient for this thing? The writer would be glad to take lessons from any brother who will point out the best way of making the desired impression upon the impenitent heart. What Bible truths are best suited to this result? Shall I preach on the three dispensations in the usual way? When I do, and give the invitation, no one comes forward. Shall I prove that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision? This would be true, but will anybody come for that? Shall I spend an hour on the nature of Adam's sin, and what kind of a death he was threatened with? If I do, will they come? If I show how the Spirit operates, will they be cut to the heart? I can prove that faith comes before repentance; that the ark was large enough to contain all the animals; that sin is the transgression of law, and many other truths all-im-

portant in themselves, and indispensable for some persons who need them, but will these sermons extort the What shall I do to be saved? Who will give us a little light here? *Second*, do you say, preach the gospel? True; but how shall I present that gospel? Will men care for the gospel before they know the law, their violation of it, and the consequent penalty? The law was given to the world before the gospel; men broke that law, felt its curse, and their own hopeless condition before the good news of salvation from that curse could be appreciated. Can the sinner be converted by preaching the terms of pardon before they feel the need of pardon? If there be no curse for sin, no future punishment, no hell, then has Christ done but little for us—done nothing, indeed, for he had no errand here but to save sinners from hell. If there be no hell, there is no redemption from it; and no redeeming love, no Redeemer; no salvation, no Saviour; and religion turns out at last to be a phantom and a farce. I verily believe that so much preaching on the love of God to impenitent men is a waste of time, unless it be accompanied by an effort to show the length and breadth and height and depth of that love—as long as eternity, as broad as the world, as high as heaven, and as deep as hell. Now what an inexcusable waste of time is it for a minister to arise, and take his text speaking of Christ's "drawing all men unto him," and spend that precious hour, the last that some in the audience may ever enjoy, in refuting some misinterpretation of some of the sects, as to *how* Christ is to do this work; and this in the presence of an audience that cares neither for him, nor the sects, nor for Christ himself. If the Eternal Judge should reveal to that minister that he had just this one hour before the end of the world in which to save as many of that audience as he could, how different would his sermon be? See him now hasten to the pulpit, making no apologies for a want of preparation, he would cry out, "Sirs, ye all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. You must be forgiven, for no sin can enter heaven; Christ died for you to save you from death and hell; repent you therefore, and turn to God, that your sins may be blotted out;" these and such like themes would be developed and crowded home upon their solemn hearts.

Whenever the minister fails in his conceptions of the danger and ruin of sin, he will not only fail to preach the necessary antecedents of baptism, and to produce a due repentance of sin, but will fail also to feel as he ought a religious concern for their salvation. A member of the Baptist Church once invited a lawyer to go with him to church and hear his favorite preacher. Returning home he asked the lawyer how he liked the sermon. After pausing a moment he raised his head and said: "If what that preacher says be true he ought to be damned, for he tells us that our eternal destiny hangs on our receiving the truth he preaches, and yet he manifests less interest in it than I do in a

case of five dollars; and if that be true, he ought to go to hell for his indifference."

In closing this article allow me to say that the object has not been to say any thing new or startling, or any thing different from the belief of disciples well instructed in the kingdom of God; and yet I must be allowed to think that the practice of some ministers is not in accord with their admitted theories. We need not study religion objectively less, but subjectively more, and so we should preach it. Then would young converts be more prayerful and exemplary in private life, and more easily induced to pray or sing in the family and congregation; and having obtained forgiveness of sins, a pure heart, and the presence of the Holy Spirit as their strengthener and comforter, it will finally be their privilege

"To walk in soft, white light, with kings and priests abroad;

CLEMENT.

A DEEPER SENSE OF SIN. —The object of Clement's article is to arouse our preachers to the necessity of creating in the minds of sinners a deeper and keener sense of sin before baptism, a consequent more intense desire for salvation, and a further consequent higher and truer appreciation of the Saviour. In this, its object, it has our high approval. Light views of sin will never lead the soul to God; and one of the fearful aspects of the present age is the indifference and want of feeling with which sin is looked upon. When men are rendered sleepless and filled with agony by a sense of their own sins, they cease to find fault with their neighbors, to cavil at the difficulties of the Bible, and to hold long debates over the terms of remission. They rush to the Saviour as eagerly as does the frantic child to the arms of a mother; they receive his word with gladness, and can not be kept from obedience. They neither have to be coaxed nor threatened. Show them the way of life, and they *will* walk therein. In all Clement says on this point we feel thoroughly satisfied he is right. It is no part of his intention to undervalue any appointment of the Saviour, or to turn away thought from any condition of salvation. His sole object is to bring out to full view, and, if possible, to make most sensibly felt, the necessity for thorough conviction of sin. Effect in the soul of the sinner what Clement wishes to see effected, and thereby, I have no hesitation in saying, conversions to Christ would be doubled. But how shall this be effected? The question is pertinent and weighty, and deserves long and deep thought. It has been but little debated among us. Would it not be well to bestow on it some special attention, now that it is brought formally forward in the preceding paper? We certainly think so.

## SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND A SUNDAY-SCHOOL PAPER.

THE subject of Sunday schools is one of those subjects usually looked upon as minor, but which, on account of its important ultimate results, is unjustly so regarded. Whatever has for its object, even in part and concurrently with the efforts of parents, the molding of the religious thoughts of our children, can never be regarded otherwise than as a most grave and delicate matter. And this surely is the object of Sunday schools. They hence possess for the parent a very high interest, and should engage far more of his attention than they usually enjoy. The subject is, however, overshadowed, as a general rule, by others deemed to be far more important because relating immediately to adults. But this is only another instance of allowing one interest to absorb attention to the injury of another, it may be inferior one, but still one of great magnitude. When, however, it is remembered how soon the children of the Sunday school become the adult listeners of the meeting-house, we can hardly look upon what relates immediately to them as of less moment than that which relates immediately to their parents. Further: I believe the subject is underestimated for the precise reason that it is not sufficiently thought on. Were more attention, especially more serious attention, bestowed on it than is, I have no hesitation in saying that it would improve much in estimation. I shall at least deem the remarks herein following not made to no effect if they shall serve to awaken thought in regard to the matter in hand.

The original design of Sunday schools seems to have been to provide more especially for the wants of the destitute. Poor children were at the first the objects to whose welfare they particularly looked. Now, however, this is no longer exclusively the case. And while the change is to be regretted on some accounts, it is not at all to be regretted on others. In all Sunday schools of our brethren a leading and constant aim should be to fill them with the children of the poor. Could this be successfully done, as a piece of policy no term but grand could adequately describe it I hence wish to invite the attention of the brethren to it in the strongest terms. To point out the results of such a policy is not difficult.

In the first place, a large per cent, of all the children thus brought permanently under the influence of our Sunday schools would not only be rescued from vice and degradation, but in the end be Christianized. Of the truth of this no one in the least acquainted with the effect of a judiciously managed Sunday school needs any proof beyond the simple statement of the fact. Of the importance of redeem-

ing this large class of the human family from final ruin, there is no necessity that I should speak. Every enlightened Christian feels it and admits it. Nor do I see that they can be so successfully reached in any other way as through the Sunday school. Their parents will frequently object to their going to church on doctrinal grounds, when they would not only urge no objection to the school, but even delight to have their children attend it. Besides, for other reasons they will often decline to allow their children to attend church. Ordinarily their children are dressed in the humblest style. Yet these parents are not without some remains of human pride. They hence do not wish their children to attend places where they appear at so great a disadvantage. Too many of them, it is a matter of regret to know, will even go so far as to discourage it. They seem to think that the house of God is not a place to go simply to learn the way of life, but a place for the display of fine things; and how deep is the shame to the profession of Christianity, that its votaries, by their conduct, afford only too just a ground for the impression. But no parent seems to feel that his child is so humbly clad as to be unworthy of a place in the Sunday school. On the contrary, the association is strong in his mind between the place and a child in the worldly circumstances of his own. It is a happy thing that such is the case. That the original design of Sunday schools, published to the world and so widely known, has had much to do in establishing this connection I do not for a moment doubt; and I trust the time may never come when it shall be broken. When once these children can be induced to enter the Sunday school and to become deeply interested therein, their happiness for time and for eternity may be regarded as virtually secured. So over-mastering is the influence which can now be brought to bear upon them, and so strong the spell with which they can be bound, that they will never completely shake them off. To excite in them the deepest interest in their exercises, and to commit them indissolubly to the happy provision made for them, should be the constant aim of their teachers. For this purpose many innocent wiles and dexterous shifts may be employed. If, for example, a boy is sprightly and trustworthy, it may be well to assign him to some little office of honor, which will serve to quicken his dormant self-respect and draw out his latent aspirations. These little offices in Sunday schools are generally filled by children of the wealthy and respectable. This is bad policy, and attended only with evil. Children of the wealthy do not need these small tokens, and should be taught how and on what grounds to resign them to their less favored mates. Besides, where well-dressed lads are assigned to all the posts of distinction in the school, favoritism, based on mere exterior appearance, is apt to be inferred, and envy and jealousy excited. For it is the misfortune of human nature that though it may fall far,

very far, it never sinks below these bad feelings. Every teacher in the school to whose care one of these children happens to be assigned should look on the circumstance as providential, and should set his heart on the salvation of his trust. If need be, he should work for this end with a singleness of aim and a tenacity of purpose which no art of the enemy can defeat. He should endeavor to draw out and attach to himself the whole heart of his pupil, and then use that influence to conduct him to Christ. If a good man, and working in the light, he will seldom fail to effect his end; for I have an impression that God strangely helps such efforts.

In no place so well as in the Sunday school can the children of the humble poor be brought into contact with the children of the more favored. To the elevation and refinement of the former this is highly necessary, indeed almost absolutely so. Here the humble child copies manners, copies speech, copies thoughts, copies morals; and while doing this is all the time casting off the vicious ways of his own less fortunate life. To him the intercourse is invaluable. From it he literally absorbs the elements of his future being. Imperceptibly to himself he is transformed from the incipient cellar rake into the joyous laughing Sunday school boy competing for his medal, or his token of honor, in a manner to mark him as a future benefactor of our race, and to fill his teacher with just pride. To redeem one human being thus, and shape his head and heart for eminent future good, is an<sup>1</sup> object which the philanthropist and the Christian may well allow to quicken his noble intentions.

Besides, these children are both hardly and hardily raised. They are not drenched on teas and rocked in feathery cribs from birth, in a way to spoil their nerves and render future life miserable. Their bones are solid, their muscles compact, and their brain, though at first it may be coarse, is yet strong and capable of immense endurance. Now where one of these children can be toned up to the proper religious and moral height, can be finely educated, and commissioned to preach the gospel, the amount of labor he can perform and the good he will effect is beyond computation in this life. And such events, though rare, are not wholly unknown. It is quite a common thing to hear it said of a man, who, in passing through life, is leaving deep footprints oil the religions or on the political world, he sprang from the obscure common people. He is a wise man who works on the by-lane child with a single eye to the future distant result. Yet such may and such should every Sunday-school teacher be, to whose charge one of the children of whom I am speaking is confided.

In all churches whose members have under their control a well-conducted Sunday school there should be a standing committee, whose special business it is to look up these children and induce their



attendance. For this purpose their parents should be visited and their co-operation sought; the children, themselves, should be visited and kindly and coaxingly spoken to; and, if necessary, I would advise even hiring, by inconsiderable sums and presents, their attendance. Less than the paltry sum of one dollar thus spent might result in the salvation of a human being; and even of a whole family. For the children, once reached and saved, might, and in many cases would, become the means of saving their parents. The committee just named should not be composed of the light and giddy members of the church, but of its sober, earnest members—members who can and will show deep sympathy with those for whose welfare they work and whose very presence would command respect, and contribute no little to effect the end in view. Were the course here suggested adopted in all our churches where Sunday schools are established, I feel sure that the very best results would follow. I sincerely hope the expedient will at least be tried.

But, of course, I am not understood as speaking in favor of Sunday schools merely because they can be rendered so great a blessing to the humbler class of children. This they should certainly be; but they should be more than this—they should be a blessing to all. The well-managed Sunday school, next to the well-managed domestic circle, is the nursery from which are to be transplanted into the future garden of the Lord its best fruit-bearing trees. No pains should then be spared to render it a fit source from which to draw this supply. Of all the youthful converts who from time to time enter our churches, I hazard nothing in saying that, as a general thing, those trained in well-regulated Sunday schools are the most intelligent, stable, and useful. Besides, that they are usually the first to break the spell which hangs over the early stages of a protracted meeting is what every evangelist of ordinary experience knows. Let these schools, then, for these grave reasons be looked upon by us as no secondary enterprises. Rather let them be looked upon as enterprises fraught with the most momentous results; and, as a consequence, let them receive the hearty countenance and active support to which they are so justly entitled.

But the important question here arises, *What things should be taught in our Sunday schools?* I answer, with no sort of hesitancy, *the contents of the New Testament, and these alone.* To this answer, it appears to me, only two exceptions can arise: 1. Where children have grown very familiar with the contents of the New Testament, they may be allowed to take lessons in the Old. It is extremely rare, however, that they become sufficiently acquainted with the New to justify the change. I should hardly think a clear case could arise. 2. Where children, from poverty, are unable to attend an ordinary elementary school, provision should be made for them in the Sunday school. In

these two cases other things than those contained in the New Testament may be taught, and in one of the cases must be, but in no others. The contents of the New Testament, then, and these alone, should be taught in the Sunday school. Is this position just? I shall take for granted that it is. But if so, then it will exclude from the Sunday school, except in the case of the poor, all who are not old enough to be taught these contents. Be it so. This is precisely what I should like to see. The Sunday school is no nursery for babies; though it is generally cursed with a superabundance of them. Home, and neither the assembly of the saints nor the Sunday school, is the place for the candy tribe. When old enough to receive even the smallest benefit from a Sunday school, I would certainly not exclude children; but I certainly would exclude them till this period. To dress mere infants in gaudy clothes and exhibit them in the house of the Lord, whether in the Sunday school or the meetings of the church, is to nurse their vanity and pride, and not to profit them. Every thing of the kind, where practicable, should be avoided, though I know that in many cases it can not be done; and these remarks are not intended to be oppressive.

How the contents of the New Testament can be best taught is a question on which I shall say nothing. I deem it perfectly safe to leave it with the practical teacher. But I would considerably submit whether the New Testament is best learned by being simply committed to memory, as is usually the case in Sunday schools? I am free to say I think not. Yet I would not be understood as discouraging, except contingently, the committing to memory of the New Testament, even in the largest measure in which it can be done. Only where it is obviously committed at the expense of *understanding* the things committed would I discourage it; and then only to the extent necessary to correct the evil. But I would certainly, in all cases, advise that children should be most minutely questioned on the portions committed, and this with the especial view of enabling them to understand the things being treasured in the mind. Not that children are to be expected to understand all they commit. This would be to expect from them what can be realized from none. But no pains should be spared to give them the sense of the Scriptures; and it should be constantly impressed upon their minds that committing to memory is chiefly subservient to this end. I have never been enabled to see that loading down the memory with large numbers of verses, ill understood or wholly not understood, is any great advantage to the child. Yet this may be said in its favor, that, though the things committed may not be understood by the child, they may be the more readily by the man, merely because in his mind.

Here, while speaking of understanding the Scriptures, a word on Sunday-school books may be in place. Yet I feel that it is a topic

rather for a well-studied article than for a single paragraph. No greater want exists at present in our Sunday schools than the want of a suitable library of sufficient size. Less than two hundred volumes I should deem inadequate, and even five hundred not too many. To provide this library is one of the most difficult tasks we as a people now have to perform. That it can be done I do not doubt; that it should be done I profoundly feel. But who shall do it? how shall it be done? and when? are questions not so easily answered. That the task should be executed as soon as possible, all will agree; yet haste and incaution are to be carefully avoided. True, something has already been done in our ranks in the way of meeting the want; but the supply thereby created is wholly inadequate, to mention nothing of quality. That the very best has been done, which, in the circumstances, could be done by those who have done any thing, I am more than willing to grant. But this alters not the case as it stands. *We need a library which shall be pre-eminent and peculiar in its strict conformity to the teachings of the Bible.* As a reality such a thing does not now exist on earth. How deeply is the fact to be lamented when we remember the extent to which the trashy little volumes, now forming the principle staple even in our own Sunday-school libraries, are giving form to the religious impressions of our children? I can not speak in terms of reprehension too severe of the sickly tales and covert sectarianism which poison these wretched books. Better far is no library at all in a Sunday school than one composed of such corrupting material. The sooner our brethren remove all these books wholly from the reach of their children the better! Nor until they have done this will they ever feel as keenly as they should feel the want of a library constructed on true principles, and inculcating only the truth. Each volume of a Sunday-school library should, as a general thing, be small; should be printed on large clear type and good paper; should be monosyllabic as to its words, as far as practicable; should be short, clear, and striking in its sentences; and especially should embody, elucidate, and impress some one or more scriptural truths or facts. Almost every separate incident of the Saviour's life might, if told in witching, happy style, be thus carried home to the heart of the child and forever written on his mind. Thus, too, might the great saving principles of the gospel be instilled into his tender mind long before it reaches the period at which the learned lecture of the pulpit can be understood. Thus, further, might every case of conversion in the New Testament be artfully woven into a delicious story, to the eternal good, possibly, and pleasure of the child. And how happily, in this way, also, could all the elements of joyous and useful life—the elements of love, hope, charity, be made to stand forth to the delight of the budding childish heart! But a hint or two, and not a discus-

sion of the subject, is all that was here proposed. More is hence not deemed necessary.

Just here it may not be amiss to drop a few remarks in regard to the qualifications of the teachers who should take part in the responsible duties of the Sunday-school room. To this room we send our children at the most susceptible period of their lives. Not only so, we send them here avowedly to be taught, not the rudiments of an ordinary education, but the truths and principles of that higher life whose lines stretch far beyond the limits of time. Is this a work which can be safely intrusted to unskillful hands? One would certainly so conclude from the class of teachers by whom it is usually performed. I have often been amazed and not seldom shocked at the blunders committed in this important matter. Persons to whom we would not for one moment think of intrusting a child to learn even the very first lessons of common arithmetic are yet, without the slightest hesitancy or apparent doubt as to the propriety of the act, placed over a class of little boys and girls to give them lessons in the solemn matter of the gospel. And all this merely because they happen to be available, and will consent "to take a class." Is it possible that my brethren see nothing hazardous in this? If so, it is certainly attributable to the fact that they have never bestowed upon it the least serious thought. The smallest reflection would be quite enough to alarm them at their carelessness, and to lead to corrections loudly called for. It is a notorious fact, as a general rule, that the very members of a church who, themselves, most need a teacher are the members of whom Sunday-school teachers are made. That this is owing, in perhaps every case, to the fact that the members who are qualified obstinately refuse to act the part which it is their certain duty to act, I well know. And the regret is only the deeper that such is the case. *The very best informed members of a church are the members who alone should teach its Sunday-school classes.* Of the truth of this no brother needs to be convinced. He knows it like an intuition to be true. The benefits to result from a change of teachers, such as is here indicated, would be many and important. In the first place it would secure *accuracy in instruction*. This point in a Sunday school should never be lost sight of; nor can it for a moment be allowed to stand in competition with any other. Nothing can compensate for a want of it; nor is it dear at the cost of any labor, time, or means. Above, every thing else, and before every thing else, let our children be accurately taught in the word of God.

I now come to speak of a Sunday-school paper. Of all the means at our command to vitalize and give interest to a Sunday school this is perhaps the chief. Other means may be employed, and they have their momentary pleasurable effect; but none combines with the

pleasure it imparts the utility of the Sunday-school sheet. To produce one in all respects up to the wants of the age in which we live, especially up to the wants of the church of Christ, is one of the most difficult tasks now before us as a people. I certainly would not make the impression by this remark that the task is impracticable, but I as certainly would that it is far from easy. I know of no paper requiring discretion so large, ability so peculiar, taste so faultless, judgment so unerring, and mother wit so true and pertinent, as that of the one of which I am now speaking. Papers for old heads may blunder; but then they are not only read by the very persons whom these blunders are least likely to injure, but by the persons who are the most likely to prevent them from injuring others. They are read by readers mature, distrustful, and wary. Hence they are not likely to do injury on a large scale or for a long time before being detected and exposed. Besides, they are read by parties jealous of the truth up even to extreme sensitiveness, and fully competent to its defense. This will prevent them from becoming the successful channels of error. But all this is not true of the Sunday-school paper. It is read by children as confiding as though every sentence were an oracle, and deception a thing unknown to the present life. It is read by them at a time when the mind is most susceptible; at a time when the deepest impressions are made; at a time when the very spirit itself is being molded for eternity; at a time, in short, when of all others truth and truth only should be allowed to come into contact with the mind, and error should be most sedulously excluded. Besides, parents do not read the Sunday-school paper of their children. It is allowed to go into their hands as though it were an infallible teacher. Hence from this, their usual source of correction, children can expect, in this case, nothing. Consequently, if their paper contain error, or inculcate wrong principles of morality, it is left with no let or check to plant its noxious seeds in the opening childish heart. These seeds when once firmly imbedded in that tenacious soil will go not out as easily as they went in. Our true policy, therefore, is to keep them from entering. Hence the necessity of having a Sunday-school paper which shall never contain them.

As to its artistic features, a Sunday-school paper should be a model of taste and beauty. The type should be large, new, and always perfectly clear; the paper should be white and fine; and all the engravings should be exquisite both in design and workmanship, and let no man ever dream of establishing a Sunday-school paper which shall not abound in these. Whatever other attractions it may omit, this it must not omit. It must, in order to be eminently popular, greet its young readers decked in lovely "pictures." With them it can possess no more charming feature than this.

A Sunday-school paper should by all means be a weekly. Nothing short of this will meet the present demand. Were such the case, few other incentives would be necessary to secure the regular attendance of children. Let the rule be once established that without the personal presence of the child, the Sunday-school paper is to be withheld, and few will be the absentees. Besides how much more profitably, as a general rule, would the Lord's day be spent by children, if on every morning of the same, they were supplied with a delightful little sheet abounding in matter to make them wise and glad. The whole week would be the better from the happy and refreshing repast of the first day. And then the instructive incidents and lessons of their weekly visitor would form constant food for their sprightly craving minds, and supply them with an endless fund of topics for chat with little mates. Many idle and vicious tales, introduced for want of something better, would thus never be heard of in these innocent circles. Further: one leading aim of a Sunday-school paper should be to provide its youthful readers with something ennobling and purifying to take the place of the silly tales which they too often drink in from the lips of old wives and superstitious servants. The more frequent its visits, the more effectually would this be done. It should hence be at least weekly.

A Sunday-school paper should be wealthy in variety. To sustain this feature of it well would form one of the chief difficulties in supplying the sort we need. Almost any one can get up a tame dull thing. But such must not be the character of the paper we have. Each number should contain several anecdotes or incidents of unexceptionable sentiment and tone, all ending in the inculcation of some fine moral, or the enforcement of some necessary truth. The more touching these incidents the better. For I lay it down as a rule that the tale which softens and humanizes the heart of the child, and starts into activity its finer sympathies can never stand in criminal antithesis over against any feature of Christianity. Even the merry little story, told only for its single spark of wit or genial vein of humor, should yet be most pure in itself and in its tendency. Now and then a short piece of sharp reasoning might afford fine relief. It would serve to strain the mind a little, and thereby aid in its more rapid development. Certainly a paper should not abound in such pieces; for it is not expected to be a field in which to cultivate a dexterous use of logical tools. But an occasional piece could hardly fail to be interesting. But it is not my purpose to multiply specifications.

But over and above every thing else, a Sunday-school paper should stand pre-eminent for its sound religious teaching. Its great leading, unvarying aim should be to impart a knowledge of the gospel. If defective here, other excellences, no matter how numerous and

varied, can never compensate for it. Bight in this particular it positively must be. Not, of course, that we may demand perfection in a paper, but at least we must demand in this respect a high degree of excellence. A Sunday-school paper, moreover, should not be merely negative in its character. That is to say, it should not merely be free from gross doctrinal blunders and other blemishes. It should be positive and affirmative in its character. It should teach Christianity, teach its general truths, teach its particular truths, teach it as a whole, teach it in detail; and that, too, with a minuteness and simplicity of detail, which should bring even its grandest truths within the reach of a sprightly child of fifteen. The sole ambition of such a paper should be to become a constant channel of communication between the youthful mind and the sacred page. Its work should be to transfer the contents of the latter to the former. The importance of doing this with fidelity no parent will question. In this particular we have a right, nay, we are in duty bound to demand much of such a paper; nor should we ever be persuaded to diminish ought from this our just demand. Every other feature of the paper should be made subservient to this. To please the children, indeed to delight them, should certainly be with it a constant object; but then it should aim to please only that it might the more successfully teach.

But not only should it be the distinguishing aim of a Sunday-school paper to teach Christianity, it should also be its aim to guard against the encroachments of error. The subtle poison of sectarianism needs, even in the case of the very young, an antidote. Indeed, it needs it more here than, anywhere else. Of this fact a Sunday-school paper should be heedful. Hence no suitable occasion should be allowed to pass where a bound might be placed to the advance of that enormous human evil. The sects propagate their false tenets through their Sunday-school sheets; and why should not we use one to counteract their influence? Indeed, we shall never teach the gospel as successfully as we might teach it till we have learned to take lessons from the advocates of error. Their zeal and modes are well worthy of being studied by us.

A Sunday-school paper such as I am speaking of would certainly be expensive. Yet to its patrons it should be cheap, even very cheap. How now shall the case be managed? I see but one way. Give the paper an enormous circulation. With twenty thousand subscribers even a half cent on each paper would yield a handsome salary. Only by a very large circulation can we obtain a paper in all respects such as we need, and at a price sufficiently low. But above every thing let us guard against the error of starting half a dozen Sunday-school papers. This is the way to spoil all, and get not one good one. We need *one*, and we need *but one*. With much

solicitude for the complete success of the enterprise of which I am speaking, do I submit the preceding remarks and reflections to the brotherhood. In the accurate scriptural training of our children, in my sober judgment, lies the future hope of the church. Let nothing, then, be wanting on our part to render it as nearly perfect as practicable.

---

How SHALL IT BE CORRECTED?—I mean the growing evil of employing all our best preachers to preach in single churches, while the inferior ones are sent out to preach abroad. Is not this an evil?—and if so, how can it be corrected? Certainly I would not advise a course which should have the effect to weaken, even in the smallest degree, our strong and influential churches. Not at all. I wish we had ten such churches where we now have one. But it has always struck me that our ablest preachers should constitute our pioneers. The first discourses heard by a community usually leave the deepest impression. How very necessary, then, that they should be models in matter, style, and spirit! First discourses, more than all others, serve to shape religious thought and commend a cause to the confidence and acceptance of a people. They should hence be of the highest order. Besides which, in the matter of planting churches and ordaining officers, the ripest experience and the soundest judgment are uniformly required. These facts would seem to justify a different policy from that which appears likely to become established among us. But how to effect the change is the question. I certainly wish some plan could be devised by which, without injury to existing interests, more of our most able men could take the field as general evangelists. I have no hesitation in thinking that the largest and best results would follow. A fine preacher is employed by a single church to preach to it a year. During this year he adds one hundred members to its number; and ten preachers will add less where one will add more. Yet this same preacher, if abroad in the field as a general evangelist, would immerse, at a moderate estimate, from two to four hundred. Is the difference justified by our present policy? I confess I can not think it. And now, let no one construe these remarks as a reflection on, or as finding fault with, our humble preachers. They have no such meaning. My object is not to find fault with what they are doing, but to suggest that possibly our ablest preachers might do more than they are doing, and to insist that it be done. This significance hath these remarks,



## BAPTISM—WHAT IS IT?

BAPTISM as now practiced is an ordinance of Jesus Christ, that is to say, it was instituted by Jesus Christ and not by any other legislature.

The action, whatever it may be, which in the New Testament is called baptism, rests solely upon the authority of Jesus Christ, and, under his direction, the practice of the apostles. Before John the Baptist, such a thing as baptism, as a distinct religious rite, was unknown to the world. No man, then, nor church, institutes or originates the action called baptism; but every person who is baptized submits to the rite in obedience to divine authority, and in imitation of the ancient practice of the apostles. Convince immersionists that the practice of the apostles was sprinkling or pouring, or both these actions, and they will immediately proceed to be baptized in this way; that is, if they have any respect for divine authority. And upon the same principle, Pedobaptists would all be immersed if they could be convinced that the Saviour commanded and the apostles practiced nothing but immersion for baptism. This, of course, will be conceded. The fact that all parties would be willing thus to unite and harmonize in the uniform practice of the apostles, if such uniformity could be clearly made out, shows beyond question that all parties do regard apostolic practice as authoritative. We speak not here of cunning, designing priests, framers of creeds and founders of churches, falsely so called; but of plain, honest people, for whom we write.

What we have said shows that the conscience feels bound to acquiesce in apostolic practice. If, then, it can be shown that the baptism practiced by the apostles was any one specific act, no other or dissimilar act could possibly be substituted in its stead. The attempt so to substitute another action would justly be held as a most daring and presumptuous sin. Now, to show that the action performed by the apostles when they baptized people is essential to the validity of the ordinance, and that, consequently, nothing else is baptism, let the inquiry be instituted: Why do the administrators of the ordinance use water in baptizing? Why is water held to be absolutely essential to the integrity of the rite? If a person should be baptized in or with dust, flour, vinegar, milk, or wine, there is no church now existing that would accept such baptism, and admit the party so baptized to membership. Through every age water alone has been the element employed, and no living man of sane mind will say that any other element may be legitimately substituted in its

place. But the question comes back Why, then, is water, as an element, deemed essential to the validity of baptism? Simply for one reason, and no more, namely, the apostles used water. The use of water in baptism rests upon the authority of Jesus Christ and the well-known practice of the apostles. It rests, we say, upon this authority, and this alone. But this is authority sufficient to justify any act beneath the heavens. If the apostles had used any thing else in baptizing, as for example wine or milk, then would we use wine or milk also. Now, if the element in which, or with which, the apostles baptized persons is essential to the validity of the ordinance, it follows that what they did with the element, that is, the act performed by them when they baptized, is equally essential to the integrity of the rite. This position can scarcely be questioned, and from this conclusion we confess we see no way of escape. Just at this point sophists are wont to indulge altogether too much looseness in the departments of combination and definition. There is a flux of vague imbecile conjecture, and a constipation of reason and common sense. Terms are employed as interchangeable that have no sort of dependence upon or affinity for each other. Eight here the question comes up: Can it be determined what action the apostles performed when they baptized people? If it can not, then I am bold to affirm that there is not a man in this world who knows certainly that he is or has been baptized. This, too, in the face of the solemn commandment, many times repeated by the Lord of lords, and King of kings—Be baptized! Did the apostles sprinkle? Did they pour? Did they immerse? If they did only one of these three things, then the other two are popish innovations. If they performed two of these three actions, then the third is an arrogant blasphemy. If they performed all three of these actions, then we may cease to debate for a preference. Either, then, the Scriptures have left the action in eternal concealment, or they clearly define it. In either case the three actions now practiced can not be justified, unless it can be shown that each one was practiced by, and therefore received the sanction of, the apostles.

Now, if the Bible does not reveal the action or actions of baptism, then, why erect and inaugurate an ordinance upon a mere human assumption of the unknown? Why baptize at all? Suppose you say, because Christ has commanded and the apostles practiced such a thing as baptism. But how are we to obey when what was commanded and practiced is left to mere conjecture; when the whim or fancy of a school-girl fifteen years old will be thrown into the balance against the learning and wisdom of centuries? There are several things in the New Testament called baptism, in only one of which is water an integral part. That one thing is the ordinance properly so called. In the others, water is always absent. Now the

laws of our intelligence absolutely demand that there shall be, in the usage of the sacred writers, a certain method of discrimination by means of which the reader may always know to what the words baptize and baptism refer.

I may illustrate this position in the following manner: the word constitution is a term of perpetual occurrence and recurrence in American politics and jurisprudence. There are more than thirty different State constitutions, and in addition to these the general constitution, or constitution of the United States. Now, if a writer were to use this word without any qualifying word or words, his production would be simply unintelligible. Suppose, then, a writer wishes to make the primary distinction between the general and a local government. He must, should he refer to the local, employ the word State; as, State constitution. Should he desire to distinguish specifically, he must append the name of the State; as, the constitution of the State of Kentucky. These marks will be sufficient, while they will leave the word constitution, unqualified by any word or words, always to signify that of the United States. Now, does the New Testament usage conform to the law of our intelligence? If not, then is the book unintelligible; since no man can ever be certain in reading it to what the word baptism refers. Whether to that ordinance in which, water is ever present, or to those other things called baptism, where water is supposed to be absent. Will our opponents meet this position fairly and candidly?

But baptism is a question of fact, and not of mere abstract speculation. Open the New Testament. The first use of the word is coupled with water, to show that baptism is something literal and outward—an institute of John's ministry, in which, it being literal and outward, some specific act was necessarily performed. This is an essential foundation. An outward ordinance, designated by the word *baptizo*, is for the first time in the history of man specifically declared. Now go to the commission given by Jesus Christ to the apostles: no qualifying word is used, but simply *baptizo*. To what now, in this commission, does the word refer? The whole religious world replies: to the ordinance. But why does the whole religious world so reply? Has some method of discrimination been discovered whereby men may certainly determine this question? Verily, one would so judge. And yet when the question is fully tested, and hoary superstitions are thereby driven to the wall, how does this same religious world act? The very query gives birth to sickening facts that, in quick succession, come before the mind. Go to the Acts of Apostles. On the day of Pentecost the word *baptizo* is again used, and again without qualification. And, indeed, throughout the sacred writings where the ordinance is meant, and water is not named, no qualifying word or phrase is used. But on the other

hand, where the word *baptizo* is employed to signify some other action than the ordinance of baptism, some qualifying word is used. For example: "I have a baptism to be baptized with." Here the article points out only one of many, or at least several, baptisms, while the context excludes the idea of the ordinance. Again it is said: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit." Here the phrase "with the Holy Spirit" excludes the idea of the ordinance. From all of which, and much more that might easily be adduced on this subject, I construct and, lay down the following rule: Wherever the word *baptizo* occurs in the New Testament, without any qualifying word or words, the ordinance is always meant. Is there an exception to this rule? I do not dogmatically say there is not, but is there one? If so, I will thank that scholar who will point it out.

The question now arises: Can we certainly determine what specific act the apostles performed when they baptized people? I affirm that we can so determine, and now invite attention to another phase of this subject. I here base an argument upon the incontrovertible fact, that our Lord always used the word *baptizo* when speaking of the ordinance, and that by this word, and this word alone, he expressed literally what was to be done. Whatever was to be done, or whatever was meant by baptism as a religious rite, was always expressed by the Greek word *baptizo*. Now if Pedobaptists will take the position that the Lord ever used any other word to express the meaning of what was to be done, or what was intended, in the ordinance called baptism, let them produce that word and the instance when it was so used. If they say that the word is used in any but the primary sense, of which more in another part of this paper, let them produce the example. If they deny that immersion is the literal and primary meaning, let them produce their authority. Our brethren have always been too liberal in their discussions with Pedobaptists on these points. I wish to be understood here, I care not if *baptizo* has a thousand secondary meanings. I care nothing for these, nor will I here stop to notice them, for they do not at all affect the question now before us. It is simply useless, not to say preposterous, to talk about ordinance, purify, cleanse, wash, stain, dye, moisten, or any thing else, when *the* ordinance of Jesus Christ is in question. I deny that *baptizo*, properly and scripturally speaking, means ordinance, purify, cleanse, wash, stain, dye, moisten, or any thing but dip, or its equivalent, no matter what English word be used to express it; whether it be overwhelm, immerse, or any tiling else.

Now, let us look at this position: *baptizo* has no such meaning as ordinance in it, else it could never be used, without strong and guarded qualifiers, where there is no ordinance. Yet we all know that the word does occur many times in the writings of the Greeks, hundreds of years before the Greek language ceased to be classic,

and before there was any such rite or ordinance as that instituted by Jesus Christ, practiced constantly by the apostles, and submitted to in humble faith and love by the myriads of the primitive church. How perfectly obvious is it, then, that the word *baptizo*, when applied to the ordinance, must have a specific and fixed meaning! Otherwise we might do any one of the forty (more or less) things said to be meanings of this word, and so claim to be properly baptized. And, indeed, if baptism be not a specific act, no one could reasonably or logically dispute such claim. Will Pedobaptists notice this? To learn, then, what the Saviour meant by *baptizo*, we must first learn the literal and primary meaning of the word.

But as the word *baptizo* had for hundreds of years been used in many different senses, and in connection with many different elements, as fire, milk, ink, blood, dust, water, etc., how, if baptism be not a specific act, are we to determine which one, or two, or three of these elements we are to use in baptism, in what manner, and in what quantities? There can be, there is, but one answer to this question, namely, simply by observing what use was made of the word by those who first received from the lips of Jesus Christ the command to baptize. What element did they use? Water. How much? When the quantity is indicated at all, it says, they baptized in rivers, and in places where there was much water. In fact, this last is given as the only reason for baptizing in some places. The idea, then, of using any other element than water, or of it but a few drops, in the administration of this rite, on the part of those with whom the word of God is of any authority, is entirely precluded. In connection with large quantities of water, we find that their *bodies* were washed, and that they were *buried* in baptism. In my humble judgment this simple and perfectly ingenuous argument for ever settles the question as to whether the term *baptizo* is generic or specific, when used with reference to the ordinance. In the seventh chapter of Mark we find this same word, which in the common version is translated wash, where no one would for a moment suppose that there is any reference to the ordinance. Precisely the same word is used in Matt. xx., 22, 23; Mark x., 38, 39; and Luke xii., 50; also in connection with the baptism of the Spirit, and the baptism of fire, where no one thinks it has the remotest reference to the ordinance.

These well-known facts disprove the idea that the word *baptizo* means ordinance. It has not the idea of ordinance in it, else it could not have been used scores of times before there was any such thing as the religious rite called baptism. That *baptizo* does not mean moisten is equally clear, because in numerous instances we find the word where it is evident there is any thing but moistening. When we read of persons being baptized in the Holy Spirit the idea of moistening never once comes into the mind. If we should read that

a man had been baptized in fire, we would not receive the idea that he had been moistened, but rather that he had been badly burned. Why? Because the word *baptizo* means to *burn*? No; no more than it means ordinance or moisten; but we receive the idea of burn from another word—the word fire. If we should read of a man being baptized in ink, we would receive the idea that he had got stained. Why? Because the idea of stain is in *baptizo*? Certainly not; but the idea of stain comes from quite another and different word—the word ink. We read that a man is baptized in water, and we receive the idea that he is wet or moistened. Why? Because the word *baptizo* conveys the idea of wet or moisten? Not at all; but we receive that idea from another word—the word water. There is not the idea of wash in baptizē, that is, that idea does not inhere in it as a meaning, else a man would be washed when baptized in the Spirit or in the fire. When we read of a man being baptized in water, we receive the idea that he is washed, but not because there is any such idea in the term *baptizo*, but the idea comes from the element in which he is said to have been baptized. Now a child can see that in such a case wash is not a meaning of *baptizo*, but simply the result of being baptized in water. If we read that a man has been baptized in filth, we do not receive the idea that he is cleansed thereby; but, on the contrary, that he has contracted filth. Why? Because the word *baptizo* means filth? Surely not; for when, on the other hand, we read of a man being baptized in pure water, the antithetical idea,—that is, that he has been cleansed—is conveyed. These illustrations forever fix the specific character of the word *baptizo* when applied to the ordinance of Jesus Christ. If *baptizo* is not a specific word as used with reference to the ordinance called baptism, then no man can ever certainly know what baptism is; and consequently can never know whether he has submitted to this solemn institution of our Lord or not.

But I now pass to consider another branch of this subject. It is objected by Pedobaptists that there is no word in the English language that is an exact equivalent of the Greek word *baptizo*. Or in other words, that no word in the English language exhausts the meaning of the word *baptizo*; in brief, that it can not be translated into English. Let us examine this position. If neither sprinkle, pour, nor immerse exhausts the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as all the opponents of immersion absurdly contend, what else must we have or do in order to have a true baptism? Of course, if neither sprinkle, pour, nor immerse exhausts the meaning of the word *baptizo*, then no one has received enough; and he is not, therefore, properly or scripturally baptized who has been simply or only immersed, or had water sprinkled or poured upon him. If neither sprinkle, pour, nor immerse exhausts the meaning of *baptizo*, then no one on this

earth is truly baptized; for no living man has the means of answering the question: How much more, or what in addition to sprinkling, pouring, and immersion, will exhaust the meaning of *baptizo*? But if any word can or does exhaust the meaning of the term *baptizo*, of course, it can not be a word that conveys other than its primary and literal meaning. And if either sprinkle or pour, or both together, if that will help the matter, does not convey the primary and literal meaning of *baptizo*, then the practice of all Pedobaptists is wrong.

Now, with reference to the common affairs of life, what method do we pursue when we find a word of doubtful meaning? For example: suppose the governor of the commonwealth sends you a command to do a certain thing, but the word conveying the idea of the thing to be done you do not understand, what now will you do? Will you not go to the English dictionary or lexicon in order to ascertain its meaning? And, then, will you take a secondary or remote meaning of the word; or will you take its primary and literal meaning? You know you will do the latter. Let this be borne in mind while we hasten to an application which is both natural and easy. The Supreme Governor of the universe, the Lord of lords, and King of kings, the only potentate in heaven and earth, has given us a command to do a certain thing. The precise thing to be done is to be baptized. But *baptizo* is a Greek word; and we, being acquainted only with the English language, do not clearly understand its meaning. In this case what will we do? We will go to the Greek lexicon, of course, to ascertain its meaning. And when we have found the word, will we take a secondary or remote meaning, or will we take the literal and primary meaning? Reason says: take the literal and primary meaning. Very well, then. What do the Greek lexicons say the literal and primary meaning of *baptizo* is? Observe, my unsophisticated reader, there is not a Greek lexicon in the world of any note, or of standing and respectability among scholars, that gives sprinkle or pour as the literal and primary meaning of *baptizo*. Let the reader observe once more, there is not a Greek lexicon, or Greek authority in the world, of any note, that does not give dip, immerse, or a word of equivalent meaning, as the literal and primary meaning of the word *baptizo*.

I do not forget that when the lexicons are all against a man he is sometimes disposed to treat them cavalierly, but such things are usually understood by sober men, and consequently create no uneasy apprehensions. I rely with great confidence on this argument. What will our Pedobaptist neighbors do with it? Will they meet it fairly? No quibbling or evasion will answer in this case. In the light of such facts they will be compelled one day to account to the world for their untenable position.

But I will notice further the use and meaning of this word. Bap-

tize is a verb, that signifies the doing of one act—not three acts nor forty acts, but one act. This truth is so apparent, and so obviously in accordance with the laws of language, that even the Methodists themselves, after practicing three "modes," as they phrase it, in defiance of the Bible and common sense, finally acknowledge it, as follows, in their tracts published for the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church: "It is plainly impossible that an ordinance of divine appointment can be administered correctly in two modes so widely different." (Tract No. 99, p. 11.) Again they say: "Of these two modes only one was primitive and apostolic." (Tract No. 153, p. 51.) It being thus frankly admitted that primitive and apostolic baptism was but one action, then arises the question—the real issue: *What was that one action?*

To answer this question, I will summon one of the very highest authorities in the ranks of Methodism, and a Pedobaptist at that. I refer to Dr. Adam Clarke. In his note on Col. ii., 12, he says: "Buried with him in baptism, alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be *buried under water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth.*" If Dr. Clarke deposes truly, then is our position sustained beyond controversy. But I will here introduce one more important witness from the Methodist Zion. John Wesley, in his note on Rom. vi., 4, uses these words: "We are buried with him, alluding to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion." Now, observe, friendly reader, I simply affirm that the apostles practiced immersion when they attended to the ordinance of Jesus Christ. Do not Dr. Adam Clarke and Mr. John Wesley affirm the same thing? We are not, then, to be charged with exclusivism, unless, indeed, it be the exclusivism of consistency. We only desire to follow apostolic practice, and are not to be held responsible for the strange fact that Dr. Clarke, Mr. Wesley, and thousands of other great and learned men taught one thing, and then themselves practiced another. We choose to follow their teaching rather than their practice.

For the sake of plain men who do not read the Greek Testament, I desire at this point to say a few words concerning the preposition *en*, most commonly translated by the English word *in*. These little and apparently insignificant words sometimes sadly mislead us. Often have I heard honest but unlettered people build an argument for sprinkling or pouring, because they read in the common version that John baptized *with* water; therefore, reason they, the water must have been applied to the person, and not the person to the water; and, indeed, this seems to many people a most formidable argument.

Now, if my plain brother will sit down with me, I will take the Greek Testament, and in ten minutes I will teach him to read this little word, so that he can take the book, line by line, and word by



word, and count its occurrences in the sacred writings just as well as any one can do it. We will begin with the testimony of Matthew. At the eighteenth verse of the first chapter we find the word for the first time. We read on till we come to the ninth verse of the third chapter. In that short space we have found the word *en* eighteen times. Now let us go to the "old family Bible that lies on the stand," the book which our fathers have read and our mothers bedewed with tears, and we will find the eighteen English equivalents. What are these equivalents? "With" twice, "among" once, "within" once, and "in" fourteen times. In each instance, however, the word *with* might be, probably ought to be, translated *in*; when we would have the literal meaning of "having *in* the womb," and "shall have *in* the womb," instead of "was found *with* child," and "shall be *with* child." This would leave but two exceptions. In one of these we have "among" before the plural noun princes, and once "within" before the plural pronoun "yourselves."

The rule in translating is to give every word its primary and literal signification, unless there is something in the context forbidding it. Bearing this rule in mind, let us now proceed to the nineteenth occurrence of *en*. "I indeed baptize you (*en*) *with* water." Now look at it. *In* Bethlehem, *in* the days, *in* the east, *in* all the coasts, *in* Rama, *in* those days, *in* the wilderness, *in* the Jordan, etc. All this is right, natural, and easy. The preposition is, in each instance, correctly rendered into our vernacular. But here the sectarians looked forward, and in the eleventh verse they saw trouble. The *en* *hudati*, in water, of this verse stood diametrically opposed to their idea of sprinkling; therefore, without any reason under the heavens for so doing, but with every reason against it, they deliberately render the preposition *with*. The heart grows sick at such gross corruption and dishonesty. Willfully and designedly deceiving myriads of our race! But now mark you; as soon as this trouble was out of their way, they resume their uniform and almost invariable rendering, and immediately we have *fan in* his hand, *in* whom I am well pleased, *in* the borders, *in* darkness, *in* the region, *in* a ship, *in* their synagogues, etc. Wiclif, Tyndale, and Cranmer, all translate the preposition in the eleventh verse properly. They all translate *en* *hudati*, in water.

Next we turn to the book of Mark, first chapter, and we have the following: *in* the prophets, *in* the wilderness, *in* the river of Jordan, *with* water! As soon as they pass baptism the same preposition occurs, and then we have *in* those days, *in* whom I am well pleased, *in* the wilderness, *into* the sea, *in* the ship, *in* the desert, *in* their hearts,

In John, first chapter, common version, we have *in* the beginning, *in* him was life, *in* darkness, *in* the world, *in* the wilderness; but in verse 26 they came again to water, and then they translate—I bap-

tize *with* water. In the next verse but one they say, "these things were done *in* Bethabara," and coming again to the water they say, "I come baptizing *with* water." In the very next occurrence of this preposition, having lost sight of water, they translate *in* the law, *in* whom is no guile, *in* Cana, *in* the temple, etc.

In Mark i., 4, we read that "John did baptize *in* the wilderness." Now they could not say John baptized *with* the wilderness, and consequently they were compelled to give *en* the correct rendering. In the fifth verse it is said that the people were baptized by John (*en to Iordane potamo*) *in* the river of Jordan. It would not do to say that John baptized the people *with* the Jordan river. They were, therefore, simply compelled to render the preposition fairly. Every scholar in the world knows that all I have said here of *en* is true, and that much more might be said. But for the present it is submitted:

1. Baptism is a commandment of Jesus Christ; and when either he or his apostles expressed what was to be done in obeying this, commandment, they invariably used one word. And one word can have but one meaning when *it alone* is *always* employed to express the idea of *the thing to be done*, the particular act to be performed. The word *baptizo* is, in some of its forms, applied to the rite about ninety times in the New Testament. The rule in translating is, that a word must be used in its literal and primary sense, unless there is something in the context forbidding it. Now there is nothing in the context of any passage in the New Testament where the word *baptizo* occurs that forbids the adoption of its primary meaning. But, on the other hand, in many places of its occurrence, we are bound to give it its primary and literal meaning, or destroy entirely the sense of the passages. The word is, then, beyond all controversy, to be taken in its literal and primary meaning. The primary meaning we have abundantly shown to be immersion. Therefore, unquestionably, when the Lord commanded people to be baptized, he meant that they should be immersed, and he meant nothing else.

2. The Greek language contains three different words expressive of three different specific acts, as unlike or dissimilar as walking, running, or lying down. These words are *bapto*, *cheo*, and *rantizo*. I give them as they stand in the Greek of the New Testament. They are translated respectively dip, pour, and sprinkle. Now there was no more necessity for our Lord and his apostles to use these words interchangeably, than there is for my saying that a man is running when I wish to convey the idea that he is lying down. From this argument there is absolutely no escape. In one single passage in the Greek of the Septuagint all three of these words occur, and all expressive of different specific acts. I will cite the passage, Lev. xiv., 15-16: "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and (*cheo*) pour it into the palm of his own left hand: and the priest shall

(*bapto*) dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall (*rantizo*) sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Now here in one sentence we have *bapto* translated dip, *cheo* translated pour, and *raino* translated sprinkle!

Positively, I do not consider it necessary to adduce another argument. A child can understand that here the priest performed three different specific acts, and each act represented by the word setting forth the idea of the exact thing to be done. Had *bapto* alone been used, then the priest would have stopped with dipping his finger into the oil; for this word has not the idea of pouring and sprinkling in it. Had *cheo* alone been used, then he would have stopped with pouring the oil, for *cheo* has not the idea of dipping or sprinkling in it. Had *raino* alone been used, then he would have stopped with sprinkling the oil, for this word has not the idea of dipping or pouring in it.

3. I lay down as my third argument that the places where baptism was performed indicate immersion as having been the action. In support of this position I cite Matt. iii., 5-6: "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan, and were baptized of him in the Jordan." Now if baptism was performed by sprinkling a few drops of water upon the person baptized, what sense or propriety is there in mentioning particularly that the people were baptized in the Jordan? It would be like loading a cannon with shot and shell to kill a wren. I will cite next John iii., 23: "And John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, *because there was much water there.*" Now I take this plain and sensible passage just as it stands. I believe it means just what it says, and says just what it means. I want no comment on it, no explanation. Every word added by way of exegesis only serves to make dark and muddy that which is perfectly transparent.

. But to cloud the obvious meaning of this perspicuous statement, it is *said* that John's preaching attracted great crowds of people, and in order that they and their animals might be accommodated he usually chose places where there was an abundance of water. Unfortunately, however, for such theorists, it is not said that John held a big meeting, or preached, at Enon because there was much water there; but that he was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there. *Where* was John baptizing? "In Enon, near to Salim." *Why* did John baptize in Enon, near to Salim? "BECAUSE *there was MUCH WATER there.*"

i. As I have neither time nor space to notice those powerful passages where baptism is spoken of as a burial and resurrection, I will bring forward but fit single case further which I can treat with more brevity. I base my fourth argument upon the record of the Ethiopian eunuch, Acts viii. Now let us note here, 1. "They came *unto* a cer-

tain water." 2. "They went down both *into* the water." 3. "They came up *out of* the water." Now this is the plain simple record as it respects these three facts; facts which are found in the case of every immersion in the world.

But I desire to notice the words *eis* and *ek* a little further. The primary meaning of the first is *into*; of the second, *out of*. Now *eis* must have its primary meaning here, unless some circumstance in the connection forbids it. But is there any such circumstance? I unhesitatingly affirm there is not. We have here, not only the primary meaning of the word, but every circumstance in our favor. Observe, they had already come "*unto the water*;" and hence if *eis* carried them any further it must have carried them *into* it, and this is the primary meaning of the word. Positively, there is not room for even the ghost of a quibble here. But again. *Out of* here comes from the particle *ek*, and not from *apo*, which sometimes means *from*. Its definite and primary meaning is *out of*. *Ek* never means simply *from*, as *apo* sometimes does. If our opponents can produce one example in the New Testament where *ek* means simply *from*, let them do so. As, then, *ek* definitely and primarily means *out of*, *eis* must necessarily mean *into*, which is also its primary meaning. For it is perfectly obvious that *ek* could not have been used if *eis* had not carried them *into* the water. *Ek*, the definite particle, limits *eis*, the indefinite one. It does appear to my mind that, in causing the record of this case, the Holy Spirit purposely guarded every avenue of approach; and has stated just what was done in language which, under all the circumstances, precludes the idea of dubiety.

DELTA.

---

MY WORK FOR THE NEXT YEAR. —After much counsel had with wise brethren, who have the cause deeply at heart, I have concluded to give as much of the next year as can be devoted thereto to visiting our churches in and out of the State of Kentucky, for the purpose of building them up and strengthening them in the Lord. Many a spirit has cooled during the past four years; in these the flame of love and devotion must be rekindled. Some have wandered; these must be reclaimed. Many have been rendered sad and gloomy; these need to be comforted and cheered. Besides, many sinners are knocking and anxious to enter; these must be gathered in. Such is the great and much needed work to which we now propose to give a year. Kind Lord, grant the strength to do it well! Let the saints of God everywhere join in the same grand toil! Then shall the year end amid shouts of praise to the Most High.

## TOO MANY CHURCHES—AN EVIL.

THE word church in its popular acceptance is exceedingly ambiguous, being employed to denote both the congregation and the house in which it meets. This ambiguity is much to be regretted; and since it is in no sense necessary, it ought to be corrected. *Kuriakon*, from which our word church originally comes, means strictly a house of the Lord, or a house devoted to his worship. Etymologically, then, the word church means the house and not the congregation. But ought we to agree to use the word in this acceptance, and to designate our houses of worship by it? I think not, and for so thinking have two reasons: 1. We have the plain Saxon term *meetinghouse*, which is better suited to this purpose, because it is the term of the common people, is very expressive, and, has but one meaning. 2. Church is the word uniformly used in the New Testament to signify both the whole body of Christ taken together and any particular assembly of his people. Nor is there now any likelihood that this word will ever be exchanged for any other in any translation or revision which may hereafter be made. Certain I feel that such exchange should not be made. I would, then, respectfully suggest to our brotherhood that, for the sake of having a uniform speech, we agree, first: never to apply the word church to a meetinghouse; but that we restrict it exclusively either to the whole body of Christ, or to a particular assembly of Christians, accordingly as we may wish to designate the one or the other by it. And further, that the word church shall be used to denote only a regularly organized congregation, or such only as it applies to in the New Testament, and not any promiscuous assembly of Christians. This, however, is its usage any how. Second, that we shall designate all our houses of worship by the plain word *meetinghouse*; and that we write this word solid, as I have done, and not with a hyphen thus, *meeting-house*. By these remarks I do not mean that we shall cease to use the term congregation as a proper designation of a regularly organized body of the saints; but simply that whenever we use the word church, we shall use it strictly as now intimated. This will give us, so far, a speech intelligible, expressive, and perfectly uniform; and surely these are ends which we as a people can not treat lightly.

The organization of a church, so as to insure its future prosperity, as far as this can be done by human sagacity, is a subject demanding far more serious thought than is usually bestowed on it. To the evangelist who is solicitous for the permanence and usefulness of his work, it is a subject of uncommon interest. When about to organize

a church many are the questions which will present themselves to him for consideration. Some of these I may here jot down, and on each offer a few comments.

1. Is the location a suitable one? The spot selected for the organization of a church and the erection of a meetinghouse should be one easy of access to the whole surrounding community. Not only should it be convenient to good roads, but it should be an enticing spot. In cities there are certain localities which people love to frequent, and in the country the same. Neighborhoods have their natural centres toward which all their inhabitants gravitate; in other words, their places where they appear more readily to assemble than elsewhere. Always select one of these centres as the spot for your meetinghouse. If possible, also, let its appearance be agreeable to the eye—a spot of which people shall say on seeing it: This is lovely. The soul delights in beauty, and takes pleasure in associating a charming site with the solemn gravity of a meetinghouse. Never select a spot presenting a bleak desolate appearance, as though God had cursed it. The soul instinctively turns away from such a place. Let it wear a wealthy look, as if the Lord had blessed it; and as if it were still rejoicing in his benignity, and inviting all hearts to share its joy. Such a site will seldom fail to command an audience. I know neighborhoods where it seems impossible to collect a large congregation; a fact for which I can not account, except on the ground that they lie in out-of-the-way and uninviting places. On seeing them you feel as if you wished never to see them again; and wonder at the bad taste which built on them, and which visits them when built on. A meetinghouse badly located in a city will frequently disappoint its founders for no cause save its bad location. It requires a sagacious eye to know where to organize a church, and where to set a meetinghouse.

2 Does the neighborhood promise to be a permanent one? No one builds his house on the shifting sands of the beach; nor will the judicious evangelist be in haste to locate a church in the midst of a community which is undergoing constant and rapid transitions. A church is never profited by, neither can it profit, members who flow in to-day and out to-morrow. New comers bring new ways; and often, like the freshly fallen rain, they swell the volume of the church, but only to muddy it and madden it. A permanent membership of sufficient numerical strength is absolutely necessary to the success of a church; and where such a membership can not be had, an evangelist should pause long before he proceeds to form a church. It is too often the case that one or two faithful men constitute the life and support of a church; these gone, and ruin ensues; and the ruin of a church is a ruin indeed. Frequently the formation of one is no great advantage to a community; but its dissolution is always

a calamity. The planks and spars and corpses of a foundered ship, as they are tossed ashore, are sad mementoes indeed, but no ruin exceeds in awful significance the ruin of a church of Christ. A sadder sight can not be seen than its vagrant members strolling over the country, homeless, companionless, and striding along the road to apostasy. Hence, where a church is to be mainly dependent for its existence upon the presence of one or two good men, great caution and hesitancy should be observed in its formation. Particularly are these remarks applicable to the great West, in which soil the primitive gospel takes root with so much readiness. Here, as in all new countries, communities are very unstable, often undergoing almost a complete change in the short space of a year. In such communities it is seldom safe to organize a church; still, if the district is fertile, favorably located, and consequently such as to invite brethren in as fast as others go out, it may be done. A sagacious evangelist will often decide, and correctly so, to organize a church with only a dozen members; whereas in a different district he would decline to organize one with even fifty. The injudicious location of a church has often, besides other bad effects, this one especially, that it prevents the location of a better church in the right place. I know churches situated in tracts of country where the distance of only two miles makes the difference between a prosperous church and one thinly attended and doing little good. Before, then, we proceed to organize a church we should feel satisfied either that the community is ordinarily permanent, or is likely soon to become so.

3. A most delicate and important question for consideration with the prudent evangelist will be the character of the material of which a church is to be composed. It is not every ten or twenty Christian men and women that should be organized into a church. If a community is possessed of small scriptural knowledge; if their previous habits of life have been loose, reckless, or vicious; or if they have not been addicted to self-government and sober pursuits; if their conversion has been sudden and attended with some excitement, as it is almost sure to be, I should certainly advise delay in forming them into a church. If there be no old steady congregation convenient, to which they can attach themselves—a thing which they should always do where they can—then let the evangelist assemble them together in informal meetings, if possible as often as once a week, for public instruction. Besides, let him frequently visit the members from house to house; and, when with them, make it his special duty to teach them, 1. How to read the Scriptures, what parts to read, and how much to read daily. 2. Habits of devotion—especially let him endeavor to induce each member to engage in secret prayer at least as often as twice a day. No Christian is safe who fails to read the Scriptures and pray daily; none is in much danger who does. Let the

evangelist remember that he is now dealing with mere babes in Christ, that he is not to presume them to know and to be able to do what he so well knows and is enabled to do with so much ease. He must hence be most patient and gentle. He must keep in mind that he is now bending the twig at the most tender and important period of its existence. All his skill will hence be requisite to enable him to shape surely his pliant subject for the crown that fades not. On the very work to which I am now alluding, more than on any other, will depend the excellence of the material of which his future church is to consist. It should hence be persevered in till thoroughly successful. To be intelligent in the Scriptures is the prior great requisite in the Christian; to be personally deeply devotional is the second. On these let the evangelist lay his weightiest stress, and bestow his minutest and most painstaking attention. If he succeeds here he may count on failure nowhere else; if he fails here, he may count on success nowhere else.

Just as soon, moreover, as possible, let him induce each head of a family, whether male or female, to commence family prayer. This he will ordinarily find not difficult if he commences with his converts at once as soon as made; but very difficult if he postpones it long. Often in approaching the head of a family for this purpose, the evangelist will be met with remarks like this: "I can not pray in my family; it is something I have never been accustomed to; I am diffident and slow of speech; and while in heart I feel that I ought to pray, I yet feel that in fact I can not." Hold, my dear brother, you who are speaking thus; come aside with me a little, and let me talk to you. You tell me you can not pray in your family. Have you ever tried? You answer, not. How, then, do you know you can not pray? I entreat you do not say that again; I shall not be able to believe you. I heard you just now describe most glibly that horse you rode; this morning, moreover, you gave me the dimensions of your farm and the properties of its soil with most obvious ease; I observed, too, that in recounting the ages, sizes, and general good qualities of your mules you neither tripped nor hesitated; even your Durhams and Berkshires you spoke of with striking facility; nay, further, I never heard a happier and more fluent account of even a dog than you gave me of your pointer—yet you tell me you *can not pray!* I entreat you never Bay it again. Let me modify your speech a little: *any man can pray who will.* Do not tell me, then, you *can not pray*; you tax my credulity too much. Tell me rather in homely criminal English you *will not pray*. Then shall I look on you as an honest man; and be ready to work with you in sweat and in tears to overcome your perverse will; for there the evil lies. But before you tell me you will not pray, hear me. Take my counsel, and make the effort; repeat the effort; repeat it again; go on, on, on, for a month. It is a right worthy work,



and will justify your repetitions. If, then, you still tell me you *can* not pray, take my counsel again, and try on till you can pray. It is a weak heart that gives up when your cause is just. But you tell me you are diffident. Well, I like that, and shall consequently make the best provision for you I can; but then I shall expect you to acquit yourself like a man.

You are going to make an effort to pray, my brother. A better purpose never quickened your pulse. Suppose, then, you wait till all your children have gone to bed; and, if you have any, company too. All are now asleep, save yourself and faithful wife. Say to her: "Mother, suppose we begin to-night to hold prayer in our home." If my life were staked on it, I should have no fear; you will have her consent. Get down your Bible, that much neglected book; get it down. Mother will set your stand and candle; my word for it, she will. This is a solemn moment in your life, my brother. Bear yourself nobly now. The doors are shut, windows shut, all is ready. You read. Your heart beats high, and voice trembles; heed them not. You kneel, and mother kneels with you. You are much confused and agitated; you choke, you stammer, you hesitate, and feel that you must stop—go on, my brother. Well, you are through, and perhaps feel that it was a poor prayer. Suppose it was; what of that? Who will ever know it? Mother will not tell it; God will not disclose it. Be encouraged, my dear brother, you have done well; you have *tried* to pray; and with even your trial God is delighted. With the most imperfect of prayers, if from mere babes in Christ, is he, perhaps, the most pleased. When one of my oldest children approaches me, and with coaxing manner and easy fluent style, begs of me a favor, I am not moved; but when my little pet, with unskilled tongue and anxious soul tries to make me know her want—this touches me. Why should it be otherwise with God? If the heart and soul and deep-felt want are in the prayer, he will heed it, though the utterances of the tongue should be poor indeed. Repeat that effort, then, my dear brother, to-night, to-morrow night, next night, and still on, till your brain works easy, your excitement subsides, and your speech is glib. Be assured, all this will soon happen; but never tell me again you *can not* pray. But ten days are now gone, and mother says to her oldest daughter, a dear Christian daughter: "Jennie, do you know that your father has been having prayer in our home every night for more than a week?" "Certainly not," is the gentle, half-chiding reply of Jennie. The next night not a child is absent when father prays; not one. And now the struggle is over, and the victory won. Tell me now, dear brother, how you feel? Is not your spirit lighter and heart more joyous? Does not heaven wear a kinder look and earth a brighter face?

If there be one scene of earth more lovely than another, it is that of

a Christian father collecting his family about him, at the close of the day, that he may read to them the holy word of God, and bow with them in prayer. Surely it must be from scenes like this that angels collect those prayers with which they fill their golden censers. How it is that any Christian man can, by neglecting his duty, rob himself of this honor, this pleasure, I never wish to know. Will my Christian brother, who is living at fault in this item, bear with me, while I relate for his encouragement the following incident, which, though not grand, is yet good:

Six years ago I was holding a meeting in Waverly, Missouri; and in one of my discourses made it my special business to urge upon the attention of my brethren the subject of family prayer. My heart was full of the theme and I urged it warmly. At the close of the speech, a sister, while bidding me good-bye, said: "I hope that will not be lost." As there was nothing peculiar in her manner or unusual in the remark, it made no serious impression on my mind. But about two months afterward I received from that same sister a letter, as inartificial as the tale of a child, and as pure as the heavens that bent over her head while she wrote it. In that letter she narrated the effect of the speech upon her husband and self. They had lived in neglect of family prayer, though in all other respects most exemplary and worthy people. But from the time of the discourse, their neglected duty became the subject of frequent and earnest conversation. He talked, and she talked, till their hearts became full. Soon it became easier to pray, hard as it was to begin, than to carry their guilty feeling. Accordingly, the family was assembled, and the holy task undertaken; how performed I do not know; for my sister did not tell me. But in the course of her letter, she said; "And now, my little children, so delighted are they, will sit in their chairs and nod rather than go to bed till their father prays." On reading this I could but exclaim: God bless that family all—father, mother, and nodding little ones. Would that a like scene transpired every night in every family in our ranks. But I have been wandering.

As soon as brethren have become a little established in habits of devotion; especially as soon as they have accustomed themselves to pray in their families, they should be induced to assemble in social meetings, where each should be most affectionately urged to take some part in the exercises. At first the reading of a hymn or of a few familiar verses in the New Testament may be enough; but no Christian should ever relax his energies, until he can stand up in the midst of his brethren, give out his hymn, read his chapter, and even add his word of exhortation, if need be. In the church of Christ we must have no unworking members. The market is the place for idlers; the vineyard, for laborers. Every member must have something to do, and every member do something. Every talent and

every energy of the church must be consecrated to the Lord. Nothing short of this must satisfy us as a people.

As soon as the evangelist discovers that his converts are in earnest, that their religion is not a mere passion or impulse, but a deep heart-felt faith, and that they intend to make it a life; as soon as he discovers this, let him organize them into a church.

Now will arise a serious question as to overseers and deacons. My advice to every evangelist is to follow resolutely and undeviatingly the instruction of the New Testament in regard to the case; follow its instructions to the letter; and neither appoint nor suffer to be appointed with your consent, either to the office of overseer or that of deacon, a man who lacks *even one* of the qualifications prescribed for these offices respectively. In no case, nor on any account, must we venture to disregard the solemn decisions of Holy Writ. Yet I give it as my opinion that, in the matter of overseers and deacons, three out of every five of our churches are deeply at fault. We are scrupulous, and most justly so, in the matter of a man's faith; his repentance; his baptism; yet without one compunction of conscience or even the slightest seeming hesitancy, we appoint a man to the office of overseer who lacks one, and it may be half the prescribed qualifications. This is not right. Such overseers, no matter how excellent they may be as men, are, without a solitary exception, an injury to the church, and in many instances a curse. If a church flourishes under their rule, it is because it has in it the elements of prosperity despite of them, and not because of any aid it derives from them. I lay it down as a position never to be controverted, that in so far only as a church conforms to every known requirement of Christ, will he bless it, and that so far precisely as it fails to do this will he hedge in its way and trouble it. Let the evangelist take heed, then, whom he appoints to the sacred offices of the church. There is, however, this to be added in regard to the qualifications for these offices. A man may be qualified to act as overseer in one church but not in another. Clearly some of the qualifications are relative. For example, a man might be "apt to teach" in one church, but not in another. In all such cases the wants of the congregation must-determine, to a certain extent, the degree of skill the overseer is to possess. But then, again, there are other qualifications not relative; as the ability to *rule*. This is absolute, and admits only of those degrees which are inseparable from human nature. But a word here is all we propose. As to the manner in which the officers of a church should be set apart to their work we shall speak hereafter.

By visiting his converts from house to house, the evangelist will soon become acquainted with the talents and acquirements of each, the facility with which he learns, his judgment, his discretion, etc. He will thus be enabled to suggest to the church the names of such

persons as can be most safely intrusted with the management of its affairs until it is provided with regular officers. Such visits I can not too strongly urge upon the attention of the judicious evangelist. Their importance, in respects too numerous for mention here, can hardly be over-estimated.

When about to organize a church, a most important question for the decision of the considerate evangelist will frequently be this: How is the organization of this church to affect other churches in its vicinity? The injudicious decision of this question leads many times to the very worst results. It is often the case that the materials collected in a recent meeting are not such as should be, by themselves, formed into a church. Before this can be done with promise of success, a draft must be made on some neighboring church for additional materials. From it an overseer or two must be taken, a deacon or two, and besides, perhaps four or five of its most substantial members. These overseers, deacons, and members are induced to leave the old church and go into the new by the flattering representation that their services are absolutely necessary to build up and give tone to the new organization. They are reminded how important the point is, where the new church is to be formed; that a church once located there, and the whole country will ultimately come in; that it would be most cruel to leave these young converts to perish for want of a church in their midst, and that many of them are wholly without the means to travel six or eight miles every Sunday to the meetings of the old church. These pleas are successful. Accordingly the old church is compelled, against her judgment, to part from half, perhaps, of her most active and valuable members. She is thus greatly weakened in ability and crippled in resources. Her influence is now impaired and her power for future usefulness most injuriously curtailed. I have never known an occurrence of this kind, and I have known many, that did not result disastrously; and where the old church is judiciously located, is well organized, and exerting an influence for good, no sort of plea can justify it. In order to extensive usefulness, certain elements are absolutely necessary in every church. She should possess great numerical strength, great wealth, and great talents and culture in her members, and the more of all these the better, provided they are sanctified by deep piety and zeal. To point out all the good to be achieved by such a church need not be attempted here. A few, however, of the more obvious results may be named. She can employ, if need be, a preacher to aid her overseers in superintending her own domestic interests; she can keep one or more evangelists constantly employed in destitute parts of the country; she can sustain a large and flourishing Sunday school; her members can amply support their own literary institutions—all this she can do besides contributing to general missionary and general educational

purposes. One such church will wield more influence and do more good than a whole score of small feeble congregations dotted over the country at short intervals from one another. In an economical point of view, to go no further, such a church is decidedly preferable to a number of small ones. She is composed, allow, of six hundred members; yet one house, costing, say, five thousand dollars, accommodates them all. But suppose, instead of this, she were distributed into six churches scattered over the country in different places. Each of these would require a house, costing, at a low estimate, two thousand dollars. In the case of the six, this would amount to twelve thousand dollars. Here, therefore, the one church is a saving of seven thousand dollars. This sum at interest would support, annually, in any one of our best colleges, two young men preparing for the ministry of the word. Where such a result as this can be achieved by having one church instead of six, that is a tough argument which defends the six.

Then the pleasure we have in meeting with a large prosperous church is immeasurably greater than in meeting with a small feeble one, struggling to maintain a precarious existence. There is spirit and excitement in the multitude. Hence from the large church we derive weekly strength and comfort; from the feeble one, nothing. The difference between the two is the difference between the deep sustaining water of the sea, and the shallow pool of the brook. In the one we are borne grandly up and on; in the other, we struggle to keep from going down. Who would not ride ten miles every Lord's day to meet with three or six hundred brethren in Christ, collected from an area of country twenty miles square, all delighting in their church and proud to meet with it, rather than walk a rood to meet with a single elder, a single deacon, seven women and four men, the house feeling dank and looking cheerless as though it were the very temple of ghosts, or the sepulchre of extinct religion? Besides we all know that where the largest body of Christians collects, the largest body of worldlings will assemble. Hence the large church will afford incomparably the better field for labor. All over the more populous portions of the West, where the pure gospel has taken deep root, the evils of organizing too many churches close together are palpable. In many counties where I have traveled we have six, in some eight, in others even as many as ten churches. Now, in many of these instances, were every church in any single county dissolved, and the whole consolidated into one church at some eligible point, the cause, the brethren, and the county would be greatly the gainers. Not that I would now counsel such a procedure with an existing state of things by any means. Far from it. The evil which would result therefrom would far more than countervail the good. These remarks are designed as suggestions for the future, not as prescriptions for

the past. Neither are they intended to reflect upon small churches, nor yet upon the intentions of those who have organized them; but to point out in large churches a more excellent way. Of course, I will not be understood as saying that a small church is an evil in itself. I am speaking only of the evil of too many small churches where thereby the formation of a large and powerful one is prevented. Where even the smallest and feeblest church conceivable is all that can be had, this I should regard as an inestimable blessing. Nay, if I could associate with no greater number, even with my wife alone would I "show forth the Lord's death" on every first day of the week. I should deem that the gracious provision for the "two or three" here applied, and should have no scruple. But one thing I would never do, which yet is sometimes done even by disciples. Though I were destitute of every vestige of a church composed of my brethren, and expected ever to be so. *I would unite with no sectarian body, or body wearing an unscriptural name.* I would live alone through life, rather than take the step. No degree or kind of deprivation can justify it; and when taken, I at least see not how it can be regarded in any other light than as a species of apostasy deeply criminal. A lone tree, in a broad prairie, bearing its fruit and seeking to plant its colony of like around it, is a lovely sight. But how much more sublime is that of a Christian man, standing alone amid the corruptions of depraved sects, laboring to commend to his fellows, by his faultless devotion to the New Testament alone, the religion of his divine Master? Marvelous to me is the taste and crooked the thought of the man, who, having once been a member of a church of God, can ever after become a member of a different body.

But I shall be asked what I would do with the converts made in the recent meeting, if not organize them into a church? This question has already been anticipated, and in part replied to. I should certainly organize them into a church just as soon as this could be safely done. But where this could not be safely done, and where the evangelist could not remain constantly with them, going in and out among them, then I should certainly urge them to unite with the nearest neighboring church which afforded the required home, comfort, and protection. This would seem to be but a dictate of common sense and common prudence. But where such neighboring church did not exist, or was not sufficiently convenient, then I should sternly require the evangelist who had been instrumental in making the converts, to remain permanently with them till they could, with a high degree of confidence in their stability, be left to themselves. Much injury is known to have resulted to the cause of Christ from the neglect of what is here said. Large and excited meetings have been held, at which many have been immersed. No convenient church existed with which these could unite; and the evangelist could not

remain with them. The consequence has been either that they have been immaturity organized into a church and left, or left without being organized. In either case, and in both cases, the results are frequently deplorable. Lukewarmness and inattention to meetings soon ensue, dissensions and bitterness spring up, and in a short time fallings away begin. Then the evil-minded sects are gleeful and prophetic; while the devoted brother in Christ bows his head in shame and tears. Never should these results be allowed to happen; hence, before the evangelist enters a strange neighborhood to conduct a protracted meeting, he should know that it is within his power to guard against them. Otherwise he should consider well whether duty does not call him to labor in other fields.

It frequently happens, and the circumstance ought to be mentioned, that an evangelist has good ground to believe that a given neighborhood is a fine field for his labor. Of course, he is anxious to enter it. But so inadequate is his support that he knows well the necessary attention can not be bestowed by him to plant and water a church. He is here compelled either to decline the labor, or if not decline it, leave his converts in the unpromising condition already pointed out. To guard against both these evils our Missionary Societies and wealthy churches should see to it, that these laborious and ill-requited men are far more amply provided for in the way of earthly comforts than usually falls to their lot. But we shall here bring this sketch to an end, commending its hints in much affection to every co-worker in the great evangelical field around us.

---

SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO WAR?—We have felt that the past four years were not the time for the discussion of this question. Excitement has run too high, and the rule of passion been too complete, to warrant its investigation. Circumstances, however, are now different; and I feel that an article on it is in season and necessary. I hence propose to devote a portion of the next number of the *Quarterly* to it. The subject will be treated as to Christians only.

WHAT I OWE TO CESAR. —This is another subject demanding at our hands, as a people, a very thoughtful and a very thorough examination. It is not an unscriptural subject; consequently we can not ignore it. We, as a people, are not wholly agreed on it. This, I believe, may be taken for granted. Yet none will deny that agreement is desirable and attainable. This agreement can be effected only by becoming discussion and sufficient investigation. This investigation we propose to inaugurate in the second number of the next volume. The subject will be treated in so far only as it is embraced in the word of God.

## IS JOHN'S LANGUAGE, "HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU IN THE HOLY SPIRIT," LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE?

THE controversy in the *Quarterly* between the original writer and Kappa on the immersion in the Holy Spirit is stirring up an investigation, which will, I have little doubt, amply repay the labors of these writers. One effect of such discussion, if carefully conducted, will be, to convince the reader, that Christian brethren, when in search of truth, though they may find it difficult to arrive at the same conclusions, feel in duty bound to treat each other as brethren, and can examine the sentiments of each other with fairness and in a Christian spirit. While it is the contemptible drivings of an inconstant mind to change upon the mere *ipse dixit* of another, it is no less indicative of true nobility to yield with cheerfulness to the majesty of truth.

In the present case the parties are at issue on the immersion in the Holy Spirit; the writer arguing that it may refer to all Christians, while Kappa contends for its restriction to the apostles at the day of Pentecost and to Cornelius and his friends. It is certain both parties can not be right in their conclusions, and barely possible that both may be mistaken. As this amounts, in my mind, to something far beyond a possibility, and as the subject concerns others equally with the writers, I presume it will not be regarded as an improper interference to examine the ground on which they mutually stand. In doing this, I am cheered with the assurance that, if what I advance is truth, it will stand investigation; if error, it will be exposed and overthrown.

The writer and Kappa are agreed on the following points:

1. That certain persons were literally baptized in the Holy Spirit.
2. That this baptism was distinct from the miraculous endowments of the Holy Spirit.
3. That it was the spirits of such that were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

In support of the first proposition the writer claims the following passages: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. iii., 11.) "I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Mark i., 8; Luke iii., 16.) "And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me: Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit



descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." (John i., 33.) "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i., 5.) And the passage in the twelfth of 1 Corinthians: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Kappa admits the validity of all these passages as proofs except the last. In proof of the second proposition it is said that Jesus himself immersed in the Holy Spirit, but that it was the work of the Holy Spirit, and not of Christ, to endow the apostles.

I am not aware that a single passage of Scripture has been adduced to prove the third proposition, viz., that it was the spirits of men that were immersed in the Holy Spirit.

If the passages brought forward in favor of the first proposition really prove it, the matter is settled; but as this is not apparent to my understanding, I must treat it as an open question. Let us keep the third of Matthew, from the seventh to the twelfth verse, before the mind. "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he saith unto them: O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance. And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

On page 213 of the *Quarterly* the writer remarks of the parties addressed by John: "The bad are compared, tenth verse, to bad trees which were to be cut down and cast into the fire. Here the word 'fire' is unquestionably literal. And that casting the bad trees into it, and immersing the bad persons compared to them in it, are different modes of expressing the same fact, seems to me almost certain. Again: the same class is compared, twelfth verse, to 'chaff which is to be burned with unquenchable fire.' Here, too, the word 'fire' is literal, and to represent persons as being immersed in it who were to be burned with it, seems necessary to a complete view of the case. Now when we remember that it is between these two comparisons in the eleventh verse that we have the language 'he shall immerse you in fire,' it is very difficult to understand the word fire in any other than a literal sense. And if we construe the word 'fire' literally, all is easy."

This is a most remarkable passage. How it could flow from the very correct pen of the writer, and also escape the notice of Kappa

(who has not a remark upon it) it is difficult to conceive. Perhaps as it was not offered in favor of a disputed point, but for one pretty generally held, it passed without much attention. I can only account for its appearance on some such ground. It is well that such passages but very seldom appear in the *Quarterly*.

It says, "the bad are compared to bad trees which are to be cut down and cast into the fire." Why not tell us, when on the subject of comparison, to what the good are compared. There is not a hint of a comparison in their case, although it is with them the present discussion is more immediately concerned. The writer concludes that the fire in which the bad will be immersed will be literal fire, and arrives at that conclusion in the following manner: inasmuch as bad trees are thrown into literal fire, and bad men are compared to bad trees, and also immersed in fire, therefore the fire in which the bad men are immersed is literal, or, at least, it is very difficult to understand the fire in any other than a literal sense.

Now, allowing that John does compare bad men to bad trees, and that both were to be cast into the fire, does it follow that the fire in both cases is the same? Clearly it does not. David compares a good man to a tree planted by a river of water, and declares that they both bring forth fruit in proper season. But we would not conclude that the fruit in both cases is the same, because the man is compared to the tree and both bear fruit. David also compares the ungodly "to the chaff which the wind driveth away." But we would scarcely contend for the same wind to drive away ungodly men that drove the chaff from the Jewish threshing-floor. Neither will it follow that when bad men and bad trees are each thrown into fire that the fire in both

But it is further stated that "the same class is compared to 'chaff,' which is to be burned with unquenchable fire. Here, too, the fire is literal." If this class is compared to chaff at all, it must be to the chaff which the Jews cleaned from their wheat and burned with fire. The fire the Jews used to consume their chaff was certainly literal fire. But, then, it was not Unquenchable fire. How, then, can the writer say that "the same class is compared to chaff which is to be burned with unquenchable fire?" If I understand him, he is speaking of literal trees which the Jews cut down and burned, and of literal chaff which they cleaned from their grain and burned with fire. But I do think, when he looks at the subject a second time, he will acknowledge that John said nothing about literal trees or literal chaff. The only chaff mentioned in the third of Matthew, then, is the chaff which Jesus himself will separate from the wheat and burn with everlasting fire. And the only fire mentioned by John is unquenchable fire. It thus turns out that there is no comparison in the passage. John does not tell the generation of vipers that they are *like* trees, but he calls them

trees, and assures them that unless they bring forth fruits meet for repentance they shall be cut down and cast into the fire. That although he baptized them in water, with the distinct understanding that they would bear these fruits, he did not hold the winnowing shovel that would separate the good and bad, but that it was in the hand of One mightier than he, who would thoroughly purge the floor and gather the good into his granary, but burn the chaff with everlasting fire. Whatever opinions may prevail as to the kind of fire in which the wicked will be finally punished, I see nothing in this chapter in proof of literal fire.

On the immersion in the Holy Spirit, the writer, after referring to the popular confusion on the subject, says: "For the word baptism has one and only one immutable meaning. It expresses a single specific act—immersion, which is incapable of modification. Change this act, and it becomes a new thing; it is neither a literal nor a figurative baptism, but a new act, and is to be expressed by a new word."

If he means by this that this word, because it expresses a specific action, can not literally express another and a different kind of action, he utters an intuitive truth. But if he means that this word can not figuratively express another and a different kind of action, I dissent. Walking expresses a specific action, but it sometimes expresses other and different actions. Thus Paul urges Christians to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called; meaning a great deal more than the act of literal walking. Many other terms expressing specific action are properly used in the same way, and so may baptism.

He adds: "In like manner, when John says of the Saviour, 'he shall baptize you in Spirit,' I am constrained to conclude that the word baptism expresses as strictly an act of immersion as though it related to water."

Some who heard Jesus say to the Jews: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," concluded that he as strictly meant eating and drinking as though they related to bread and water. Will the writer tell us what power constrained him to his conclusion that did not constrain the Jews to theirs?

In the October number, page 61, is the following: "John's language is as palpable an instance of a promise as can be found in the Scriptures. But even allowing that it is not, then is it prophesy, the interpretation of which differs not one particle from the interpretation of the very plainest narrative. When John says 'he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit,' he speaks just as literally as when he says 'I indeed immerse you in water.' The same rules of language apply to the one sentence that apply to the other."

These assertions will be alluded to in another part of the present article. In the mean time, we will **hear what is offered** in proof of the

second proposition, viz., "That the immersion in the Holy Spirit is distinct from the endowment of the Holy Spirit." "It was Jesus that immersed the apostles in the Holy Spirit. But it was the Holy Spirit that endowed the apostles." It is hence argued that the immersion and the endowment must be two distinct operations. Do these facts lead to this conclusion? I think not, and will now give my reasons. It is true that some things are ascribed to Jesus that are not ascribed to the Holy Spirit, and some things ascribed to the Holy Spirit that are not to Jesus. It is equally true that some things are ascribed to both. Hence, it does not always follow that when an action is affirmed of the Holy Spirit it must be denied of Jesus. Such a conclusion is particularly dangerous in regard to miraculous gifts. In Luke xii., 11, 12, Jesus says to his disciples: "And when they bring you into the synagogue, and unto magistrates and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer or what ye shall say; for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye shall say." Speaking of the same thing in chapter twenty-one, and fourteenth and fifteenth verses, Jesus says: "Settle it, therefore, in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer; for I will give you a month and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." Here Jesus promises his disciples miraculous instruction. In one place he promises to be their teacher; in another he assures them that the Holy Spirit would be their teacher. The same teaching is affirmed in one place of Jesus that is affirmed in another place of the Holy Spirit. How, then, can it be denied that Jesus endowed the apostles, because that endowment is affirmed of the Holy Spirit? And this must be denied, or the argument given up for the distinction between the immersion and endowment of the Holy Spirit.

On the third proposition, viz., "That Jesus immerses the *spirits* of his disciples in the Holy Spirit" I have but little to say. As I am not aware that a passage of Scripture is brought to prove it, I am willing that it remain as a mere assertion. When the word of God tells me that Jesus literally immerses the spirits of men in the Holy Spirit I am bound to believe it, though I do not understand it. But in the absence of such testimony it is a privilege to leave such things among the occult marvels of theological speculation.

It is now time to show reasons why I consider John's language, "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit," figurative and not literal.

I. —John was a prophet sent before the face of the Lord to prepare his way before him. His work was not to promise specific blessings to the followers of Jesus, but to announce his near approach and vast superiority. It was customary for prophets to use figurative language, when foreshowing the coming and work of Christ. That they did sometimes speak of him without a figure is true, but this is the rare exception and not the rule. Figurative language is the lan-

guage of prophesy. One of two conclusions is inevitable; either that John used the language peculiar to prophets when he prophesied or that he was an exception to the general rule. As I see no reason to conclude that he was an exception I reject it, and conclude that John, when foreshowing the work of Christ, used figurative language, as is the case in nine-tenths of Jewish prophesy. But to strengthen this conclusion, I know that it was customary for John to use figurative language. Even when he saw the Saviour, and pointed him out as the true Messiah to his disciples, he did it in highly figurative language: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." That a part of John's address is in figurative language I think will not be denied. Still, there is a part of it in literal language. I will transcribe it, putting what I believe to be figurative in italics. "Now, also, *the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree, therefore, that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.* I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; *he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*" Here the prophetic part is treated as figurative. What John affirmed of himself is plain narrative. He says, I indeed, or I truly, baptize in water. When inspired historians tell us what John did, they say John baptized in Jordan. We are repeatedly told in inspired narrative that John did baptize; hence, we know that John spoke literally, when he said: "I indeed baptize with water." If I saw good reason for treating the prophetic part as literal I would cheerfully do so; but as it is I am bound to treat it as figurative.

John was not sent to give a minute description of the work of Christ. He said nothing about his resurrection. He alluded to his death but once, and that in highly figurative language: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Now if John never mentioned his resurrection in any way, and said nothing about his death but once, and that in figurative language, is it at all probable that, even before he saw the Saviour, he would minutely and literally describe a certain blessing which he would bestow upon his disciples after his death and resurrection? This is so highly improbable, that in the absence of proof I feel bound to reject it.

II. —Baptism was not a suitable term to express literally the blessing bestowed upon the apostles at Pentecost, or on Cornelius and his friends. There is nothing mentioned in the second of Acts that even resembles an immersion in the Holy Spirit. We are told: "They were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues

as the Spirit gave them utterance." Here is no account of Jesus immersing them in the Spirit. The same is true of the tenth of Acts, where the conversion of Cornelius is recorded. If Baptism were a suitable word to describe what occurred, on these occasions, the narrative would plainly reveal an immersion in the Holy Spirit, but the plain narrative neither expresses nor implies such an immersion; hence, I conclude that baptism could not literally describe what took place on these occasions. Another reason for this conclusion is the fact, that no inspired historian, when describing spiritual blessings ever used the word baptism. If any spiritual blessing, ordinary or extraordinary, was a literal baptism in the Holy Spirit, how is it that these historians, when recording these blessings, in every case avoided the word baptism? Again: neither baptism in the Holy Spirit nor its equivalent is ever mentioned in prophesy, only when John's baptism is spoken of, which shows that the expression took its rise from John's baptism and not from the nature of the case. Jesus often spoke to the disciples of the Holy Spirit whom he would send from the Father. He foretold with great minuteness both miraculous and ordinary blessings of the Comforter. Why did he never use the word baptism at such times, if it were a proper word to express these blessings? On more occasions than one he spoke of a baptism which he should undergo in his death, and even spoke of two of his disciples being baptized with the same baptism, but never alluded to their baptism in the Holy Spirit but once, and that in contrast with John's baptism.

III. —Another reason for thinking John's expression figurative. There are many figurative passages in Scripture bearing a strong resemblance to it. I have, I think, shown clearly that the terra was not necessary to express any spiritual blessing, but arose from the circumstance of John's baptism. I will now refer to similar terms, which arose from like circumstances. When Jesus, being wearied with his journey, sat on Jacob's well, a woman of Samaria came to draw water. "Jesus said unto her, give me to drink. Then saith the woman of Samaria to him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans. Jesus answered and said unto her, if thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." After they had conversed for some time, the woman speaking of the water in Jacob's well, and Jesus of the water of life: "Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him; shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." The woman understood Jesus to be speaking of

such water as Jacob's well contained; but I presume none would now argue that she was right, or hold the term "drink" to be as literal, when it referred to the water which Jesus promised, as when it related to literal, water. The water in that well was the subject that gave rise to the conversation; Jesus, therefore, describes his salvation as water and the receiving of that salvation as drinking water. Many did thus receive his salvation; and the facts are recorded by an inspired historian in the Acts of Apostles, but they are not recorded in the language which Jesus used, because Jesus prophesied and used figurative language; but Luke wrote narrative and used literal language. The same is true of John's language. When his baptism was the engrossing subject with the people he described the greater work of Jesus as a baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is believed that this baptism did take place, and that the fact is recorded by Luke in the Acts of Apostles, but not in the words used by John, just because John prophesied and used figurative language, but Luke wrote narrative and used literal language.

Again: in the sixth chapter of John, when bread and the manna eaten by the Israelites in the wilderness were the subject in hand, Jesus tells the Jews that he is the bread that came down from heaven, and is so far superior to the manna as to be called the true bread, of which a man may eat and not die. The Jews strove, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Jesus finally answered, and said unto them: Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." Many, no doubt, ate of that flesh and drank of that blood, and the facts are recorded by the same historian that recorded the foregoing, but in different words from those used by our Lord, for the reasons already mentioned. Let the reader compare our Lord's language in these passages with that of John, and see if the cases are not strikingly parallel. Similar quotations might be multiplied, but it is presumed that these will be sufficient to show how figurative language took its rise, and why it was sometimes used in the New Testament instead of literal.

Perhaps they may also suggest the necessity of caution in using prophetic terms as literal when subsequent history does not sufficiently justify that use.

IV. —Another reason for regarding John's language as figurative, is the declaration of Paul: "There is one baptism." Nothing appears to me more evident than this, that Paul knew but one literal baptism. If we can find out with certainty what that one baptism is, then I hold we are bound to receive it, and repudiate every other. Have we, then, a rule by which we can ascertain the one baptism? I

think we have; it is this: Whatever the inspired historians of the New Testament call baptism, is baptism. They call the immersion of believers in water baptism, and they call nothing else baptism; therefore, that is the one baptism.

No doubt Paul admitted that other things had been figuratively called baptism. He would not deny that Jesus had been baptized in overwhelming agony; nor would he deny that John, the surviving son of Zebedee, would yet undergo a baptism similar to that of his Lord. But as these sufferings had never been historically called baptism, he felt at perfect liberty to overlook them, and declare there is one baptism."

Paul knew very well that John's immersion, which was literally and historically called baptism, had passed away, and that there was then but one remaining. He knew that John said of Jesus, "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." But as these had never been historically called baptism, it seems he felt at liberty to ignore them, and declare "there is one baptism." But if the view propounded by the writer be correct, viz., that the spirits of all Christians are literally baptized by Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit, then it follows that every time a man baptizes the body of a true believer in water, Jesus as literally baptizes his spirit in the Holy Spirit. Thus the baptism in the Spirit is as often performed as the immersion of a believer in water. And it must be of far greater importance for the following reasons: 1. One man can baptize another man in water; but it is Jesus alone that can baptize in the Holy Spirit. 2. It is the body that is baptized in water; but it is the spirit that is baptized in the Holy Spirit. 3. The element in one case is water; in the other case the Holy Spirit. Here, then, is a baptism as literal as baptism of a believer in water, as often performed, and of infinitely greater importance, and yet Paul pronounces its non-existence; ignores it altogether, and declares "there is one baptism." Those who can thus believe will excuse us when we differ from them, and believe that from the days of John the Baptist until now there is and has been but one literal baptism.

The baptism predicted by John was promised by the Lord to his apostles, just before his ascension, in the words following: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." It is generally believed that this promise was fulfilled when the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost, and that its fulfillment is recorded in the second of Acts. If so, there is no difficulty in ascertaining what is meant by that baptism, for we can read every thing that is predicated of the apostles on that occasion; and the baptism of the Spirit must be one of these predicates. It is affirmed, then, of the apostles: 1. That they were all with one accord in one place. 2. That they were sitting. 3. That



they were all filled with the Holy Spirit. 4. That they began to speak with other tongues, etc. This, then, is all that is affirmed of the apostles at the time the Spirit descended from heaven. Which of these, then, will describe the baptism of the Spirit? Their being with one accord in one place was not their baptism. Neither was their speaking with tongues, nor their sitting in the house. What, then, was the baptism the Saviour promised? It either was this, that they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, or else its fulfillment is not recorded at all. I have no doubt that the promise was fulfilled and also recorded. Thus I am persuaded that the endowment of the Spirit and the baptism of the Spirit are one and the same thing. That it was a gift received by the apostles on the day of Pentecost, and by Cornelius and his friends, direct from heaven.

Jesus told his apostles to "wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." The promise of the Father they waited for, and that promise they received. They were filled with the Holy Spirit. That they were literally baptized in the Spirit, or raised out of the Spirit, I do not read. Such a baptism I neither see promised nor fulfilled. Our Lord, said John, truly, not figuratively, nor typically, but truly and literally baptized in water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit. Had he said, ye shall as truly be baptized in 'he Holy Spirit, we would be plunged into the deepest difficulty, for the narrative gives us no such baptism. The historian tells us that John did truly baptize the people in the river Jordan; but no historian tells us that Jesus, or any one else, did truly baptize the apostles in the Holy Spirit. Jesus, however, does not say, ye shall truly be baptized in the Spirit; but evidently makes a distinction between that baptism and John's. One was not figurative, but true. The other was not true, but figurative, or at least so they appear to me.

These are my firm convictions on the subject, and they are submitted to readers of the *Quarterly*, in the confident hope that wherever the truth maybe, it will be discovered and firmly held by all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

C.

---

TO SUBSCRIBERS. —Occasionally a subscriber complains to us that he does not receive his *Quarterly*. We regret this; but can assure all such that it is no fault of ours. The *Quarterly* is mailed regularly and promptly as soon as a number is out or a name received. If brethren will notify us of failures, we will make them good. Hereafter all money must be sent at the subscriber's risk; and the *Quarterly* shall go at ours. Hence all must receive it. This we feel to be but just and fair.

## THE CONTRIBUTION.

THE object of this communication is to remove the objections of A. G., and to answer his inquiries as presented in an article on the contribution in the April number of the *Quarterly*. In addressing ourself to this task we desire to treat the subject with fairness and frankness, and to avoid every thing that could wound or offend the feelings of the writer.

The reader of that article will be impressed with the favorable sentiment entertained by the writer toward the benevolent aspect of the contribution, but he is made as deeply sensible of the aversion felt by him against any recognition of it as a divine institution, or an ordinance of worship of continuous obligation. The exhibition of a spirit so generous and liberal causes us to wonder the more at this decided aversion, since it is presented in complete undress, and no attempt made to clothe it even with the *flimsy* garb of truth in which he seems to think our position is enveloped, and which could be so easily removed. After expressing his gratification at the appearance of our original article on this subject, "as the beginning of a still further and fuller development of the subject of which it treats," he says, "still there are points in the proposition with which the writer sets out, and for the vindication or proof of which he mainly labors, which, though clearly stated, lack that fullness of proof for which the mind hungers when dealing with questions of such import." While we can not complain of any judgment which he may honestly form as to the merit of our article, or chide him for his unbelief in any "point in the proposition," as long as neither the one nor the other will establish its truth, nor determine its falsity; still we do regret that he did not make some effort to reveal this deficiency, and relieve us from the necessity of vainly exclaiming with

"Oh, wad some pow'r the gifte gie us  
To see ourselks as others see us"

He declares that "there is something repugnant to the mind in regarding an ordinance which terminates in food and raiment as an ordinance of worship, under the dispensation of the Spirit." We will examine this declaration briefly, made as it is without any qualification, and containing one capital error at least, if not more. In the first place he asserts this repugnance of mind without limitation or restriction, leaving us in doubt whether he means to confine it to his own mind, or to affirm it as existing in the minds of all, and that too upon a false assumption as to the "termination" of the ordinance.

If he means to say that there is something repugnant to his own mind in this supposed case, we would kindly suggest that it might be produced by erroneous conceptions, for which he is personally responsible. But if he refers to the mind of the Christian world at large, we must be excused for doubting the coextensiveness of his information. Supposing, however, that he means the mind, as a reasoning and judging power, and even admitting this to be its decision, we are certainly bound not to accept its conclusions as proper and right, except as they accord with unmistakable teachings of Scripture of which he has left us wholly destitute. Even when this concurrence exists, we accept the fact upon the authority of revealed truth, rather than upon the judgment which the mind as a reasoning faculty furnishes.

The plainest truths of the Bible afford instances of this kind, such as "God is Spirit," etc. The mind may, in many of its decisions, be infallibly correct, and can be proved so by the teachings of the word of God. This, however, will not justify us in accepting all its decisions. In this particular case it certainly bears with it no authority, inasmuch as we have a knowledge of no "ordinance of worship" which does "terminate in food and raiment." This is the grand error into which our reviewer has fallen. We may clothe any other ordinance of the gospel with these false apprehensions of its character, and it will become repugnant to and incompatible with every enlightened scriptural conception of them. These palpable or sensibly apprehended things, connected with the ordinances of the gospel, are often seized upon to derogate from the true dignity and authority of divine institutions. Christian men are often charged, from such a cause, with teaching the gross doctrine that water, as used in the ordinance of baptism, really, washes away the defilements of the soul, and that the bread and wine used in the supper authorize the doctrine of material communion with God. Whether the contribution be an ordinance of religious worship or not, it certainly has a very different "termination" from the one honestly but erroneously presented by A. G. in the above quotations. That it contemplates in its administration supplying the wants (temporal) of the saints, Paul plainly affirms in 2 Corinthians, ix., 12. But that this is only one of the things which enter into and compose the appointed act, rather than constitute its result, is very clear. Food and raiment are the immediate result of receiving. The "receiving" is one part of the ordinance, just as the "giving" is another. Paul makes this very clear when he says to the Philippians, "no church communicated with me as concerning *giving* and *receiving*, but you only."

The Saviour said, "it is more blessed to give than to receive," and possibly the very name "contribution" may have been given to this institution, as it is in all the others, in reference to some one of its

distinguishing acts. The "termination" of the ordinance is not in food and raiment. The true culmination is embraced in a summary contained in the ninth chapter of 2d Corinthians, where, among other spiritual results, Paul mentions, "thanksgiving to God," the indwelling "grace of God," the strengthening of brotherly affection, the evidence of "subjection to the gospel of Christ," and the blissful assurance of God's love.

The use of a material element in the observance of the contribution, can constitute no objection to its being regarded an ordinance of worship. For to the extent that such an objection would impair the claim of this ordinance, it would to the same extent affect the Lord's Supper, in which material elements are actually eaten and drunk. Such a criterion is not therefore allowable in any case. If we decide that an ordinance of Christianity must exclude from its signification, performance, or design whatever is material as being inimical to its spiritual purpose, such decision would result, not only in the overthrow of divine ordinances, but leave Satan to rejoice that the things of this world are no longer fitted for the use of Jesus Christ in sustaining and extending his kingdom on earth. Prayer and praise would no longer engage an unruly member; communion with the Lord and with one another through the elements representing the body and blood of our adorable Saviour would cease; friends who will welcome us to everlasting habitations could no more be made with the mammon of unrighteousness; nor sacrifices, holy and acceptable, be offered in these vile bodies.

We have said this much to relieve the contribution from objections which it is alleged invalidate its claim as an ordinance of worship, and to show that it does not contain within its limits any thing which may not be predicated in some degree of other acts properly regarded as ordinances. This identity is not urged, however, to prove it such. For it might embrace every conception, object, and spiritual signification, belonging to an ordinance—and yet, if it be not appointed by proper authority, with laws regulating its observance, it can not be regarded as authoritative and binding. This much it must have to constitute it an ordinance. Less than this will not do, and more than this is not necessary. So teach our best lexicographers and writers. Authority and legislation are essential antecedents and the true source of every institution human as well as divine, the former always creating obligation and the latter appointing the mode of its discharge. Direct reference was made in our former article to the evidence of these two essential conditions existing in the New Testament, and their direct bearing on the contribution, and hence will not be reproduced here. A few thoughts in reference to it as an ordinance of worship, seem, however, to be needed, and are now offered.

If what is called the contribution corresponds with the *koinonia* in Acts ii., 42, in which it is said the Jerusalem church "continued steadfastly," we are bound to regard it as a divine institution, or else we are to suppose that this congregation, which of all others must have been rightly organized under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, had thus early become corrupted by human innovations. This supposition, the only one possible, is certainly discarded by every one as being entitled to no credit whatever, and the practice must therefore receive the sanction of a divine warrant. Those who practiced it, by submitting to the gospel ordinances as such, had been introduced already into the church, and hence must have observed it as an ordinance of worship, "in paying divine honors" to the Lord through the newly established modes and institution of his kingdom. Rendering to God obedience in all his appointments in the true spirit of obedience is the highest worship, veneration, or homage the Christian can ever offer while in the flesh. Much that the church now does may be wide of this mark, but all she ever was authorized to do contemplated this great object. No man without this spirit can ever worship, even though his compliance be otherwise exact with all God's appointments. The absence of this spirit, however, on the part of the worshiper evidently does not affect the appointment in relation to its being an ordinance of acceptable worship. The contribution may be an ordinance of worship, and yet ceases to be such to him who observes it not in the right spirit. We must not expect to find in the acts belonging to this or any other ordinance that which will evoke the proper spirit. Ordinances are not established to produce this spirit, but to present a way in which the Christian may offer acceptable worship to God. Hence the Apostle Paul attempts to evoke this spirit, in reference to the contribution, by presenting the grandest considerations that ever engaged the mind or heart of mortal, not excepting even the love of God and the condescension of Jesus Christ. We can but ask the reader to refer to them in the various places where this ordinance is alluded to in his epistles, and analyze them for himself.

Before dismissing this especial point, however, we must be permitted to ask a few questions calculated to involve in doubt, if not in unsoundness, the position of those who differ from us. We, in common with a large number of the existing denominational churches, observe in our weekly assemblies what is called the contribution. The practice exists. We wish to know what authority it bears? Is it of God, or of man? If of man, when was this human device introduced into the church, and by whom? The historic account in Acts ii., 42, being the earliest mention we have of this matter, it must be, upon the latter supposition the first instance of human innovation, and hence can not be ignored. How will you proceed to prove it of

human paternity, and claim for the other practices of the church there mentioned divine authority? If you escape from this difficulty by admitting them all to be divinely warranted, and then claim that the contribution was designed to have only a temporary continuance, in the absence of scriptural evidence to sustain such an opinion, do you not assign a similar fate to all the other items with which it stands so intimately connected? Are you prepared for this wholesale repudiation of divine order and ordinances? If you affirm the fact of subsequent abrogation, of course you are expected to state when and where it occurred, and by whose authority. Can you do this? The words of Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians, "that there be no collections when I come," lends not the shadow of support to such a conclusion. For in the second epistle, when speaking of the same thing, he clearly explains what he designed by this injunction, as being nothing more than urging them not to put off the collection until he came; inasmuch as having boasted to the churches of Macedonia that "Corinth was ready" a year before, he was unwilling that the Macedonian brethren who would accompany him thither should find them unprepared, and therefore mortify him and the church at Corinth in this "confident boasting." All admit that these words demand that collections should be made before he reached them, but certainly no one can construe them to forbid collections being continued after he left them. No such liberty can be tolerated in construing the writings of any man, and in this instance such a construction only finds a feeble plausibility as it may borrow strength from the idea that, as soon as the great distress which was known to exist at that time among the Jerusalem brethren was relieved, its continuance would be unnecessary. This is certainly interpreting the doubtful by the false, and that it may appear such, it will only be necessary to quote the passage relied upon to sustain the idea, and offer a few remarks upon it. It occurs in Romans xv., 25, 26, and reads as follows: "But now I go to Jerusalem to minister unto the saints, for it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem."

Unfortunately for those who rely upon this passage to sustain their theory of the occasional obligation of the contribution, the word which they regard as favoring such a limitation is found neither with such a signification in the original, nor at all in the reading of the late translation by H. T. Anderson. We allude to the word *certain*, in the above quotation from the common version. It is, nevertheless, urged that inasmuch as the contribution in this case had a definite object (the relief of "poor saints") its observance is only proper when a like definite object requires it. This evidently bases the whole obligation of the contribution not only upon a false foundation, as we have before shown, but also makes that which is the continual occa-

sion of its observance both a contingency and a cause. The plea is therefore destructive to itself. The fact of the Saviour's saying "the poor you have always with you" dissipates, not only the idea of contingency, but does also, on the above supposition as a cause, if it prove any thing, prove beyond all controversy that the church should observe the contribution regularly and continually. Neither can such theorists claim that a condition of things precisely similar to those then existing is required to justify its practice now that the number of sufferers must be as great and no greater—that they must be located at one and the same place—that they must have become destitute in consequence of persecution—or that the relief sent must be by the hands of an apostle. None are so silly as to affirm this. But it is urged generally that this contribution was made directly with reference to and on account of the special distress! then prevailing. Does the passage warrant such an idea? If I were to announce publicly that I was going to Richmond to carry to the poor saints of that place a contribution which it had pleased the brethren of Lexington and Cincinnati to make, would the reader be authorized to infer that the money was collected by the churches in view of this particular case, rather than that these churches, having a treasury in which they were in the habit of keeping in store somewhat for such purposes, had appropriated the whole or a part from it for this particular case? If it were known that this treasury was established for a purpose identical with the one which carried me to Richmond, no one would be at liberty to suppose any thing else than that it was appropriated from that treasury. Such was precisely the case cited in Romans. If the passage can be tortured to express the idea that the contribution is only to be observed under appeals made by abject and clearly ascertained poverty, it will, by the same liberty of interpretation, forbid our doing it then, unless matters otherwise conform to the other peculiarities of this case. It is not difficult to see that this rigid mode of interpretation would soon overthrow all the authority we now derive from precedent. Circumstances may be such as to make the demand on our liberality more imperative, just as there are occasions when prayer seems more appropriate and when it contemplates a particular thing as its special burden, but these can never weaken or strengthen the force of the institution itself, resting as it does on a basis independent altogether of what is purely occasional. There is nothing in these occurrences to alter the operations of the institution, in order to meet the requirement of such cases. For the church must support its poor, whether they be few or many, and by means of this institution can make provision commensurate with the amount or degree of want which may exist at all times. But by anticipating objections, not contained in the body of A. G. 's article, we have digressed and must therefore return.

The fact that weekly contribution was observed by the primitive churches under the direction and sanction of the apostles—the absence of any subsequent legislation annulling its practice, and the existence at this time of the same reasons which seem to have occasioned its institution, leave us no room to dispute or disregard its obligation at the present time. Its name, its place, and its rank among the various items of religious duty, service, or worship, have been candidly considered by us. Of those who differ from us in relation to its obligation or classification, we ask a development of their views and a candid consideration of the difficulties which seem to involve any conception of it other than that which we have given. Especially are we desirous of knowing whether they will regard it as standing on the same level with other benevolent acts, and assign that which is solemnly done by the congregation in its assemblies on the Lord's day, the same rank with that which is individually done as an act of charity on any day indiscriminately. We make this request of our brethren at large, for we can not believe that they will commit themselves to the views of our reviewer, who testifies that the "ministering to the saints," the "sabbath" and "instrumental music," occupy one and the same plane. In the mean time, however, we would request him, in view of his declaration, that the other things enumerated by him are "of the earth, earthy, and "from the nature of things excluded as acts of worship from God's spiritual temple," to trace the correspondence between these and the contribution, showing their points of identity, and then enlighten us as to what "nature of things" it is which excludes it from being an ordinance of worship. In justice to himself this task becomes necessary, and especially so in view of the admissions in a subsequent paragraph, in which he says, "that it should take the form of a weekly contribution, even to the just designation of 'the contribution,' " would seem entirely in harmony with the spirit and genius of the gospel.

Against regarding it an ordinance of worship, he presents an Objection, which to be clearly apprehended requires us to quote in full the following paragraph: "If worship at all, the act itself, the contribution, must be performed. Would not this deprive the ones for whose benefit the ordinance was given of all participation in the worship, so far as the ordinance goes? Was there ever an ordinance of religion given of God for one class of persons to the exclusion of another under any dispensation? The Lord's day, the Lord's house, the Lord's table, singing and prayer are for all God's people, but the fellowship excludes the Lord's poor from any participation as an act of worship."

The first error into which the writer has fallen is in assuming that the ordinance is for the benefit of one class only in the church. This is no less a mistake than his supposition that it terminates in "food and raiment." As high as the spiritual design and effect of the con-



tribution are above the contingent considerations of carnal relief, so far does the truly enlarged privileges of the institution in relation to all classes reach beyond the limitations expressed above. To the attentive reader of the New Testament it is perfectly clear that Paul urges that both the "giver" and "receiver" are benefited, even in the low sense of temporal blessings. Without, therefore discussing the error regarding the institution as established for the exclusive benefit of the "poor" we simply refer the reader to the second letter to the Corinthians, ix., 8-13 inclusive.

The second error is in affirming that the "poor" would be necessarily excluded from participating in the act of ministering or giving. Of course, we can only understand him that poverty would be the cause of such exclusion. Following the law of giving "as he is prospered, the rich would give of his abundance, and the poor according to his poverty." If his poverty is so extreme as to leave him no "crumb" from the proceeds of his own toil, he would still be enabled by reason of his having received bountifully from the church, to give some fractional part of this, which he should regard as expressive of his prosperity. Such a case, therefore, can never exist under the operations of the institution; but, being supposed, affords an opportunity to vindicate in this simple manner the equalizing effects of the institution in its privileges to persons of all classes and conditions in the church, and thus to attest the divine wisdom and benevolence exercised in its appointment. The objection is, therefore, in point of fact, worthless. The poor can and must give as well as the rich.

The idea of "participation" is located not so much in the act of giving (where A. G. placed it), as it is in the equality of blessings produced by it, and that community of feeling and sympathy evinced through it. A whole congregation in the same manner participate in the prayers of the church, although there is but one of the entire number who speaks. Participation in most of the ordinances of public worship is independent of the performance of precisely similar acts, upon the part of all. If this were not the case and exclusion from worship followed as a consequence to every one who did not perform the act, the worship of God would become more exclusive, perhaps, under any other ordinance of the church than under the contribution. For it is a significant fact in respect to this ordinance that all can participate in its blessings, both temporal and spiritual, by act and otherwise, to the full extent and demands of their several capacities and necessary situations. In no other is there furnished the same evidence of our being the children of Him who is good unto all and whose care is over all. Nor is there another which so fully discloses the wondrous provisions of this grace, through that chain of dependence, which binds all the members of the body of Christ together in

## DESTINY OF THE WICKED.

THE controversy in reference to the eternal punishment of the wicked, like many other controversies, has been greatly prolonged, by the want of system with which it has been conducted. This want betrays itself in reference both to the sources from which evidence is drawn and the arrangement of the points in dispute. The two great sources from which evidence is drawn, are speculative philosophy and the Bible; and the disputants often pass rapidly from one of these to the other without proper discrimination between them. When both parties are believers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the testimony of the latter should be regarded as all sufficient; for no speculative conclusion, however potent the logic from which it springs, can invalidate the testimony of God's word, nor is any such conclusion needed by the believer to confirm the testimony of the Scriptures. A man shows his faith in the word of God by relying implicitly upon its statements. But if one of the parties is an unbeliever, the question which they ought first to discuss is not whether reason teaches the fate of the sinner; for the believer is little concerned about the teachings of reason upon such a subject; but whether the Bible is the word of God. Only when both debaters are unbelievers, and have, therefore, nothing more certain to rely upon, is it proper to discuss the question by the light of speculative philosophy. These observations are made, not because truth has any thing really to fear from speculative philosophy, but because she has no use for it in the presence of a safer guide. She can defend herself against all assaults which come from that quarter; but she chooses to arm herself with better weapons than the armory of speculation can furnish. A strict observance of this necessary distinction would narrow the ground of controversy, and bring the parties into closer conflict, so that error would have less room in which to play, and the triumph of truth would be more decisive.

A similar discrimination is necessary in reference to the points at issue. It is idle to dispute about the duration or severity of future punishment, until it is first decided that some future punishment will be inflicted. It is idle, too, to discuss the meaning of the word eternal, until you first ascertain definitely to what punishment that term is applied. So in reference to all the facts which constitute the different stages in the progress of the sinner's future history. Each should be made a separate subject of thought, and the issue upon each should be separately decided. We should decide, first, whether there is any punishment at all after death. If not, the whole discussion

ends at its beginning. If there is, then it is proper to make it a subject of inquiry in reference to all its characteristics, and each of these separately. We should inquire when it begins, what is its degree of severity, what changes will it undergo, and how long will it continue.

Our present inquiry is designed primarily for those who believe that the Scriptures are inspired of God. We have nothing to do, therefore, with any facts, real or supposed, not mentioned in the Bible. If, when the testimony of this book is exhibited, any one should assert that a book containing such testimony can not be the word of God, it would be proper to open with him a discussion as to the authenticity of the Bible, thus defending the doctrine, by defending the book which announces it. But we will not anticipate such a circumstance in the present essay.

We will endeavor, while prosecuting our inquiry, to bear in mind the arrangement of thought above indicated. We will advance by progressive steps, and let each step we take be such, that if it rest not on solid ground it shall be the last, or if it be sustained, it shall prepare the way for the next. These steps shall be marked by six distinct propositions, each one of which shall stand upon its own merits, and shall be demonstrated by unambiguous statements of the word of God, while the whole of them shall constitute a complete statement of the future destiny of the wicked.

PROPOSITION 1. *There is punishment for sin after death.*

We do not affirm, in this proposition, that *all* sins are punished after death; for sins which are forgiven are necessarily excluded. Of these God declares in the New Covenant: "I will remember them no more." In all our propositions we shall have in view only those whose sins remain unforgiven at the close of the present life. Neither does our present proposition deny that there is punishment for sin *before* death. Of this we now have nothing to say. Nor do we now affirm any thing at all in reference to the nature or duration of punishment after death. We simply assert that there is some kind of punishment for sin after the death of the unforgiven sinner. If this proposition is not sustained, our inquiry terminates right here. If it is, we may then proceed to make some other inquiries in reference to that punishment. Here the parties to the controversy should join issue, and remain here till this issue is settled.

For proof of this proposition, we select a single statement of Jesus, in which its truth is declared without the slightest ambiguity or obscurity. We quote it as expressed by both Matthew and Mark:

"Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. x., 28.)

"Fear not them that kill the body, but after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: fear him,

who after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell. Yes, I say to you, fear him." (Luke xii., 4, 5.)

It concerns us not in the least, at present, to inquire what precisely is meant by Luke's expression "cast into hell," and Matthew's equivalent expression "destroy both soul and body in hell." All that concerns us now is, that it is something to *fear*, and that it comes *after death*. These two facts are as plainly declared in the passage as human speech can utter them. It is also perfectly certain that this which is after death is to be feared as the consequence of sin; for by the expression "them that kill the body" is evidently meant human beings, and by "him who has authority to cast into hell," is meant God. The fear of man, which leads to sin, is put in contrast with the fear of God, which leads to righteousness; and the command to fear God is enforced by the consequence of not fearing him, which is to be *cast into hell after death*.

All attempts to evade the full force of this proof are utterly fruitless and frivolous. If it be urged that while it is true that God has authority to cast into hell after death, he certainly will not do so; we answer, then it is not a thing to be feared; for man can not fear that which he knows will not take place. Moreover, in that case, Jesus knew that what he was bidding them to fear could not possibly have any real existence, and was therefore guilty of deception, while mocking the fears of his ignorant disciples. But this is contrary to the assumption with which we set out, that the word of God is true and Jesus divine. He bids us fear this punishment after death, or fear God on account of it, and this is proof to every believer that it will certainly be inflicted on all who comply not with the conditions of escape. We now hold that our first proposition is demonstrated, and its truth will be again involved in" the truth of every proposition yet to be presented.

PROP. 2. *There is punishment for sin in hades.*

At death the souls of all men leave the body. Their presence can no longer be detected by sight or by sound, and the state into which they have gone is invisible. To that state the Greeks gave the name *hades*. This term means, etymologically, *the unseen*, but is used in an appropriated sense for the *unseen abode of spirits*. They so called it, because the spirits which had entered there, were gone beyond the reach of human sense, and whether far or near no man could tell. Whether above the sky or beneath the ground, or far beyond the ocean's wave, they knew not. They only knew that it was invisible, that it was, in the familiar language of our own poet, an "undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveler returns." In our common English version, this term is incorrectly rendered *hell*, and once the *grave*. In our quotations we shall render it *hades*.

In this state the condition of the righteous is represented by vari-

ous expressions indicative of tranquil enjoyment. The dying thief went into "Paradise;" the spirit of Lazarus was borne into "Abraham's bosom," where he was "comforted;" the departed saints are "asleep in Jesus;" they "rest from their labors." All these expressions belong to the disembodied state; none of them except the first to the state which follows the resurrection.

In the same state the wicked suffer punishment. For proof of this, we refer, first, to the case of the rich man and Lazarus. It is said: "The rich man *died*, and was buried, and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in *torments*, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." It is here positively asserted that the rich man *died*, and the other events are located *after* his death. One of these events is his burial. This refers necessarily to his body alone, for the spirit is never buried. It is said, that in *hades* he was in *torments*. But the spirit alone enters *hades*, seeing that *hades* is the abode of disembodied spirits; hence, it is as certain as the words of Jesus, that the rich man's spirit suffered *torments* in *hades*. It is equally certain that these *torments* were in consequence of sin, and that others who do not repent will meet the same fate; for the rich man begs: "I beseech you, father, that you send Lazarus to my father's house; for I have five brothers; that he may testify to them, lest they also come to this place of torment; if one should go to them from the dead, they will *repent*." Abraham said to him: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded though one should rise from the dead."

There is only one possible method of evading the force of this proof, and that is, to deny that the incident represents the actual condition of a disembodied spirit. This is sometimes attempted. It is urged that the phraseology is inconsistent with the nature of disembodied spirits; for the rich man is represented as lifting up his *eyes*, and calling for *water* to cool his *tongue*, while Lazarus is represented as resting in Abraham's *bosom*, and is requested to dip his *finger* in water. But this objection is frivolous in the extreme; for we are compelled, whether we would or not, to conceive and speak of spirits as possessing such members as belong to us in this life. This necessity is so imperious, that the Scriptures even speak of the finger and hand and arm, and ear and mouth and eye of God. It would have been impossible for the Saviour to convey in words a vivid idea of the sufferings of a spirit without using this very phraseology.

But those who urge this objection insist that the account of the rich man and Lazarus is a parable drawn from the imagination to illustrate the dealings of God with the Jews and the Gentiles. The rich man, in this rich interpretation, represents the Jews while they were the chosen people of God, his death their rejection by God, and his *torments* in *hades* the humiliation and dispersion of the Jews. The

beggar at the rich man's gate represents the Gentiles before the church was opened to them, his death their passage into the church, and his resting in Abraham's bosom their comfort in the church of Christ. But see in what absurdities this assumption involves the narrative. The Gentiles, in the person of Lazarus, die in order to get into the church; they are then borne into it by angels, instead of being brought in by preachers. After they are in the church they can give no relief, not even a drop of water, to the poor Jews out of the church, for an impassable gulf is placed between those in the church and those out of it. Then they are entreated to leave the church and go back to their unconverted state again, to warn certain unconverted Jews. In the mean time, the Jews, in the person of the rich man, are playing antics quite as ludicrous. They die and are buried in order to get out of the church. There is then an impassable gulf between them and the church, so that neither can they get back into the church, nor can those already in it get out. Then, to cap the climax of their misery, they are greatly concerned about their five brothers, lest they should get out of the church, though they are already out, and the impassable gulf so fixed that they can never get in. Such is the confusion in which the hapless Universalist finds himself involved while seeking to evade the plain words of Jesus. Truly the way of the transgressor is hard.

It is difficult to believe that an honest soul could accept this absurd evasion. Even if its absurdities could be removed, and it could be admitted that the story is used to illustrate the case of the Jews and Gentiles, still the facts of the story remain unchanged. That certain facts are used to illustrate certain others does not in the least affect the reality of the former. On the Universalist's own hypothesis, therefore, we still have the fact that the rich man, after his death and the burial of his body, was in torments in hades, sought relief which he could not obtain, and held a conversation in reference to the effect upon living sinners of the return of one from the dead to testify of the torments awaiting them in hades. Such is the indisputable import of the narrative itself; and when we come to understand the real proposition which it was intended to sustain, we shall find that no other meaning could possibly have answered the Saviour's purpose. That proposition is stated in the 13th verse of the chapter, in these words: "You can not serve God and Mammon." The covetous Pharisees derided the saying. Seeing that they were servants of Mammon, yet highly esteemed among men, he turned upon them and amended his proposition by this addition to it: "That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." To prove, now, that the successful servant of Mammon, though highly esteemed among men, is an abomination in the sight of God, the story of Lazarus and the rich man is introduced. One of the characters is the successful

and highly-esteemed servant of Mammon—"a rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen, and feasting sumptuously every day." Never was the picture drawn, in so few words as these, of that which the world most admires and strives most to imitate. The other character is he who, of all human beings, is least esteemed among men—"a poor man, full of sores, laid at the rich man's gate, and begging for the crumbs that fell from his table." Any man on earth, knowing nothing more of the two characters than these visible circumstances, would say that the former is the delight of God—an honorable and virtuous man, whose labors God has delighted to bless. He would say of the latter, that the curse of God rests upon him, and he is now enduring the wretched consequences of a misspent life. Thus far, then, the cases presented contain no proof of the Saviour's proposition, for as yet, the one highly esteemed among men appears also to be the favored of God. Jesus follows their history till each of them dies; but here, so far as their bodies are concerned, the case remains the same, for the rich man is buried with all the respect that he commanded in life, while the curse of God seems to follow the very dust of the beggar, which is trundled away like the carcase of a beast. Of necessity Jesus must follow their history further still, before it can at all answer the demands of his argument; but when he draws aside the curtain which hides from us the invisible world, the dread truthfulness of his proposition flashes suddenly and irresistibly upon us. Here the condition of men declares the esteem in which they are held by God alone; for no human praise or blame can follow the spirit through the gates of death. And here we behold the highly esteemed rich man crying for help amid unspeakable torments, while the despised beggar is escorted by angels into a place of comfort. The proposition of Jesus stands demonstrated, and the world is told in unmistakable terms that the wicked suffer torments in hades.

We find another proof of our second proposition in the figurative use of the term hades and its corresponding Hebrew word. It is frequently used figuratively in the Old Testament, and sometimes in the New. When David sings of the deep troubles in which he had been engulfed, he expresses himself thus: "When the waves of death compassed me, the floods of ungodly men made me afraid, the sorrows of hades compassed me about, the snares of death prevented me." (Psalm cxvi., 3.) Here hades and death are distinguished, and the "sorrows of hades" is one of the images to represent his sufferings. But if the conception of hades had nothing of suffering in it, he could not possibly have so expressed himself. If the disembodied state is to all men a state of rest and enjoyment, it would be as incongruous to speak of the sorrows of hades as of the torments of heaven.

Jonah uses the term in the same way when describing the intensity of his agony while shut up in the bowels of the great fish for three

days and nights. His physical suffering must have been great, besides the mental agony consequent upon the remembrance of his sin, and the consciousness that he was floating about in the great depths of the sea. Nothing experienced in this life could adequately portray his wretchedness; hence he borrows an image of horror from the spirit world, and exclaims: "I cried by reason of my affliction to the Lord, and he heard me; *out of the belly of hades* I cried, and thou didst hear my voice;" The Saviour, when depicting the wretchedness that would come upon the city of Capernaum, expresses himself in the same style: "Thou, Capernaum, who art exalted to heaven, shalt be "brought down to hades." Here the high privileges which this wicked city had enjoyed are represented by the term *heaven*, while the miserable contrast yet before it is depicted by the term *hades*.

This usage, found on the lips of inspired men throughout the Jewish ages, shows that the idea of indescribable misery was deeply engraven upon the Hebrew idea of hades, so that the darkest of all images were those taken from the disembodied state. But it is only of the condition of the wicked there that this is true. To the righteous this same abode is represented by Job as a place "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." To Lazarus it was a place of comfort; to the thief on the cross it was paradise; and to all the dead who die in the Lord it is a Sabbath-keeping, where they rest from their labors. We dismiss, then, our second proposition, with all the assurance of its truth that the word of God can give. There is no certainty in human speech, and no reliance to be placed in the words of inspiration, if the unforgiven wicked do not suffer punishment in the disembodied state.

PROP. 3. *There will be a universal judgment at the end of the world.*

There have been many special judgments in this world, and to these the term, judgment frequently refers in the Scriptures. Jesus once said: "Now is the judgment of this World; now is the prince of this world cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the world, will draw all men to myself." This judgment is clearly that by which the sentence of death passed upon Jesus by the world was reversed in heaven, and the issue formed between him and the world was settled in his favor by his resurrection from the dead. But besides this, and all the judgments of this life, there is a judgment of which men are to be the subjects after their death. This is positively asserted by the apostle Paul. He says: "And as it is appointed to men once to die, and *after* this the judgment, so the Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and to those who look for him he will appear the second time, without a sin-offering, in order to salvation." (Heb. ix., 27, 28.) Here is a parallel between two events in the history of men, and two in the history of Christ. The latter are the facts that Christ once died for the sins of many, and that he will return to this earth in order to



the final salvation of those who look for him. The parallel facts are those appointed to men once to die, and *after* this the judgment. That Christ died, is compared with the fact that it is appointed to *men* to die; and this is equally appointed for all men. The fact that after his death he will come again, is compared with the fact that to men is appointed a judgment after death.

A silly subterfuge has been invented, by which the men here spoken of are declared to be the Jewish priests; and the judgment after death, that of their fellow-men upon their characters. I mention this, not for the purpose of gravely discussing its merits, for a child can see that the men to whom it is appointed once to die are all the men on earth; but for the purpose of showing that those who make the most desperate efforts to destroy the meaning of the passage are still unable to even obscure the fact that there is a *judgment after death*.

This passage does not inform us, in positive terms, at what time after death this judgment takes place, though its being made parallel to the fact that Jesus will come to the earth a second time, would, at least, suggest the thought that it will occur at his second coming. But we are not left to inference on this point; for other statements of the Scriptures in reference to it are distinct and positive. Jesus says: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here. The Queen of the South shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and condemn it; for she came from the most distant part of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, something greater than Solomon is here." (Matt. xii., 41, 42.) Now, the men of Nineveh and the Queen of the South had long been dead, and as they were yet to rise in the judgment, here is another proof that the judgment is after death. Moreover, as they were to *rise* in the judgment, and to rise *with* that generation, the judgment must take place when both they and the generation which lived with Jesus shall rise from the dead. When they rise, they will "rise in the judgment." But all other men will rise when they do; hence the judgment after death is also after the resurrection of the dead.

The time of the judgment is fixed with equal precision by the Apostle Peter, though in connection with another event. He says: "The heavens and the earth that now are, by the same word are kept in store, reserved for fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." (2 Peter iii., 7.) Here "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" is identified with the day to which this earth is reserved for fire, as for final destruction. Referring to the same day in a subsequent verse, he says: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth and the works

that are in it shall be burned up." This is an expansion of the thought previously expressed, that the present heavens and earth are reserved for fire; and the day is the same, for it is the day of the same event, called interchangeably "the day of the Lord," and "the day of judgment." Here, then, the very day of the judgment after death is again fixed, and is the day in which this earth and these heavens are to pass away. This harmonizes with the preceding fact, that it is to occur at the resurrection of the dead; for it is certain that the dead will rise immediately previous to the destruction of the world.

We have now only one more point to establish, in order to the complete demonstration of our present proposition. It is, that the judgment now spoken of will be universal. For proof of this we turn to Matt. xxv., 31. "When the Son of man shall come in his own glory, and all the holy angels with him, then will he sit on the throne of his own glory, and all nations shall be gathered before him; and he will separate them one from another, as a shepherd separates his sheep from the goats." A weak attempt is sometimes made by Universalists to find the fulfillment of this statement in the siege of Jerusalem; but no amount of ingenuity can torture the words into harmony with such an interpretation. There was no incident of that siege which can answer to the coming of the Son of man in his own glory, in company with all the holy angels. He came to the earth, then, in no sense adequate to the demands of this language. Much less can it be made to appear that all nations were gathered before him, and that he separated them one from another as a shepherd does his sheep from the goats. Not till those nations which have perished shall arise from the dead, so as to stand before him with the living, can all nations be gathered before him. Neither will he come in his own glory, attended by all the holy angels, and sit upon the throne of his own glory, till the final resurrection of the dead, and the day of judgment; for the scene here described is the scene of the final judgment, as is manifest both from the facts just noted, and from the nature of the separation which here takes place. The judge says that the one class shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the other into everlasting life. It will be a *universal* judgment, for "all nations" are to be subjects of it.

We have now demonstrated, by statements of the Scriptures which admit of no question as to their meaning, that there is a judgment after death; that it occurs immediately subsequent to the resurrection of the dead and the destruction of this earth; and that it will be a universal judgment of the human race.

Against this proposition one or two objections are sometimes urged, which are based, not upon Scripture statements, but upon the fitness of things. It is objected, that there is no necessity for such a judgment, because God, by his omniscience, already knows the character

of every human being, and the destiny due to each. And again, that there can be no propriety in judging men at the end of the world, after some of them have already been punished for thousands of years in hades; either the judgment ought to occur at the death of each man, before he is punished, thus making a continual judgment, or all punishment ought to be postponed till after the final judgment.

Both of these objections are based upon a misconception of the nature and design of the judgment. It is nowhere represented as a day of trial, in which God, by the evidence presented, may determine the deserts of men, for, as the objection insists, His omniscience precludes all necessity for this. On the contrary, it is a day for the public announcement to the universe of the decisions already formed, together with the reasons therefore. This appears from the description of the judgment given in the last passage under consideration. The King says to those on his right hand: "Come, you blessed, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the earth; for I was hungry, and you fed me; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in; naked, and you clothed me; I was sick, and you visited me; I, was in prison, and you came to me." And to those on the left he says: "Depart, you cursed for I was hungry, and you fed me not," etc. Here is a decision announced, not formed; and as it is announced, the reason for it is given. It must be observed, too, that this reason has exclusive reference to things done or left undone during the present life. This accords with Paul's statement that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done in the body*, according "to that he has done, whether it be good or bad." Inasmuch, then, as the decision is based upon the things done in the body, it is necessarily completed when the last deed in the body is done. It is fitting, therefore, that the suffering of the guilty should then begin, and it is equally fitting that the Judge should choose for the public announcement and vindication of that decision, a time when all men who have been and who are to be subjects of his judgment, together with all heavenly beings who take interest in it, could be assembled together to hear it at once. But no such time is possible except the one already chosen, the day which closes the earthly existence of man, after which no human being will be born, and none will die. There is no valid objection, then, to the universal judgment at the end of the world; but it harmonizes with the fitness of things, while it is a fixed fact in the government of God.

PROP. 4. *At the judgment, the wicked will be condemned to punishment which lies beyond it in eternity.*

We have traced the history of wicked spirits to the judgment of the great day, and have found that they suffer punishment in hades. But hades is not an eternal state. Being the state of disembodied spirits,

it necessarily terminates with the resurrection: hence Paul represents the rising saints as exclaiming, "O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?" And in his vision of the judgment, John saw "the sea give up the dead which were in it; and death and hades gave up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death." (Rev. ix., 13, 14.) When death and hades give up all the dead that are in them, they themselves must necessarily die; for there will be no more death, and therefore no more disembodiment of spirits. The end of these two states is represented in the vision by their being cast into the lake of fire.

When wicked spirits shall have passed through the punishment of hades, and shall have appeared, after reunion with their bodies, before the judgment-seat of Christ, their history will still be incomplete, and our present proposition covers another chapter in its progress. It affirms, first, that at the judgment they will be condemned. Of the truth of this affirmation we have an express declaration of Jesus himself. He says: "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." Here is an assertion of the universal resurrection of the dead; not of those dead in trespasses and sins; but of "all that are in the graves;" and a declaration that the resurrection of that portion of them who have done evil is a resurrection of condemnation. But condemnation implies a judgment in which it is pronounced; and we have already seen that the judgment follows immediately upon the resurrection. The condemnation, therefore, to which the wicked shall rise is a condemnation at the judgment. But condemnation necessarily implies punishment; hence we might assume that in this single statement of Jesus we have proof of our entire proposition. We have, however, more specific testimony to the punishment which follows the judgment in such passages as these: "The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the ungodly for the *day of judgment to be punished.*" (2 Peter ii., 9.) "The heavens and the earth that now are, are reserved for fire against the *day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*" (2 Peter iii., 7.) By these three statements of the word of God we hold it to be settled beyond all question that the ungodly will be condemned to punishment which lies beyond the final judgment. This proposition will be proved again and again in the proof of those yet to be submitted.

PROP. 5. *The punishment after the judgment is represented by words and phrases expressive of the utmost pain and desolation.*

There is nothing which produces so intense physical pain as the

application of fire to the flesh. When savage cruelty has exhausted every other method of torture, a resort to this always produces fresh pain. From this circumstance it arises that fire is the most terrific symbol of pain, both mental and physical, known to the human mind. It is frequently used as a symbol for the punishment of men, and for great mental agony. David exclaims, in reference to a period of intense suffering through which he had passed: "I was dumb with silence; I held my peace even from good, and my sorrow was stirred. My heart was hot within me; while I was musing *the fire* burned; then I spoke with my tongue, Lord, make me to know my end, and the measure of my days, what it is, that I may know how frail I am." (Psalm xxxix., 3.) Again: he says of the murmurings of Israel in the wilderness, and their punishment for it: "The Lord heard this and was wroth: so a *fire* was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel." (Psalm lxxviii., 21.)

Of the many passages in which this term is applied to the final punishment of the wicked, we select the following as entirely sufficient for our present purpose. In his own description of the judgment, which we have already proved to be such, Jesus represents himself as saying to those on his left hand: "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting *fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. xxv., 41.) The Apostle Paul, referring to the same event, uses the intensified expression "*flaming fire*." He says: "It is a righteous thing with God to repay affliction to those who afflict you, and to you that are afflicted, rest with us, at the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. i., 6-8.) The preposition *in* is here used before "*flaming fire*," rather than *with*, which we might expect, to harmonize strictly with the fact that the wicked are to be cast into the fire. That this punishment in flaming fire is to begin at the period demanded by our proposition, is manifest from the fact that it takes place "at the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven with his mighty angels," an event which, as we have already proved, constitutes a part of the judgment scene.

The vision of John presents the same punishment in a still more appalling light, by spreading the fire into a vast lake, and intermingling it with brimstone. He says: "The fearful, and the unbelieving, and the detestable, and murderers, and lewd persons, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." (Rev. xxi., 5-8.)

Whether these expressions be regarded as literal descriptions, or as merely symbolic representations of final punishment, affects not our proposition. It is sufficient that they are the most intense ex-

pressions of pain which human language furnishes. It is impossible to express more; and as God has expressed this much, it is vain for the wicked to expect less.

But these are not the only terms employed to describe that punishment. These are enough to indicate the external pain that will be inflicted; but there are other aspects of the sufferer's condition, which demand the use of other expressions. If the human imagination were taxed to its utmost for a picture of desolation and anguish, it could not do more than to conceive a person enveloped in darkness, where not a single object could be seen, not even his own person, and surrounded continually with weeping from invisible sufferers, and the gnashing of invisible teeth. Yet, such is the Saviour's portraiture of the desolation and anguish which shall characterize the last state of the unforgiven sinner. We find it in the parable of the talents. There are three circumstances which prove incontestably that the settlement with the servants in this parable represents the final judgment. 1. There is nothing in the mediatorial reign analogous to the return of the master of the servants, after a long time, to settle with them, except the Lord's return to judgment. 2. The master says to each of the faithful servants: "You have been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many." This implies a great exaltation of the faithful servants, but there is no exaltation of the servants of God above their earthly condition, until they are exalted to heaven. 3. The Master says to each of the faithful servants: "Enter into the joy of thy Lord." But the joy of the Christian's Lord, as described by Paul, is the joy of taking his seat at the right hand of the throne of God (Heb. xii., 2); and when his faithful servants enter into his joy, it will be to sit down with him on his Father's throne. (Rev. iii., 21.) Now while these things, which can but refer to the final judgment, are said to the faithful servants; at the same time, it is said of the other: "Cast the unprofitable servant into outer darkness. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. xxv., 30.) Such desolation, then, as wandering in outer darkness; such sorrow as is indicated by the weeping of a vast multitude, for multitudes will be there, and such indications of remorse as the gnashing of teeth by unseen companions, will be the portion of the unforgiven when this world shall be no more. By a bold and majestic metaphor the Apostle Judas calls one class of these doomed and miserable beings, "*wandering stars*, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." They have broken away from their proper orbit, and, like blazing comets, are darting swiftly away from the great centre of light, to which they shall return no more. Growing dimmer as they pass away, they quench their light at last in that outer darkness which lies beyond the sun's most distant ray; for they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power."

This abode of the lost, whose pain is a lake of fire and brimstone, and whose desolation is blackness of darkness, while its anguish is weeping and gnashing of teeth, must have a name. In applying names to things of the unseen universe, the Holy Spirit has not invented a new vocabulary, but has selected from human speech such existing terms as could, with as little change of meaning as possible, be transferred to the new objects. Thus, the term *fire*, as we have seen, and the terms *darkness*, *weeping*, and *gnashing of teeth*, have been transferred to the future state of the wicked without any change of meaning. The term *messenger*, in Greek, became the name of *angels*, who are sent on messages of mercy to the world. The term *heaven* has undergone a similar transfer. Originally, as in the first chapter of Genesis, and many other places in the Bible, it meant the visible dome of air above us. In that usage, it was the most lofty and glorious term in human speech, because it was the name of the most glorious object which human eyes ever beheld. When, therefore, a place of infinite and eternal glory was to be revealed, where the sun never sets, and where no storms nor darkness are ever known, there was just one word, and only one in human speech, which had already a meaning analogous to it, and it was called *heaven*.

In the same way originated the name by which the final abode of the wicked is distinguished. Near Jerusalem there was a deep narrow gorge in the mountains, called Gehenna, or the Valley of Hinnom. In the times of Jewish idolatry this valley was stained with the blood of their innocent children, which "were burned with fire for burnt offerings to Baal." (Jer. xix., 1-6.) The deepest depths of human guilt and misery were here combined; the guilt of men who compelled the sacrifice, and the misery of the children who were burned, and of the mothers from whose breasts they were torn to be cast into the fiery furnace. When these abominations were suppressed, the most horrible associations were connected with that place. To the superstitious Jew it was a resort of ghosts and hobgoblins, and to the pious it was a place of unspeakable horror. There was no other word in Jewish speech so full of this meaning, and this word Jesus seized upon as the name of that final state where the wicked are enveloped in fire and darkness and continual weeping. He called it *gehenna*, and this, when translated into English, is *hell*.

That the term is thus employed by Jesus is susceptible of the clearest proof, without much multiplication of words. Jesus says: "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. x., 28.) Now the soul and body are separated at death; the soul entering hades, the body the grave. They are then in different states. But when they are both destroyed in hell they must be in the same state, for they share the same fate. This can

not be till after the resurrection, when the soul returns from hades, and the body from the grave, and the two are reunited. The destruction of both soul and body in *hell*, then, must take place after the resurrection of the dead, and can be no other than the punishment to which the unforgiven are then to be condemned. The conclusion is irresistible, *hell* is the *name* of that state of punishment.

This conclusion springs with equal necessity from another statement of Jesus. He says to his own disciples: "It is better for you to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go away into hell, into the fire that is not quenched, where their worm dies not, and their fire is not quenched." (Mark ix., 43-48.) Here, going away into hell is the antithesis of entering into life, and is made the alternative. But the disciples had already entered into life in the only sense true of this world and of hades. They enjoyed that relation of spirit to God, which constitutes Christian life in this world, and the rest of the soul in the disembodied state. The only life which they had not yet entered is that which follows the resurrection of the body, a life of both soul and body, which shall never end. As the alternative is to enter that life, or go into hell, the latter expression must necessarily refer to that condemnation to punishment, which, at the judgment, will be the doom of those who enter not into eternal life.

Such is the usage of the term *gehenna*, the only word properly translated *hell*. This application of it originated with Jesus, and had significance, at first, only among the Jews. But the publication of the narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in which alone it occurs, throughout the Gentile world, soon made it familiar to all the nations who heard the gospel. That which once was a name of terror only to the heart of the Jew has thus become a tocsin of alarm to every soul that sins, in almost every quarter of the globe. The infidel and the skeptic affect to smile at the terror which it inspires, as a result of superstition; but while the readers of the New Testament hear it emphasized by the lips of Jesus, who alternately wraps it in flame, clothes it in darkness, and fills it with weeping and gnashing of teeth, they will still believe that it is better to lose an eye, a hand, a foot, and all that a man has, rather than "go away into hell." With this most terrific of all the words in human speech still trembling on our lips, we dismiss our fifth proposition, assured that it will not be questioned by one who believes the Bible.

PROP. 6. *The punishment after the judgment will be endless.*

In the progress of our investigation, we have found two distinct states of suffering after death, separated from each other by the judgment; one of them in hades, this side the judgment; the other in eternity, beyond the judgment. They differ, in that the former is confined to the disembodied spirit, while the latter involves both soul



and body. They differ, also, as to some of the epithets applied to them, and they differ in duration. The former necessarily terminates with the resurrection; we now affirm of the latter, that it will never end. We have reserved the question of duration to this stage of the inquiry, because it is naturally and logically the last question in the series. If there is no punishment after the final judgment, then the question of duration is excluded, and all debate upon it is labor lost. If there is, still the question of duration is comparatively of little value, unless the punishment possess some degree of severity. But having settled both of these questions, the question of duration properly comes in to close the inquiry.

The best way to test the exact meaning of a word in familiar use, is to write it, or pronounce it by itself, and note what idea it conveys to the mind. We write down, then, the word *everlasting*. We leave a space on each side of it, and put it in different type, that it may be perfectly isolated; EVERLASTING. There it stands, connected with no other words which might modify its meaning, but speaking simply the idea which it contains within itself. What idea is this? It may be safely ventured, that to every single mind acquainted with the English language it conveys instantaneously one and the same idea, the idea of endless duration. Even with men who have trained themselves to attach to it some other signification, the first impulse of the mind is the same, and it requires a second thought to reach another meaning. No more invariably does the pendulum, when disturbed, drop back to a perpendicular than the mind drops upon this meaning, when the eye or the ear catches this word. It may, like the pendulum, vibrate afterward to other points, but this is invariably its first motion. This statement met with a very striking illustration a few years since, in the course of a public discussion in the West, on Universalism. The gentleman opposing this system, had observed how frequently Universalists themselves use the terms everlasting and eternal in their proper sense, when they are not on their guard. He determined, therefore, to take full advantage of this circumstance in the discussion. He laid aside a piece of paper, on which to note down, if possible, one or more instances of this usage in every speech his opponent delivered. The device proved a complete success. Near the close of the debate, when the issue upon the meaning of this term had been distinctly joined, he addressed the audience somewhat as follows: "My opponent is now laboring to prove that the word everlasting has not the meaning which is commonly attached to it; that it designates no definite period, but may mean as short a period as three days and three nights. Such is his position while he is before the audience to maintain his favorite dogma. But there is a secret here which I must now disclose. You are aware that when a man has committed murder, he hides the dread secret effectually in the

presence of others. But if you could stand by his bedside at night, and listen to his mutterings amid the visions which disturb his rest, that terrible secret would be divulged; for there the spirit unconsciously speaks itself. Well, I have been standing by the bedside of my opponent, paper in hand, and have noted some of the truthful mutterings of his soul, while he was unconscious of my presence. By this means, I have discovered a secret of his thoughts, which he is carefully concealing from you. It is this: in his secret soul he knows that the meaning which we attach to 'the terms eternal and everlasting is their true meaning. In proof of this, listen to some sentences which I have written down as they fell from his lips." He then read to the audience two sentences from each speech which the Universalist had delivered, in which the term was used in its proper sense. The effect was overwhelming. It shows that there is a meaning fixed in the word which can not be divorced from it, but will continue to reassert itself whenever the attempt is made.

We deem it unnecessary to say more upon the literal meaning of the term everlasting, except to remark that its etymology stamps its meaning upon it unmistakably. Compounded of two most familiar terms, *ever* and *lasting*, it reads out its meaning to every child that has learned to pronounce these terms. The same is true of the Greek original, which is compounded of *aei*, *always*, and *oon*, *being—always*

We now proceed to show that this term is applied to the punishment which lies beyond the judgment. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, where we have already proved that the Saviour speaks of the last judgment, he represents himself as saying to the wicked: "Depart, you cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels." And at the close of that description, he says of the same parties: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Here, now, is the same punishment of which we spoke in our fourth and fifth propositions, a punishment to which the wicked are sentenced at the final judgment, and which, therefore, lies beyond it; and to this punishment is applied the term everlasting. If this term, then, as here employed, has its literal meaning, there is an end of controversy on our present proposition. How shall this be determined?

It is a law of language, as fixed and unchangeable as any law of nature, that words must be understood literally, except where there is something in the context to indicate that they are employed figuratively. Is there any thing to require this in the present instance? It is sometimes urged that the term *punishment* so requires, from the fact that all just punishment must be corrective, and therefore can not be unending. We admit that some just punishment is corrective, but it is not asserted in the Scriptures that such is the design of the punishment beyond the judgment, nor can we possibly know any thing

of it except what the Scriptures teach. To assume, therefore, that it is corrective, is to settle the question by assumption instead of proof. The punishment called everlasting may be, for aught that we know, and for aught that the Scriptures declare, simply punitive, like the execution of a murderer, or the destruction of Sodom. There is nothing in this term, therefore, to limit the meaning of the word everlasting; but the latter term gives to the former the idea of endless continuance.

The term everlasting is sometimes applied, by hyperbole, to things which will come to an end; as "the everlasting hills," the "everlasting covenant" with Abraham. But in all such cases we learn the fact, not by the nature of the term, but by other statements of the word of God; and but for these other statements we could not possibly suppose that these things would be less than *ever* lasting. In the case before us there are no statements to thus modify the meaning of the term, and therefore it must stand unlimited.

It is urged that the term sometimes means *age-lasting*. But what is an age? In its narrower sense it is the period in which a generation of men exists on earth; and in its wider sense it means the same of a nation. It is measured by the birth and the death of individuals or of nations. But in that state beyond the final judgment, where we have located the punishment in question, there are no ages. There will never be another individual born, nor will another die. Nations will rise and fall no more. There are no alternating nights and days, nor months and years, for time itself shall expire as that period is ushered in. The term *age-lasting*, therefore, in its temporal sense, can not apply to that state. In another sense, it is possible that it may. If the birth from the grave, with which that state begins, and the duration without end, in which it continues, may be styled an age, then all that belongs to it may be styled *age-lasting*. But in this sense *age-lasting* would be but another expression for everlasting. In the only sense, therefore, in which the term could possibly apply to the punishment beyond the judgment, the meaning is everlasting, and our proposition is established.

It is now clear that, whatever may be the other uses or senses of the word everlasting, when applied to things beyond the end of time it can have but one meaning. There are no temporal things there, and there is only one word of duration employed to project thought into that period. All things that are there, both the things of heaven and the things of hell, are stamped with the one word, *everlasting*, and then the curtain of revelation drops, leaving the human mind to ponder the deep significance of that word, until the gates of heaven or the pit of perdition shall open to receive it forever.

We have now traversed the entire compass of our subject, and delineated the entire future destiny of the wicked. We have not drawn

upon conjecture or imagination for a single thought. We have not drawn our conclusions from doubtful premises. But the reader will bear witness that we have allowed plain and unambiguous statements of the word of God to settle every issue, without straining their meaning or obscuring the exact force of their terms. The conclusions deduced, or rather the divine statements made, are the most fearful which human speech was ever employed to communicate. They tell us that those who die without obtaining the pardon of sins committed here will enter immediately, in hades, into punishment the intensity of which is represented by flames of fire. This state of punishment is followed by a resurrection from the dead. The sinner stands before the judgment-seat of Christ, in the presence of all men and all angels, where his iniquities are enumerated, and he is condemned to punishment yet in the future. He goes away into hell, where the fire of his burning is never quenched; where the worm which feeds upon him never dies; where the darkness is relieved by no ray of light, and where the presence of many companions, weeping and gnashing their teeth, increases the misery which is already beyond endurance. The wretchedness of this state no tongue can exaggerate, for Jesus has described it in words which defy exaggeration. It will never, never end.

It is only when we contemplate this fearful destiny of the unforgiven sinner that we can properly appreciate the efforts which have been made to redeem man from sin. If there is no reality in it, then the death of Jesus, as scripturally presented, was a waste of tears and blood; while the toils and sorrows of saints and martyrs have had no adequate design. But admitting this dark reality, we have a fact to justify every groan and every prayer, every drop of blood, and every life-long struggle to bring the guilty to pardon. Only pardon can release the guilty from punishment. To release them from such punishment, it was becoming that even Jesus should die; and it is proper that saints should labor, and pray, and exhort, and entreat, with all long-suffering and endurance, not willing that any should perish, but that all should turn and live.

---

TO CONTRIBUTORS. —During the year we have received several articles which we fear we shall not be able to print. Some of them are too long for the subjects of which they treat. Others are hardly up to the *Quarterly* standard, and it is best not to print them. Every piece, however, shows marks of talent, and all their authors lack is practice. Try again, young brethren. You can all succeed.

## CO-OPERATION OF MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

THE management of our Missionary Societies so as to render them eminently useful and wholly innocent is certainly not free from difficulty. These societies are not divine, but human institutions. They can claim not even a constructive sanction from the word of God of their existence, any more than can a college or corporation for the distribution of religious tracts. Their management is hence left wholly to human wisdom. It has not the advantage of a solitary hint in the Bible to determine what it shall be or how conducted. Under these circumstances it would certainly be marvelous if they should never err. Their acts should hence be construed charitably, but at the same time be kept under strict watch and criticism; otherwise they will not only cease to be simply innocent, but will soon become positively injurious. A safe maxim for life is, profound confidence in the Lord's plan for Christianizing the world, and devotion thereto with a whole single heart, but deep distrust and jealous watchfulness of all human expedients to aid that plan. The sole business of a Missionary Society is to cause *the gospel* to be preached in places where it could not or would not be preached without its aid. This business imposes upon the Society two duties, and only two, namely, to employ preachers, and to pay them. This again requires a supply of preachers and a supply of money. The church of God should furnish the former; the liberality of the brethren the latter. This done, the work of the Society is simple and innocent. Beyond this a missionary can be of no service to the cause of Christ. Within these limits it may be useful; beyond these limits "it will prove hurtful; and even within these limits we should be careful to regard it as simply *useful*, but as not *necessary*. But the object of these few pages is not a general discussion of the duties and powers of Missionary Societies, but a few reflections on the proposed co-operation of our State Societies with the General Society.

That our brethren have now inaugurated two systems of missionary labor, which, though agreeing in aim, are yet destructive of one another, seems to me intuitively clear. We have one General Society, several State Societies. If the former was all it should be, We have no use for the latter; if the latter were what they might be, they would certainly extinguish the former. Make the General Society all it should be, and I have no hesitancy in declaring my preference for the General over the State Societies. Certainly one Society is more efficient than ten; and that it is nearly ten times less expensive no one will deny. And two great objects in missionary work should be

to have it conducted by bodies inexpensive and capable of easy action. True, if the one society performed the labor of the ten, its expenses would thereby be much increased; yet even in that event they would still fall far below the expenses of the ten. Again: if the General Society were all it should be, it would not only be a place where all brethren in Christ might meet, but where all would delight to meet, and take counsel together with a view to identity in theory and harmony in action. Thus it might become the radiating centre of a larger brotherly love, of a stricter agreement in religious sentiment, of a more harmonious action, and hence prove indeed a bond of union among us. For these reasons I repeat my contingent preference for one society over any greater number. But is the General Society all it should be? I candidly do not believe it is. It is either more than it ought to be, or it is less. It has now under its care, not simply the missionary work, but the work of educating young men to preach the gospel; the work of supplying the brotherhood with a Hymn Book; and actually the work in prospect of giving us a "Hymn and Tune Book." In thus departing from its only legitimate business—that of causing the gospel to be preached, I candidly think the Society has committed a grave error; and that it owes it to itself and to the brotherhood to drop and have nothing to do with every work and interest save the single one which belongs to it. Let the Hymn Book, in some judicious mode, pass from its hands for the benefit of the brotherhood; let the Society have nothing to do with educational matters; let it leave the work of a "Hymn and Tune Book" to individual hands; and let it keep itself free from political taint and bias, and I am much mistaken if, in a few years, the Society does not enjoy the confidence and sympathy of our brotherhood to an extent to which, by its present omnibus course, it will never enjoy these elements of strength and prosperity. Will the Society adopt this course? If so, then am I for it in all coming time, and through every vicissitude of fortune, favoring and adverse; and what I here say for myself, let me assure the Society, is the sentiment and wish of thousands besides, as good and as true as our ranks can boast. If the Society loses no present friend by confining itself strictly to the missionary work; but if by discarding every work which is not strictly missionary, and performing no act not essential thereto, it gains many friends, then it seems to me that the most ordinary sagacity ought to see the advantage of the course here suggested. It is not the missionary work proper which the Society has done or is doing that makes any brother stand in doubt of it. Not at all. The more of this work it does, the more will every good man aid it. It is the fact that it stands before the brotherhood as a semi-political institution, and as coveting the control of interests which do not legitimately belong to it—this is what causes brethren to distrust it and to stand aloof from it. And

if it does not take steps to relieve itself from these embarrassing features, then let me assure it that the day has come when from "Border States" at least it may expect neither countenance nor material aid. Let not brethren think this a petulant utterance; rather let them regard it as the very sober expression of a fact to the calm consideration of which no less an interest than that of the great work in which we as a people are engaged invites attention. Love and peace and harmony are what we now need; and where no principle is to be thereby sacrificed, that seems to me to be a wise policy which strikes for them. I profoundly wish our General Society would kindly weigh a few of these hints. A course on its part at once legitimate, magnanimous, and kind, could not fail to result in great good; any other course I much fear will only end in evil.

But how shall we manage the obvious antagonism which exists between the General and the State Societies? If we adopt a general system of State Societies, and if these societies meet the expectations of their founders and present friends, then it follows, 1. That they, without the General Society, will soon occupy all the home field; and 2. That if they do this, they must absorb the entire funds of the brotherhood, and so leave the General Society to perish for want of means. This result seems to me to be inevitable. Again: if the General Society could command the available funds of the brotherhood, and if it were acting up to its high and just pretensions, then not only could it occupy the home field, but also foreign ones. This would render the State Societies wholly useless. But can the General Society command the funds in question? I am sure it can not, and for so thinking assign the following reasons:

1. There is a deep and well-founded aversion in the minds of our brethren to building up in our midst a great ecclesiastic society, endowed and independent, such as our General Society seems anxious to become. Under this head we have not forgotten the lessons of church history. Never till the church became corrupt did she sanction the formation of these great bodies.; and never did corruptions flow into the church as fast from any other sources as from these bodies. I have no faith in them, but an abiding fear that they will prove the curse of the Reformation, as they did the curse of the primitive church.

2. The General Society has already shown itself willing to transcend the limits of its constitution, and to become in a measure a partisan and political institution, and to control other interests and perform other acts than those contemplated in its organization. This has caused brethren to distrust it and to lose confidence in it.

3. There is no probability that the State Societies will consent to a dissolution in favor of the General Society. And unless they do this, there is left no work to be done by the General Society which can not

as well be done by the State Societies. The State Societies can occupy home fields better than the General; and I see no reason why they should not occupy foreign fields at least as well. If so, this leaves the General Society with few claims on the brotherhood.

4. As the State Societies stand more immediately connected with the brethren of the States than the General Society, brethren of the States will usually give to the State Societies in preference to the General, unless the General had some high claim over the State, which I confess I do not see it has.

5. There is a growing conviction in the minds of many brethren that, unless the General Society will revert to its original and legitimate work, and confine itself strictly thereto, the sooner it is dissolved the better. I am free to confess myself of those who entertain this conviction. And although from my heart I wish the Society would do this, I yet fear it will not do it. Should it fail to revert as here suggested, then the less money it has the better for the peace and harmony of the brethren.

For these reasons I do not believe the General Society will be able to command the funds necessary to enable it to occupy, even in small part, the missionary fields now lying open to us. Nor have I the evidence before me that it will either be so managed in time to come, or so act up to its pretensions as to entitle it to these funds. Whether these views are well or ill founded time will determine.

But how does the Society itself propose to raise the funds necessary to its future operations? Its plan, as reported in its last published minutes, is as follows: "That seventy-five per cent, of the entire funds raised in any State, whether by State or General agencies, be subject to the direction of the State Board, and the balance to be appropriated by the Board of the General Society."

To this plan I stand utterly opposed. Let the General Society come before the brotherhood in its own proper name and on its own merits; and all the money it can raise in this way let it have, and no more. The evidence is not before the brotherhood that the General Society can make a more profitable use of a given amount of funds than can the individual State Societies. Hence for a State Society to give up twenty-five per cent of all the funds raised in its State, seems to me to be gratuitous and without reason or advantage. If brethren have any thing to give to the General Society, let them give directly to it. Why give through a State Society? To do so is to complicate the affairs of different and independent institutions, and to confer on the General Society the right to *demand* tribute from the State Societies. The proposition is in effect one to subject the State Societies, to the extent of one fourth of their power, to the control of the General Society, leaving the General Society in no sense nor to any extent to be controlled by the State Societies. To this I am utterly



opposed. Let the General Society raise its funds independently in its own way, and appropriate them as in its wisdom is best; let the State Society do the same. Then will the action of each be simple; about it no complaints can arise; and we shall avoid a system of entangling alliances so contrary to the genius of the gospel. I hence hope the State Societies will decline to accede to the proposition of the General Society.

It is further proposed "that the State Societies report, year by year, their missionary operations to the General Society, to be embodied in one general report." For this I confess I can see no sufficient reason. In the way of furnishing information it might serve a valuable end; but it imposes duties on the State Societies, and renders them subservient to the General Society, in a way and to an extent which look to me much like the first steps to the formation of a great and wide-spread ecclesiastic organization, which I hold to be a thing unknown to the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and a sure means of corrupting it. If the State Societies see fit to tender voluntarily such a report as is proposed, let it be done; and leave the General Society free to dispose of it as it may see fit. But let no mutually binding obligations be entered into. Let the fatal experience of past ages be our warning here; and let no steps be taken or measures inaugurated which shall in any degree interfere with the perfect independence of the churches and the perfect freedom of all the children of God. On these points let us be jealous and reserved.

But it is also proposed to the General Society "so to amend their Constitution that the Presidents of the State Boards and Corresponding Secretaries of the several State Societies be *ex officio* members of the Board of the General Society."

This proposition seems to me to be either wholly useless or injurious. In the first place, suppose it to be adopted. Would the State functionaries attend the meetings of the Board of the General Society? No one, surely, can believe it. Hence, in this view, the proposition is useless. But suppose the State functionaries were to attend. Would they not render the Board of the General Society a large, unwieldy body, protracted in their sittings, and well-nigh as ill adapted to expedite business as a State Legislature? To the General Society this would prove a positive injury. The proposition, I hold, should hence be rejected.

In conclusion, I trust our brethren of the States will reject this whole scheme of co-operation. It is a scheme of centralization, which can end in no good.

## THE CLOSE OF VOLUME SECOND.

THE present page closes the second volume of the *Quarterly*. We have now furnished its readers 896 pages of matter. Of the character of this matter we do not propose to speak. It is before the brethren, and they will judge of it. In due time the first number of the third volume will make its appearance. Here and now, therefore, we ask for the *Quarterly* a far more generous support than, up to date, it has received. Is this appeal to be made in vain? Shall not our list of subscribers for the third volume more than double our list for any preceding volume? Brethren, gladden our heart in this affair, and let us have the number which, it is fondly hoped, is not unreasonably asked.

Owing to the enormous expense of paper and printing, we feel it to be an act of simple justice to the laborer to increase slightly the price of the work. The third volume will consequently cost \$2. 50. This is an increase in the cost of the work of only fifty cents. To each subscriber this will be a small matter; to the editor it may prove a great one. We trust that no brother will regard it as unreasonable, and that hence the number of our subscribers will not be diminished by it.

It is now, we regret to say, very unsafe to remit money through the mails. Our losses in this way during the last year were painfully heavy. But it is perfectly safe to send it in *checks*. I consequently hope the brethren everywhere will adopt this mode of remitting funds. The expense of remitting in this way is very trifling, and when its safety is considered, it is hoped all will adopt it. Where funds are remitted in the form of checks, all remittances will come at my risk; but where simply the money is sent, it must in all cases be at the risk of the subscriber. The *Quarterly* goes at *my* risk, and where it fails I have to re-send it. I consequently feel it to be but just that money should come at the subscriber's risk. To take the risk both ways is more than is right, and certainly more than I am able to bear.

To the gentlemanly and cultivated brethren who have contributed their articles to the present volume I have deep pleasure in hereby returning my cordial thanks. If their productions have brought them no gain, they have at least given others both pleasure and profit. This is the reward of the generous. They are all warmly requested to continue their contributions.

All names, moneys, and exchanges to be sent to me at Lexington, Kentucky.