

LARD'S
QUARTERLY,

DEVOTED TO THE

PROPAGATION AND DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL.

~~~~~  
BY MOSES E. LARD.  
~~~~~

VOLUME III.

LEXINGTON, KY.

—
1866.

INDEX.

	PAGE.
WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?.....	1
REVIEW OF DR. CHRISTOPHER ON THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. THOMAS MUNNELL.....	15
THEIR TESTIMONY.....	29
NATURE AND REVELATION. DR. H. CHRISTOPHER.....	44
CHRISTIAN UNION: REAL AND UNREAL.....	66
A. W. ROBINS.....	90
THE ROMAN CENSUS. GUMPACH.....	100
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH! J. W. MCGARVEY.....	113
THE MISSOURI OATH AND A. CAMPBELL.....	130
ORIGINAL SIN.....	136
CREEDS. L. W. WILKES.....	155
THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIANS. G. W. LONOAN.....	162
A NEW TRANSLATION BASED ON REVISED TEXTS.....	178, 383
THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD TO CHRIST. ALEX. PROCTOR.....	185
SCRIPTURE TYPES. ROUT. GRAHAM.....	203
KENAN'S LIFE OF JESUS. I. B. GRUBBS.....	207
SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO WAR?.....	226
THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIANS.....	245
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.....	253
SCRIPTURE TYPES. R. GRAHAM.....	271
ANOTHER THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM. JAMES HENSHALL.....	276
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. O. A. BARTHOLOMEW.....	291
BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES.....	310
RENAN. L. B. WILKES.....	320
CAN WE DIVIDE?.....	330
THE THIRD CHAPTER OF JOHN.....	337
REPLY TO THE QUESTION—SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO WAR? JOHN SHACKLEFORD.....	355
OUR RELATIONS TO THE INVISIBLE. DAVID WALK.....	362
SUPPORT OF AGED PREACHERS.....	377
THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. JAMES BEATTY.....	395
THE CONFESSION OF THE EUNUCH—IS IT GENUINE?.....	408
DRAPER'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE. JOHN A. BROOKS... 419	
A TRIP TO MISSOURI. JOHN W. MCGARVEY.....	433
TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES IN FRANCE.....	443
THE FOURTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY.....	448

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1865.

No. 1.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?

THE answer of the world to this question would certainly be a curious one; this much may be said in safety, all beyond is doubtful. What the world really does think of Christ we know not, except in small part. We have the fact that it thinks, but what it thinks we are imperfectly informed. Now clearly the question implies not only that we do think of Christ, but that we *may* think of him, that is, think of him with the divine sanction. He is, in other words, a legitimate subject of human thought, and if so, this implies that the materials of such thought lie within our reach; for the mind can no more think without something to think of than the eye can see without something to be seen. As furnishing, then, some of these materials of thought, I transcribe the following paragraph from the Gospel of John, omitting a few intervening verses, as not pertinent to the object I here have in view:

" 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 anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. 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."

These verses, in their several parts, we propose making the basis of some subsequent thoughts on Christ, that we may indicate what we, at least, think of him. Not that we propose to indicate all we think, but only so much as may be necessary to our present purpose. It may be best, perhaps, to distribute these verses, as we proceed, into their several most important members, and to confine our remarks to these. By this means, our view will have, in the case of each important item, the advantage of being the more distinct.

1. "*In the beginning.*" This phrase carries our thoughts a long way back. How far back we can. not say, but certainly a long way. Its import is unquestionably to be limited, either to the commencement of time, or to the commencement of such things, whether

material or not, as had a beginning. We can not think of the beginning of eternity, since this would imply a contradiction; for whatever has had a beginning, self-evidently, is not eternal, neither is it eternity. Hence we must limit the import of the phrase as now said. But what know we of beginning? Strictly speaking, nothing. Of it certainly we have some conception, but a most inadequate one indeed, having never witnessed a beginning, and enjoying no other competent means of information. All our beginnings are mere re-beginnings, that is, strictly no beginnings at all. They are either the re-enacting of what has already been enacted, or the reappearing of what has already appeared, or some mere change or modification wrought, or combination effected, in already existing materials. Of absolute beginning we neither know nor can know anything. Indeed in the highest sense the term can bear, or in the last analysis of the conception it expresses, a beginning must be set down as a miracle. It originates in the exertion of almighty power, and can have no other origin. Unquestionably, however, the phrase raises a question of time, or of something which, for the want of a better term, we must call time; and a question which has its true solution only in the commencement of creation. Until things began to be created there was no beginning, no time. When creation began beginning began. They were simultaneous. We repeat that the phrase raises a question of time, but a question respecting whom or what? Not a question respecting *what, i. e.*, things; but a question respecting *whom*, the Word. *When* was the Word?—answer, *In the beginning*. He was, then, present at it, saw time begin; saw it first spread its wings for its long, long flight, and heard its inaugural note. He was not himself the beginning, but merely witnessed it; he was in it, but not of it, at it, and shall we add before it. *If so, then he himself never began to be, but is eternal*. Such is the easy, and, we believe, the legitimate conclusion from the premise now before us; a conclusion, however, which will be shown to result more clearly from another item yet to be noticed. Thus, by the aid of a simple, most coherent, and direct train of thought, we arrive at the conclusion of the eternity of the Word. If such be the conclusion from the very first premise, the very first element of thought examined, well may we afford to repeat the question, *What think ye of Christ?*

2. "*And the Word was with God.*" This clause raises a question as to place. *Where* was the Word?—answer, With God. *When* was the Word?—In the beginning. Thus briefly does infinite wisdom dispose of these two questions. On each, man would have written a volume. A single gleam of divine light on each, and God is done. The brevity is sublime.

3. "*And the Word was God.*" This clause is often cited, and confidently relied on to establish what is popularly termed the doctrine

of the trinity; in other words, to prove that God and Christ are one, not in some sense, but *one person*. But the difficulties of this doctrine, at least as generally understood, are insuperable. First, its basis is an impossible conception; and what men can not conceive, they can not believe. This is self-evident. It involves the conception that God and Christ, who are admitted to be *two* separate and distinct persons, are yet *one* and the same person. But this it is impossible to conceive. To use a simple illustration—that *two* pens which are two separate and distinct entities, are yet *one* pen, a man can no more conceive or believe than he can verify to the eye. To argue such a position is a downright insult to reason. Second, the doctrine rests on a false inference. It is not actually asserted in the Bible that God and Christ are one *person*; neither is it necessarily implied; hence the inference that it is so is false. True, Christ says: "I and my Father are one;" but then he does not say one *person*. His predicate is *one*, not *one person*; and *one* and *one person* are not necessarily identical. But the controversy is not about the predicate *one*, but about the supplement *person*; hence it is not about what Christ says, but about what he does not say. A man and his wife are one, yet not one person; so God and Christ may be one, but still not one person. To this, however, it may be replied, that these remarks are a begging of the question, since the doctrine is actually asserted in the clause, "the Word was God." But is this so? Is it true that this clause asserts of the Word and of God that they are one *person*? That identity in some sense is asserted is most cheerfully granted; but that it is identity of person I can not think. Yet it must be conceded, that if the term God is to be taken as standing strictly for the person of the Father, then the question is settled; and the clause asserts of the two that they *are* one person. The whole controversy then turns on the sense in which we must take the term God. Now I submit, as a possible view, to say the least, that *Qeoj* (rendered in the clause God) is expressive of, or designed to denote, *nature*, and not personality. And here, let it be added, that the word nature is not to be taken in its strict Latin acceptance, as denoting something born or something produced. In this sense God has no nature. Hence the word is to be taken in the very opposite sense, as denoting something in reality unborn or unproduced. Taking it, then, in this sense, and the meaning of the clause would be: the Word was *theos*, *i. e.*, *divine*, or of the *same nature* as the Father. In other words, we should then have *one* nature, but two persons of that nature. My reasons for this view are concisely as follow:

1. It alone is conceivable; and God never revealed to man and required him to believe what is beyond all doubt inconceivable. By this, however, it is not meant that human reason is competent to determine every question upon its merits that may relate to the matter of

revelation. What is claimed for it is, that, the matter being given, it can determine what is or is not conceivable; and it is *assumed* that what is not conceivable is not matter of revelation.

2. Had it been the intention to designate God personally, the expression would have been *ὁ Θεός*, and not simply *Θεός*. Clearly something is meant by the omission of the article in a case where, if *ὁ Θεός* was intended to be meant, the laws of the language required its insertion. Hence, since *Θεός* must mean either the divine *person* or the divine *nature*, and since it is not of the form, when occurring in the predicate, to denote the person, I therefore conclude that it denotes the nature. But let us take a parallel case: "God is spirit, *Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός*. Here *πνεῦμα* is without the article, and is clearly expressive of nature. The meaning being that God is *spirit*, spirit in nature, in essence or in substance, and not *a* spirit nor *the* spirit. In like manner I conclude that in the clause *Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος*, the former term is expressive of nature and not personality; and that the meaning is, the Word is *Θεός*, *i. e.*, in nature, essence, or substance, the same as *ὁ Θεός*, or *the* true personal God the Father. According to this view, we have one *Θεοειδέης* or one absolutely divine or God-nature, and three personal manifestations thereof, to wit: *ὁ Θεός*, *ὁ Λόγος*, and *το Πνεῦμα*, or the God, the Word, and the Spirit. And this is analogous to what we have in the case of man. Here we have one man-nature, or humanity, with, not three certainly, but innumerable personal manifestations. I hence conclude that what is true in this particular of the human nature is also true of the divine.

3. It was obviously the intention of John to introduce the Word and treat of him as a distinct person from the Father, assigning to him a peculiar office as well in the work of creation as in the matter of redemption. Yet this intention would have been completely frustrated by a remark declaring of the two, that they are one person. I hence conclude that the remark has not been made.

But should it be said that the view here taken is really the view of the sounder class of trinitarians, I reply that then is there a very marked distinction between the view of that class and the view of the rest. The advocates of the doctrine have in that event been very unsuccessful as teachers, and have landed their pupils wide of the mark. Besides, in that case the outlandish word trinity conveys to the mind a falsehood; for it is not employed to express oneness as to nature, but oneness as to person.

Should any of my brethren murmur against the foregoing as being too speculative, I shall be ready to grant the justness of their plea; and shall allow them to urge it in abatement of the value of what has been said. My apology, however, is, that there is a view which may be taken of the subject treated of which alone is consonant with reason, and that this is not the view usually taken; that we are regard-

ed by the orthodox of the day as not sound, because we do not accept the latter view. Whereas we are sound for the precise reason that we do not accept it, but accept the former view. Besides, the little sprinkling of Greek found in one or two of the preceding sections is objectionable to the common reader. This is granted, but my excuse is the nature of the subject treated of, and the difficulty of discussing it except in the manner employed.

4. *"All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made."* This language, too, hurries our thoughts a long way back, back even to the instant when creation began. But now no question is raised as to nature, place, or time. The fact simply is asserted, that all created things were made by the Word. There is something grand in these brief utterances. The thought is voluble, but the compression marvelous. To me it seems in fine taste to have prefaced this short account of creation with a few weighty sentences personalizing the author of it as the Word, and settling what he is, where he was, and when. The clause in hand shows him in a new light, or rather presents him in a new character, as universal creator. Not an atom was made without him, but every atom by him. Since, therefore, he is the creator of all things created, he himself is not a creature. For this would imply that he created himself, and this again that he existed before he existed, which is a contradiction. The truth of this we shall now proceed to establish.

From the expression, "in the beginning was the Word," it was inferred, in a preceding paragraph, but only as probable, that the Word might be eternal. This inference, however, could not be drawn merely from that expression alone as indisputably certain. From the expression, "all things were made by him," we now propose to render it self-evident That the energy which creates must be exerted before it creates is as intuitively clear, as it is that an effect can not antedate its cause. Equally clear is it that he who exerts creative energy must be existent at the time when he exerts it. Now let us suppose the very first thing created to have been an atom of matter. The Word exerted the energy which created it. The energy, then, was before the atom; and the Word was coexistent with the energy. Hence the Word was before the atom, and if before the atom, then eternal. This inference we had a legitimate right to draw from the nature of the Word; for clearly, if the nature of the Word and the nature of the Father be the same, then must the Word be eternal as surely as is the Father. Yet we did not wish to let an inference of so much significance rest on purely implied grounds, and hence preferred to deduce it from another and independent source. The Word, then, is not only uncreated and eternal, but is himself the universal creator of all things created.

Now surely this is the most glorious character of which we can

form a conception. Indeed an adequate conception of it we can not form. To create, what is it? The Creator himself alone can answer. In no case does human reason feel more its weakness than when attempting to form to itself the true conception of creation. Let the thoughts straggle back to the instant when creation began. What was there? Of created things nothing. It is oppressive thus to think of God unenviored with the Universe and alone, except in the mysterious society he had in the personal manifestations of his own nature. Despite of us a feeling of desolation steals over the spirit, and we are in awe at the very thoughts we think, when we attempt to poise him in the vast, eternal void. How difficult is it to realize that there was a period when there was not a sun, nor a moon, nor a star, nor a ray of light, nor a created living thing! Involuntarily we ask ourselves the question, was it surely ever so? And instantly we have the answer, Yes. But the work of creation begins. The design, it may be, is of God, while by the all-creating Word the creative energy is exerted, and the first atom of matter exists. This atom had no antecedent being, never existed in any other form or elsewhere. It is absolutely created, itself, its whole self, in matter, essence, and form, is created. This is the sublimest and truest conception we can have of creation. When we conceive of a thing as created by a simple volition of the Word, created in its matter or essence and not from pre-existing material, we can add nothing more to complete the true conception of creation as far as we can form it. Now, how curious must have been that primal atom! It was the Universe, the whole of creation. What interest gathered about it. That atom the Word made, can tell the number of its years, and knows where it now is; for it still exists. But the work of creation goes on; and now a sun rays forth from the presence of the Word, and at his bidding takes its place in its appointed path to move and shine forever. Away on every side in the distance measurable and immeasurable stars are fixed, planets move, comets blaze, and moons revolve. Over all these the Word now flings a mantle of light; and for the first time "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." But as yet no created intelligence stands up to admire this and give God homage. A more exquisite design is therefore now to be executed, and no sooner does the instant arrive, than countless cherubim and seraphim stand up in the divine presence to pay him high reverence, and to do his will henceforth. Last of all, and why not best, man is made, made in the image of his divine Original; and the work of creation, as far as avouched to us, is done.

Over all this the Word is now *the* Lord; and in the title there is something peculiarly significant. It denotes proprietorship or ownership; but not in the loose sense of a right in property from purchase or

gift. It denotes the proprietorship of a thing, which vests in virtue of having' created it. The Word is owner of the universe because he made it; hence his title is most absolute. Could man create a tree in the sense in which the Word created the first atom of matter, his right to that tree would be as absolute as the right of God to the throne on which he sits. This is the simplest and truest form of ownership. But in this sense man owns nothing. How poor he is! He is owned in this sense, but in it owns not. He owns only in a conventional sense, hence has no absolute right to anything.

But why was the glorious being of whom we are speaking called the *Word*? Certainly we can not tell. The Bible is silent in the premise, neither asserting nor implying any thing that supplies an answer; and when it is silent conjecture may not be safe. If, however, the reader will consent to hold it as a harmless speculation, I will venture a thought or two. The contents of a word is light, mental or spiritual light; that is, it is light in the mind or spirit. Hence, "the entrance of thy word giveth light." The light of the sun lies on its surface; but the light of a word is within it. A word on entering the mind parts from its light to the mind, just as the flint struck by the steel gives out its hidden spark. Now as he of whom we are speaking is *the light* of the world, not of the world without, but of the world within, or spirit world, it would seem in fine taste to call him *the Word*. And as in the case of an ordinary word its light is within, so *in* him was light, light in the form of life; and this light in the soul of man is its life—its true life—its present, new, divine life. He is then, *the Word*, as bearing from God the fountain to earth, the light which is in the soul, its life, and as causing it to shine into the hearts of the children of men. This light which is from the Word and in him is, when in the soul, its life, because its food, its very pabulum. Therefore said the Savior, "man lives not by bread alone, but by every *word* that proceeds out of the mouth of God." But this only by the way.

5. "And the Word was made flesh." This expression, if not ambiguous, is yet susceptible of misconstruction, and needs a word of explanation. The meaning is not that the Word ceased to be the Word proper, and became another thing or another nature, namely, flesh. In other words, the meaning is not that the substance of the Word became transmuted into another substance, ceasing to be what it formerly was, and becoming flesh; but that the Word remaining still himself proper, became, not flesh, but *in* flesh, that is, took upon himself and dwelt in a human body or body of human flesh.

But here we are met by the skeptic and told that this can not be, that it is impossible for a being who is eternal, almighty, and omnipresent, to be so far circumscribed or limited as to dwell in a human body. Now in reply, an almighty being is precisely the only being

of whom it is not impossible. Were he not almighty the thing might be impossible; but for the very reason that he is almighty, it is possible. He is the very being who if he sees fit can so dwell, and who for a sufficient reason will so dwell. The objection consequently is null. As for his being circumscribed or limited, this is merely assumed. It is not known that dwelling in a human body either circumscribes or limits an almighty being. In the case of another the circumstance might imply limitation, but not so in his. In the case of man, for instance, the human spirit dwelling in a body is limited, but then is it not equally so out of the body; only perhaps its range of power is greater in the latter state than in the former. Consequently, since dwelling out of a body does not render a being almighty who is of limited power in it, so neither does dwelling in a body limit the power of a being who is almighty out of it. Beings have their power, whether limited or unlimited, not from the mode in which they dwell, but, in the case of created beings, from their original constitution, and in the case of uncreated beings they have it, absolutely and, as far as we know, without regard to the manner in which they dwell.

But again: we are told by the skeptic that it is degrading to the immaculate and almighty Word to conceive of him as dwelling in human flesh. Is it so indeed? Was that flesh created or uncreated? It was not eternal. Then it was created; and if so, by whom? "All things were made by the Word, and without him was not anything made that was made." He, then, made that flesh. Now is it a degradation to the Word to clothe himself in the mantle which his own hands did make? As well might we say that it is a degradation to God to sit amidst the cherubim and seraphim because they are created. No. It is not a degradation. A condescension it may be; but it is no degradation.

The expression, "the Word was made flesh," necessarily leads me to notice the manner and circumstances of his incarnation. In doing this, I shall not be very strict to set down the events in the exact order in which they occurred. In some cases I may even reverse them. I at once, then, repair to the scene of his birth.

It was perhaps late in the day, in the city of David, when a plain, honest looking man, a carpenter, with his modest, decent wife in the most delicate situation in life, might have been seen traversing those streets from inn to inn, and may be from house to house, asking for a night's repose, and finding none. "There was no room for them in the inn." The circumstance must have given Joseph exquisite pain, who, from another incident in connection with his espoused, shows himself to have been a man of genuine and truly delicate feeling. It is, suppose, deep dusk, and Joseph and Mary are weary. Besides "the days were accomplished," and a shelter must be had. They

turn in, but not into a palace, nor yet into a sumptuous abode, but into the stall where the ox did eat. The great beast gives up his pallet of straw, as much as to say: "It is fitting that this night should write a satire on the world's hospitality and pride. Sir and Madam, you can have my bed." But we pursue the narrative no further. It is morning; and "Mary has wrapped her first-born son in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger." This is now "*the Word made flesh.*" Mysterious child, dear little boy; how art thou "set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel!" Thus is fulfilled the angel's announcement to Mary, namely: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that holy *child* which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God.*" This announcement calls for a few remarks.

The Word, in his antecedent state, was never, as far as we know, called the Son of God. In his incarnate state alone is this title applied to him. What he may have *been*, in reality, we can not say; but what he was not called, so far at least as the Bible teaches, we can say. I know that some insist that the Word, even in his antecedent state, was in reality the Son of God in the same sense in which he now is; and that consequently his sonship can not date from the time of his becoming flesh. With this opinion I can have no serious quarrel, for the simple reason that it is an opinion; and, as far as I can see, a harmless one. The position is not asserted in the Bible; and with me it is, therefore, *nil*. What I insist on is this, that, according to the angel's announcement, the Word was, when born of Mary, *to be* called the Son of God; and from this I *infer* that previously he had not been so called, at least in the sense in which the title was then applied to him. But let it be distinctly said, that no change is conceived to have passed upon the Word in becoming flesh. Neither in nature, rank, nor power was he affected by the fact; nor in any pre-existing relation between him and the Father. A new circumstance, certainly, has transpired in his history, which, if it does not indicate a new relation, at least calls for a new title.

But the expression, "Son of God," calls for an additional remark. This expression has perplexed some who have not, to my mind, indicated a disposition to think perversely on what the Holy Scriptures teach. Their perplexity I therefore deem entitled to some respect. Can it be possible, they ask, that the expression, "Son of God," indicates the same relation and connection between Christ and God and God and Mary that existed, say, between Isaac and Abraham and Abraham and Sarah? I reply certainly not. Yet were the expression unattended by any circumstances serving to qualify it, such inference would be perfectly legitimate. When a term has a current well-known meaning expressive of certain relations, and is found in a narrative unattended by any epithet or circumstance serving to qualify

it, the presumption that it is to be taken in that meaning and as expressive of those relations is overwhelming. Such would be the case with the expression, "Son of God," were it not so attended. The two chief circumstances which serve to qualify the meaning of a term are the subject-matter and accompanying epithets. The former circumstance is seldom, and then with great caution, to be allowed to modify the sense of a word. The latter mostly perform that office. This is the case with the expression, "Son of God." It is accompanied by such epithets and statements as clearly indicate that it is not to be taken wholly in its current meaning and as expressive exactly of its accustomed relations, but in a specially qualified and peculiar sense. This will become sufficiently obvious by merely reciting the announcement of the angel to Mary: "*The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.* Therefore also that holy child which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." After this nothing need be added to show how the Word became incarnate or was born of a woman, or to explain further the import of the expression, "Son of God."

But the clause, "the Word was made flesh," is suggestive of still additional material for thought. When treating of the Word as uncreated, as eternal, as almighty, as with God, we could not repress the feeling that he was not of us, that his dwelling was from far. It is difficult to free the soul from this seemingly instinctive feeling of distance between itself and the unseen hand that made it. Even while "feeling after" God, though assured that "he is not far from every one of us," yet we can not wholly extinguish the impression that the distance, though brief, is still not to be passed by us. Now the clause, "the Word was made flesh," completely relieves the soul from this feeling. At once we seem to forget that we are of him, and come as it were to realize it as a fact that he is of us. Especially is this feeling of proximity intensified by the supplemental clause, he "dwelt among us." He now seems to be not merely bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, but a child of sorrow with us; his life seems bound up, in a bundle with our life, and the feeling is that we are brethren.

During his life on earth Christ once said to his disciples: "*If ye love me keep my commandments.*" On this condition alone will he accept the homage of human hearts. No mere mechanical conformity to his will, no matter how complete, can ever enjoy his sanction. Obedience, to be acceptable to him, must spring not merely from a heart of faith, but from one replete with love. To such a heart obedience is the very form in which it delights to express its fealty to Christ. Faith in him and love to him generate in the human soul an intense religious feeling. Obedience is the form in which that feeling vents itself. Hence the purest and deepest joy of earth is tasted in that obedience.

But can we with our whole hearts love Christ, and is the sentiment entirely voluntary? In hearts enfeebled and corrupted by sin the latter we think is not. In Christ more than in us must the power reside to wake the sentiment to life and maintain it in an active, healthy state. Whether he possesses that power or not will perhaps be best learned by again returning, not to that cradle scene, but to that manger scene, from which our thoughts have wandered a little.

While Joseph and Mary were bending over her child and wondering "what manner of man" he should be, other scenes were transpiring in the vicinity and elsewhere which invite a passing notice. An angel who had just a moment since spread abroad his wings and bathed them in celestial light, now folded them in the presence of "shepherds who in the same country were abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night." The honest men "were sore afraid;" "for the glory of the Lord shone round about them." The angel said to them: "Fear not; for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. *For to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior who is Christ the Lord.*" Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name. I do not wonder that ranks of angels momentarily quitted their abode to sympathize with the sorrowing children of earth; for why should not angels have sympathy when "Jesus wept?" "Suddenly there was with the angels a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and Baying: *Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.*" A glorious anthem, and worthy of the occasion on which it was sung I "Come," said the shepherds, one to another, "let us now go even to Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass." Each wrapped his shepherd's cloak about him, took his crook, and "came with haste." The dew of the night still lay fresh on their burly forms as they gathered about "this child," praising God for what they had heard, and now for what they saw. They stood close by the manger where the "Savior" slept, while Mary showed them his sweet little face, and they touched his little hands. They folded their arms and looked at Joseph, and looked at Mary, and looked at "the child," and whispered to each other low. Enchanted spot, well might the purest men of earth, and the holiest feelings of the human heart linger about thee! Thou art dear to my memory still; while all my affections gather near thee and lie, like the light of the sun on the lily's cheek, on that tender form which makes thee so dear.

Not only did angels mysteriously hover about "the child," and shepherds collect in groups to see him; but "magi," who had seen "his star "in the east, came "to worship him." Clearly that was a miraculous star. How else could these men have distinguished it from other stars? Especially, how could they have distinguished it as "his star"—the star of the King of the Jews? Then again, when they

left Jerusalem, it appeared to them a second time, and "went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was." Hardly a doubt can exist that it stood over the very house in which he lay. It must then have been very low or very close to the ground. The expressions, it "went before," "it came," it "stood over," are reconcilable with no other view. Hence, we wonder not that the "wise men," when they saw it a second time, should have "rejoiced with exceeding great joy." Dark must have been his mind, and corrupt his heart, who, cognizant of these "signs of the times," could not infer from them the Christ.

Shortly after, as a "male," "holy to the Lord," he was presented in the temple. At this time devout Simeon, who was "waiting for the consolation of Israel," came "by the Spirit into the temple." Taking up the child "in his arms," he "blessed God and said: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel." At the same time ancient Anna, "coming in," "gave thanks likewise to the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." Now when devout manliness and pious widowhood rejoiced thus over the "child," shall our souls remain unmoved at the deeds of "the man?"

From this time forward we hear but little of Christ until "he was twelve years old." We then have an account of him "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." This was in the city of Jerusalem, in a senate of her great men. In my mind's eye, even now, I can see him in that sitting. His personal appearance was faultlessly neat; for Mary was a most tidy woman, and kept him in finest taste. He was of ordinary height and size, with a voice liquid and sweet, an articulation distinct and solemn, a manner graceful and dignified, a brow smooth and thoughtful, an eye deep and calm, and a something still so exquisitely divine as never to be distinctly reproduced in the mirror of the pen. Even here, where, for a time, he is no longer the mysterious object of maternal regard, "all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers."

Such are a few of the scenes connected with the early childhood of Christ. We have dwelt upon them to show the absorbing interest that attached to every incident of his wonderful life. If his earlier record proved him all divine, his later showed him equally human; while the combination of the two produced that strange union which, while it caused some to doubt whether he could be that, led others to ask, can he be this? If the child is the forecasting of the man, and such was the infancy of Christ, what must not his after-life have been? We next select an incident or two from the marvelous group

of his life to show, not that he was eternal, was almighty, became incarnate, was tender and lovely, but that he had a heart ever full of the purest sympathy for fallen humanity.

He had a friend whom the Scriptures call Lazarus, who resided about two miles from Jerusalem. This friend had two sisters, who, with himself, must have been exceedingly amiable and pure; for it is said of them that "Jesus loved them." To the house of this friend he often repaired, after the too fruitless toils of the day in the city, with the dust of the street on his sacred person, the redemption of the world lying heavy on his great heart, and the painful and anxious future just at hand. Here many a time, when "a little water was fetched," did he "wash his feet" and rest. He often reclined at the hospitable table of that friend, ate of his bread and drank of his tea; and then retired to sleep in that sweet bed which Martha and Mary, with their own hands, had spread for his use. As they adjusted those linens and placed that pillow, this is for, "the Master," would be quietly said. This friend at last fell sick, at a time when the Master was "beyond Jordan, in the place where John at first baptized." The sisters, therefore, sent to him, saying: "Lord, he whom thou lovest is sick." He remained there yet two days, and then said to his disciples: "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." He went; but before he reached the house, Martha met him, and with bursting heart, said: "Lord, hadst thou been here, my brother had not died." "Thy brother shall rise again," was the glorious and inspiring reply. Poor Mary next came, and falling at his feet, repeated: "Lord, hadst thou been here my brother had not died." These lone and stricken sisters had met the "familiar friend" of their brother, "who ate of his bread," and how was the bitter anguish of their souls increased! "Where have ye laid him?" said Christ; and they stood at the grave and "wept" together. A brief, fitting prayer is uttered; when the Savior adds: "Lazarus, come forth," and all is over. The truthful heart can readily supply the rest. Tell me, now, proud scoffer, can Christ "weep with them that weep." What lacks he yet to make him altogether lovely? Yearns not your soul after him? Be true to the better awakenings of your own heart; I ask no more.

But in reply to this it might be said that Christ could well afford to sympathize with Martha and Mary; whose brother, Lazarus, was his friend, a man of affluence, and whose hospitality he had often enjoyed; but where, it may be asked, is the proof of his sympathy with the poor and erring? I reply, first, and generally, his whole life is an indisputable proof of the fact; but, second, and particularly, the case of the unfortunate woman "taken in the very act," is peculiarly and specially so. This was a delicate case and required on the part of the Savior great skill in its management. The sin was a gross one

and without excuse; men at least affecting zeal for the venerable law of Moses clamored for her blood. The Savior was made the umpire in the case. The question was put to him: "Moses in the law commanded us that such should be stoned; but what sayest thou?" He, reading their wicked hearts stooped down and wrote enigmatically upon the ground, and remained silent. They still pressed their question. At last his conduct in effect spoke thus: The woman is guilty and the law is just; and besides, your own spotless lives eminently fit you to be her executioners. Only let every thing be done with propriety, so "he that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Self condemned, they skulked away, until not one was left. The Savior and the woman remained alone in the midst of the temple. Poor dejected wretch, I fancy I see her now. Her countenance was haggard, her eye wild, her garments soiled, her hair disheveled, and her head resting on that impure breast, rebuked all the more keenly by the spotless presence in which she stood. True, she stood in such a presence; but then it was the presence of one who desired mercy and not sacrifice, the presence of one who sought the spirit's weal, and not the body's blood. After a moment of dreadful suspense, the Savior said: "Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? (that is, Has no man condemned thee to die? for such is the meaning of the expression.) "No man, Lord," is her meek reply. Jesus said: "Neither do I condemn thee (to die); go, and sin no more." Thus that fettered soul was unbound; and with no coarse reproof, but with the gentle admonition, "sin no more," she left that presence. If she ever sinned after that, she is lost. If that kindness restrained her not forever, there is no hope. Reader, what think you of Christ? Are you ready to say in the sweet language of one of old: "Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God; where thou diest, I will die, and there will I be buried; the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me."

SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO WAR?—Several brethren, whose opinions are highly esteemed, have requested that the article on this question be postponed for awhile. They think the popular mind not yet in a condition to be widely profited by the discussion. In this opinion I confess I think them not correct; but as there is no necessity for haste in the case, I have concluded to lay the article aside for a quarter or two. When discussed, it is very desirable that the question shall have a thorough hearing; and that sound conclusions shall be reached respecting it. It may hence be best to allow it to rest still awhile longer.

REVIEW OF DR. CHRISTOPHER ON THE "GIFT OF THE
HOLY SPIRIT."

It has been suggested to me that a further notice than has been taken of the article above named would be serviceable to the cause of truth and perhaps not disagreeable to its author. I accept the task with a degree of pleasure, because I believe the principle involved to be an important one; and, also, because I am persuaded that, should the writer see proper to respond, the answer will be in a scholarly, Christian style, and will be dictated by a sincere desire to eliminate the truth. As it is our object to consult brevity as far as consistent with a fair discussion of the question at issue, we will indulge in no long-drawn preliminaries, but will at once state the position we intend to dispute and proceed with the examination of it.

That the reader may have full knowledge of our difference, and that we may not misrepresent him in the least degree, the Doctor shall state the issue himself. On page 354 of *Lard's Quarterly*, vol. I., he asks: "Do the Scriptures, then, affirm, unequivocally, that the Holy Spirit dwells literally or personally 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 the church is contemplated as a temple." On the next page he says: "The dwelling is *among* the disciples and not *in* them." On page 300 of vol. II., he says: "When this preposition, *en*, describes the relation that exists between persons, it must be translated *among* and not *in*;" as in the water, but among the people.

These statements are clear and unambiguous. The Holy Spirit is not to be considered as in us individually, either in our souls or bodies, but among us as a multitude, and on the outside of every individual. As the "Lord walked in the midst of the Jewish camps," but personally took up his abode in no Jewish heart, so the Holy Spirit is among the disciples, but in none of them. Clear as these statements seem to be, grammatically considered, some may still be troubled to know precisely what notion of relationship the word *among* generates in our author's mind. Does he conceive of the Spirit as among the disciples as Jesus was on earth? Now Jesus was not omnipresent personally while here, for when in one place he was not in another. He was among only a few at a time. Is the Spirit subject to these limitations when our brother speaks of him as a person? Or is he, like the atmosphere, present with all God's people in all

places simultaneously? This, perhaps, would more nearly represent his views. If the word among suggests this notion of the Spirit's presence, just as on the day of Pentecost he "filled all the house where they were sitting," and of course was among them, another question might be put, viz.: Does his being among the disciples exteriorly prevent his being among them interiorly also? How do we know that he was not *in the hearts* of the one hundred and twenty disciples as well as among them in the room? Or, rather, why should the one notion exclude the other? The blood is among all the members of the body, and at the same time in them. You close your hand and the blood is among the five divisions of that hand—among them, and that, too, on the inside of each one. Now if the blood can be on the inside of each individual member of the hand and still be among those members, why may not the Spirit be among all the members of the spiritual body, the church, and still be in the hearts of each one? I have no great difficulty in admitting that much which the Doctor says about the "providential work of the Spirit" may be true, although it is unscriptural language, but can not see that that is all the Spirit does, or that such a notion is hostile to the more precious truth that the "Spirit dwells in you." "Among" is not, then, wholly an outside word. It may be among and yet within, and surely if he dwells in the hearts of all disciples, he is among them in the best and sweetest sense of the word.

The property of impenetrability in matter appears to lie at the foundation of his doctrine, for that *one person can not be in another* seems to be implied as axiomatic. As a rock in water displaces a portion of that element to make room for itself, so he seems to think if the Spirit of God should inhabit the human soul, or the place of the human soul, that soul would be compelled to get out of the way, for one person can not inhabit another. Mechanical and physical as this view of spiritual things is, it is not relieved even by the poor admission that spiritual beings might commune together something like liquids, or gaseous substances do, commingling without any mechanical inconvenience. The fact that saccharine atoms are said to be lodged between the adjacent particles of water, filling up the interstices thereof, surely would not prove that spirits have organizations analogous to this, and that one person can therefore dwell in another; but when a writer either covertly or unconsciously bases an argument about spiritual things upon a property of matter in its coarsest and most palpable form, he could not object if his reviewer should look for analogies in nature also that militate against his theory. It is not affirmed here that the article before us *formally* places his argument on impenetrability, nor do we pretend to say that the mode of the Spirit's "communion" is at all analogous to the commingling of liquids, but surely it should not be too confidently as-

sumed that one spirit can not possibly dwell with and in another, if nature is to be our teacher. We are aware that even in chemical affinities the impenetrability of matter is still a fixed law; but we can not on that account admit that one spirit can not directly commune with and dwell in another of kindred nature. If the Holy Spirit can not dwell even in the body of a Christian as a temple, how is it, still reasoning by analogy, that the electric spirit can so conveniently inhabit the extended wire? How can magnetism inhabit the loadstone? Does not heat "dwell in" the iron? and light live very comfortably in vitreous and other transparent substances? It would seem that God has in these things given us some very strong hints for the single purpose of leading us out of our sensuous habits of thinking—to teach us that spiritual things are not to be judged of by the laws of space, corporeity, and avoidupois.

Having disposed of the natural-philosophy view of the case, we advance to try the strength of the main position argued in the essay, viz.: "That the Holy Spirit dwells among Christians and not in them." "The whole controversy is reduced to this." In reply to the editor of the *Quarterly*, our writer affirms: "The preposition *en* is never used in its usual signification, *in*, when expressing the relation existing between persons. This assertion you will not call in question." Upon this "assertion," then, the "whole controversy" depends, and of course it demands our careful attention.

Notwithstanding the incautious assertion that *en* is "never" to be translated *in* when persons are spoken of, he is afterward under the necessity of informally modifying it in all cases where *en* is followed by a noun in the singular number. Paul says: "Christ liveth in me," in which case "among me" would be a rather ridiculous translation. "Know ye not that I am among the Father and the Father among me" would be wholly intolerable, and in these and scores of other passages where persons are spoken of **en** is used in the Greek, and must be rendered *in*. To justify this modification of his rule for translating *en*, and still defend the proposition that the Holy Spirit only dwells among Christians and not in them, the author of the essay pronounces all passages in which *en* must be rendered in "unquestionably figurative," "evidently figurative." This is decidedly convenient; for that polysyllable, "figurative," so common, so facile, so little understood, forms a labyrinth in which a person may circulate for years and hide as many fallacies as are necessary to prove almost any proposition desired. Whenever *en* can be translated among, the language it seems must be literal; and wherever in is forced upon us, it is "unquestionably figurative." It is vital, then, to anything like an intelligent discussion of the subject before us to have right conceptions of the use and meaning of this word "figura-

tive;" and then we will decide whether *en* must always be *in* when persons are spoken of.

Let us try to understand the word "figurative." What do we mean by figurative language? Do we mean that the thing spoken of figuratively has no real existence, and that a figurative act is no act at all? Or, that a figurative action is just as real as a literal act? Christ was buried in the grave—we in the water of baptism. Ours is a figurative burial, his a literal one. Our act is as real as his, notwithstanding it is figurative. It is figurative simply because it is the antitype, having been typified by the Savior's literal burial. Sigma says, God literally dwelt in his temple anciently, but that when he now is said to dwell in a Christian, it is only figuratively true; by which he seems to mean not really true at all—true in some airy, fanciful way, but actually true in no sense, there being no real indwelling because it is figurative. Our baptism is only a figurative burial with Christ, but is it not a real burial, a literal burial in another sense? Tell the Pedobaptist that we are buried with Christ by baptism, and he will respond: "It is all figurative;" and by simply calling' it a figure, they get rid of any actual burial at all, conceiving it to be a sort of spiritual or metaphysical burial. If we admit the phrase, "if Christ be in you," to be figurative, do we therefore conclude it to be untrue in fact? Does figurative mean unreal, not actual? The most it can mean is that, like an antitype, it conforms to some literal fact in the previous dispensation intended to adumbrate it. It is as true as its type, only it develops itself in a higher plane. The Jewish temple was a type of the bodies of Christians. The Lord dwelt in the one literally, in the other figuratively—in the one typically, in the other antitypically, but in both really, truly, and actually.

The tabernacle in the wilderness was certainly a type of the "true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." This true tabernacle evidently is only called a tabernacle in a figure or figuratively. The first was a "worldly sanctuary," and was a "figure for the time then present." Figure of what? Of something unreal and unsubstantial? The types and figures were all literal things representing spiritual things in this dispensation which we now call figurative, because they do not assume the same forms precisely their types did, but refer to them as their basis and illustrations. Those types "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things;" but are these "heavenly things" all resolvable into airy nothings, or shadowy, misty existences, resembling a Pedobaptist burial in baptism? The truth is, that of the two, the antitypal objects are by far the more real, substantial, and lasting. The "true tabernacle" is as real and more enduring than the "worldly sanctuary," and God's dwelling in the temple of the human soul is far more perma-

ment than his abode in the Jewish temple. The Doctor says: "Christ is formed in you," only "figuratively." Then it is done in the most permanent and real way possible. He says God dwells in the Christian body only figuratively. We are thankful for this, for every Christian belongs to the "true tabernacle which the Lord pitched," and all its arrangements, including the presence of the Lord in each one, are therefore the more real and enduring. He also informs us that "the Spirit is never literally in us." If not, still we have it in a higher and more precious sense, even figuratively, as we belong to the true tabernacle, whose blessings are neither transient nor merely literal good.

Whenever *en* is followed by a noun in the singular the Doctor is obliged to render it by *in*, for *among* can not govern the singular number, as in the following passage: "He who dwells in love dwells among God and God among him." He broadly asserts that *en* is "never" to be translated *in* when persons are spoken of. This assertion, however, as we said, he is compelled to modify in every instance where *en* is followed by the singular, to the great detriment of his rule. But if he should admit that God really dwells "in him who dwells in love," it would destroy his leading notion that the Spirit dwells merely among Christians and not in them. What, therefore, is to be done with all these passages in which *en* is followed by the singular? Just pronounce them all figures of speech, and as figures mean almost nothing, "God's dwelling in him," figuratively, means that he does not dwell in him at all. Now, why the figurative passages should nearly all happen to have a singular noun after the preposition *en* may cause a smile, for certainly it is very convenient. But, even if we grant all those scriptures referred to to be figurative, it is still a question whether this disproves the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, for if they be figurative at all they must conform to some facts of which they are figures. What, then, was the type of the indwelling? Was it God's appearing in human form as he did to Abraham? Or, was it the "Spirit of Christ in the prophets?" In all these cases, one person seems to have dwelt in another. Or, was the true type of it the incarnation of the divine *Logos*? Or, was it God's presence in the temple? These were all literal facts, and if any one, or all of these, were types of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, then this latter is the antitype, the figurative indwelling, and, like all other antitypes, a real fact. Sigma says: "The body of a Christian can be called, in a figure, the temple of the Holy Spirit." Well, Jesus Christ is "in a figure" called the Sun, the Sun of righteousness. But does the "figure" forbid his being a sun at all? Is he not the "true light," even more of a sun than the natural orb? True, he is a sun not on the same plane; he rises from the natural to the spiritual, to the figurative, but surely none the less

a sun on that account. He is the "Light of the world," who "shines in our hearts," and in heaven will be the "Light of the place." Things figurative, then, should not be considered hazy, misty nonentities, far less real than their types. Yet, this is precisely what the Doctor seems to mean; for while he admits God's real presence in the Jewish temple, the same thing developed in the antitype by the indwelling of the Spirit in the heart, he considers as something unreal, simply because it is figurative—making figurative entities literal nonentities. But as sure as the Sun of righteousness is not a literal nonentity, so sure the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not. On the contrary, following the analogy of other antitypes, it is a far more permanent, enduring, real thing, than was the presence of the Lord in the Jewish temple.

That the views above submitted on the use of the word figurative are consonant with sound criticism should not be disputed, as they harmonize without any friction with Mr. Lord's valuable work on the "Laws of Figurative Language," and such like productions generally. The Egyptian bondage, the Red Sea baptism, the "Wilderness, the manna, the rock Horeb, the Jordan, Canaan, the priests, the altars, the victims, the tabernacle and the Guest Divine who dwelt within it, were all types of "heavenly things" developed in the Christian dispensation. There is a figurative Egypt, figurative wilderness and manna, figurative Jordan and Canaan, figurative tabernacle and Guest to dwell within. That temple is the church and that Guest is the Holy Spirit who dwells, as we shall presently see, not only in the church as a whole and among its members, but in each one. Now if all the other antitypes are both figurative and real, and none the less real existences because "figurative, it remains that some one give us a good reason for excepting the indwelling of the Holy Spirit from all the rest and reducing it, in fact, to a nonentity simply because it is true figuratively.

The word "personal." It is assumed that if the Spirit bear a personal relation to the Christian, the idea of indwelling is of course an absurdity. On what ground such an assumption can be based is hard to conceive, unless it be the psychological notion that one spiritual person can not dwell in another. The Doctor says, if we retain the translation, "The Spirit dwells in you," this word in "destroys all idea of the relation being personal." Now admitting on his part that one person either physically or spiritually was in another, why should this "destroy all idea of the relation being personal?" Did the "Spirit of Christ" when in the prophets sustain no personal relation to them? When the Divine Logos was within a human body, did he sustain no personal relation to that body? This was the divine person in the human person. Does an unborn child sustain no personal relation to its mother? Or does she sustain no personal relation

to it? Sigma would have us believe there is no personal relation till after the child is born, for indwelling "destroys all idea of the relation being personal." Whatever induced a sound mind to conceive that the word personal can be predicated only of things on the outside of each other, may be discussed in some future work on the causes of confusion of thought and mental bewilderment; but if it must be admitted that a divine being may inhabit a human being, as above cited, and if even one physical being may inhabit another without destroying all idea of personal relation, why may not the Holy Spirit dwell in the human soul without involving the sequence threatened by the essayist. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him." If we are baptized into Christ, of course we are in him—in him in no coarse palpable sense, but in him figuratively, spiritually, really, and truly, bearing a personal relation to him most endearing. And if such an one may dwell in Christ, Christ may dwell "in him" without destroying his personal relation to him; and if Christ may dwell in the heart, the Spirit may, and so the above idea should be allowed to go meekly to the rear. Why the idea of personality should be connected with palpability and materiality is not very clear. There are spiritual, impalpable persons, as well as corporeal persons, and who can assure us that the former, like the latter, are amenable to the laws of space, bulk, weight, extension, and impenetrability. And yet this conviction seems to give shape and complexion to almost every sentence of the essay under review. Seldom has any mind been more completely subjugated to a pet theory than that of the essayist is to the notion that one spiritual person does not dwell in another; and this, apparently, is based on that other notion of impenetrability, which, even if true in a spiritual sense, can never be proved; and if proved, would not disprove the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Bro. Christopher thinks that because God dwelt personally with, not in, Adam and Eve in the garden, and was personally with the Jewish people, personally in their tabernacle and temple; and that because Jesus Christ was personally with and not in the disciples on earth, the conclusion must be inevitable that the Holy Spirit still retains the same outside relation to the church. Now such an ignoring of the difference between the blessings of the old and new covenant would be expected from a sectarian trying to prove church identity and infant baptism; but who was prepared to hear Dr. Christopher ignoring the fact, that the gospel brings us into closer relations with the Holy Spirit than was ever promised or enjoyed before? The coming of the Spirit or Comforter to dwell in the hearts of the people of God was a new thing, peculiar to the Christian dispensation. An examination of the Concordance of the Old Testament will show that, with the exception of one ambiguous passage, there is not the least

evidence that the Spirit ever dwelt in the saints of that age, except those who "were moved by the Holy Spirit" to reveal the will of God. Peter says, the "Spirit of Christ was in them," the prophets—one person dwelling in another. And now, if we should grant that God and Christ dwelt merely among the ancients, does this prove that, in a covenant established upon "better promises," they might not dwell in the members of the new body? When Jesus became the mediator of a "better covenant," he resolved to show that it is better by granting some new blessings not enjoyed before, such as full remission of sins, purging the conscience, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; so that our friend's analogies from the Old Testament are worth about as much to him as Pedobaptist analogies are for sprinkling infants.

We come now to notice the facility, or rather the arbitrariness, with which the Doctor decides what passages are literal and what figurative. He quotes: "But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if, indeed, the Spirit of God dwell in you." The phrases "in the flesh" and "in the Spirit" he pronounces "evidently figurative," but the expression, "Spirit dwells in you," is to be "taken literally, because the Spirit dwells with or among Christians." Just so, it must be literal in order to justify his translating *en* among instead of in. Were it not that among must be wrung out of *en*, there would be but little reason why "dwell in you" should be any more literal than "in the Spirit." If the writer could say, "you are among the Spirit," and make sense, the passage would be no less figurative than it is, yet he would very likely then imagine it to be "unquestionably" literal. The only reason why among can be introduced in the passage at all, is that the pronoun "you" is in the plural; for had Paul been writing to an individual and had said the "Spirit dwells in you" (singular), would this have changed the expression from a literal back into a figurative style? The author would be compelled to say so; for he would not translate such a passage, "the Spirit dwells among" you Timothy. Wherever among can not be mustered into service of course it is not literal, it is "unquestionably figurative;" for if not, down goes the new psychology, as it would never do to say the Spirit actually dwells in a man. But now, in all candor, does the mere circumstance of the noun following *en* being singular, or plural, make a sentence either literal or figurative? It is most remarkable that every passage that can not be translated to suit the new theory is pronounced "evidently figurative," "unquestionably figurative," while when *en* is followed by a plural noun it is generally decided to be literal, for in that case among, that ever-present help in time of need, hides its deficiencies among the multitude.

To illustrate still further: Paul, addressing the Colossians, uses the phrase, "Christ in you the hope of glory." This, of course, the Doctor

might translate, "Christ among you," and call it literal. But Paul says again: "Christ liveth in me;" but as this could not be rendered "among me," it would be labeled figurative. But why should there be a difference when the form of speech is the same? Christ can be as literally in one as in many. Again: why should the expressions, "until Christ be formed in you," and, "if Christ be in you," be called figurative any more than the phrase, "the Spirit dwells in you." The latter is pronounced literal, and *en* translated among. Could not Christ be among them as well as the Spirit? This seems to be a departure from his general rule of rendering *en* among before plural nouns, and only demonstrates the arbitrariness of his distinctions.

To prevent misunderstanding and logomachy, a little further explanation of terms may be necessary: 1. When we affirm our belief in the indwelling of Christ, or the Spirit personally, we do not mean bodily, nor does literal with us mean physical. Christ may be personally and literally in the Christian by his Spirit, or spiritually, without involving any gross occupation of space as conceived in physics. 2. Nor does our conception of this matter imply that the whole power and divinity of the Savior is concentrated in each Christian, any more than the whole divinity was in the temple, for this would make the creature equal to the Creator. An apostle says: "He has given us of his Spirit." We say the sun is in the room, when it is only shining through the window; nor does any one understand us to say that the whole diameter and circumference of that orb is crowded within the space of a few feet. Christ is the "true light," and "shines in our hearts." It is not assumed that even these illustrations properly represent the thing as it is, for the Bible simply asserts the fact that the "Spirit dwells in you," without explaining the manner of it; all we insist upon is, that the Spirit "dwells in us," in "our hearts," and that analogies are not wanting to relieve the subject from all supposed absurdity. The words personal and literal, then, involve nothing of corporeity nor of entirety in our conceptions of the divine nature, when speaking of his filling the human soul with his presence and power.

The Doctor is particularly anxious to have us believe that the "dwelling" is expressive of a "relation," and not of a "possession," that "among" is expressive of relation and not of possession, but that "in" is expressive of possession and not of relation. This position was by no means well studied before it was written, for who does not know that "in" expresses relation as fully and much more intimately than "among?" The Holy Spirit may dwell "in" every Christian, and so be not only related to them, but possessed by them, as "in" expresses both a relation and a possession. No possible advantage can be gained by choosing the cheaper word of the two, unless one is very desirous to express some very cheap view of a very cheap

religion. Besides the lack of finish in the distinction just noticed, is not the Holy Spirit often spoken of as a possession? "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Do not all rhetoricians regard have as a word expressing possession? If not, name a stronger one. Jude describes some wicked persons as "not having the Spirit." "Will not your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" We surely possess what is given to us. When ye, being evil, give your children bread, they possess that bread; and when God gives his children the Holy Spirit, they possess that gift. If not, why? A matter so plain demands no very extended notice, as the only features remarkable in the position are a want of circumspection, and the tendency to make religion too much an outside objective reality.

A few of the leading passages of Scripture analyzed by the essayist shall now receive a brief notice. The Father "will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with (*meta*) you forever; he shall "dwell with (*para*) you, and shall be in (*en*) you." It is assumed that the above three Greek prepositions express about the same relation, that the first two define the meaning of the last. But are we sure they are not climactic as they go? Does not the second speak of a relation more intimate than the first, and the third of a relation more intimate than the second? Sigma's own criticism seems to favor this view, for he decides that *meta* signifies that the persons are "associated together in the company of each other;" but *para* "places the persons at the side of each other, as two walk together in company." This is certainly starting the climax, which reaches its top in the preposition *en*. In the first place, the Spirit is to be with or among you in a general way; secondly, he is to be at your side, as if walking with you; and thirdly, he is to be in you, as your holy guest. It is good, better, and best.

"Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts." The Doctor had but two ways to manage this passage, either to show that "into your hearts" does not mean "into your hearts," or to show that the "Spirit of his (God's) Son" does not mean the Holy Spirit. He undertook the latter, and announces that the "Spirit of his Son" means simply "the spirit of adoption." A very few words shall settle this. Will he say that the "Spirit of his Son" and the "Spirit of Christ" mean the same or different things? "Christ" is "his Son," and of course the Spirit of the one is the Spirit of "the other. So we will believe, until the writer of the essay shall succeed in the task more difficult than dividing between the "south and southwest side of a hair." If these two expressions are identical in meaning, all that remains is to decide what the "Spirit of Christ" is. "The prophets searched what or what manner of times the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified" to the

sufferings of Christ. Was this the mere spirit of adoption? Or was it that by which "holy men of God were moved?" It was: holy men of God were moved by the Holy Spirit, and thus was the Spirit of Christ in them, which is the Spirit of God's Son, which is sent forth into the hearts of all his children, passing the *meta* and the *para*, and reaching its goal in the *en*.

Bro. Sigma has used up three and a half pages of the *Quarterly*, proving what no one would ever think of denying; that, in 1 Corinthians and in Ephesians, Paul addresses the church as a whole, and as a whole calls them a "temple," a "holy temple," and "a habitation of God through the Spirit." He is careful to make it appear, that no individual is a temple, for then he could not use his favorite little word "among," which he seems to have confiscated to his own use. He can say the Spirit dwells among the church, and even in the church, provided you contemplate the church as a whole; but if a single Christian could be proved to be a temple, he could not use among, as the Spirit could not dwell among one person. The cause of his anxiety about looking at the church as a whole is therefore very apparent. He dare not consider them individually, or if he does, the language immediately assumes a "figurative" style. For example: "Whosoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwells in him and he in God." Paul made this confession, and therefore God dwelt in Paul; Peter made the same confession, and God, by his Spirit, dwelt in him; the same may be said of James. Now taking up these men individually, and reading that God dwelt in Paul, in Peter, and in James, Sigma says the language is "figurative;" but speak of the three collectively, and say that God dwells in them; that moment he calls the language literal, and translates it among them. And why not in three as well as in one? Simply to save his translation of *en*, and the notion that one person can not dwell in another.

After all, the very notion of considering the church as a whole is destructive of the theory it is intended to support, for then it is reduced to one thing, although made up of parts; and this furnishes one thing, according to Sigma, that the Lord may come into. The Spirit may literally dwell in the church as a temple. True, he is in it only by virtue of his being among the members outwardly, but still he is within the temple. All grant that he is in his temple, but in what sense is he there? He may be in his temple by being among them, as the atmosphere is among men on the outside; or he may be in his temple by being within each individual, just as the blood is in the body by being in each member of the body; and as God may be conceived of as dwelling in his temple in either of these ways, we must try to determine which it is. The passages quoted by the Doctor do not determine this question, as they simply affirm that he is in his

temple or church considered as a whole. Paul settles it, so far as he is concerned, by saying that "Christ liveth in me." Here, then, is one member of that body, the church, one living stone in the building within which the Lord dwells. There may be others. To the Galatians Paul says: "My little children, with whom I travail in birth again till Christ be formed in you." Then he was in the Galatians who were also stones in the building, the temple; in them individually, for Sigma refused to translate the passage by the word among. Again: still keeping the individual Christian before us, we quote from John: "And he who keeps his commandments dwells in him, and he (Christ) in him." This is getting along faster, as it is here declared that Christ dwells not in Paul only, but in every individual that keeps his commandments. We can not allow the bare assertion that these passages are figurative, and therefore of no force; for we have a right to an equal amount of arbitrariness in asserting that the expression, God "dwells in his temple," is figurative. Indeed, we are unable to see anything more figurative in the one case than in the other. God is not palpably and visibly in the heart, nor is he palpably and visibly in his temple. His whole divinity is not compressed within any human heart, nor is it confined within the whole church, or the church as a whole. You may call it figurative in both cases; but we object to the unjustifiable distinctions made for one against the other, and that, too, to support a theory that has no foundation either in Scripture or in true psychology. Surely God dwells in his temple, and, if you please, among his people; but this is far from proving that he does not dwell in every member of the body of Christ, imparting vital energy to all. If he is in one person only figuratively, he is but figuratively in two, and so of the whole church; and who knows but that the words "among you," might be figurative, not real, not actual, and so keep the Spirit out of each heart, out of each congregation, and out of the temple or body itself.

We now call especial attention to a thesis, regarded as fundamental by Bro. Christopher, as to its influence in his theory of spiritual power. It is this: "We believe that the Holy Scriptures are the only means that the Holy Spirit uses to enlighten the minds of men in regard to every relation they may sustain to God, and to comfort and strengthen the heart of the Christian." This he makes no attempt to prove, but remarks: "If what is here affirmed be true, then there can be no reason why the Holy Spirit should dwell in the heart." And further on he makes this unfortunate remark: "These necessities for the Spirit's (outside) presence our enlightened reason can appreciate; and when our enlightened reason is satisfied, there must be a substantial basis for that satisfaction." Enlightened reason! We will not stop to compare the Doctor's enlightened reason with the enlightened reason of many others, for then it would be hard to tell whose

reason is enlightened; but we must confess that these and other cognate expressions in his essay smack of rationalism, just a little. We have not quoted them, however, with a view to a discussion in that direction, nor even to hint that he at all means to favor rationalism; but desire to call attention to the above thesis, which seems to be the basis of what follows it. The first part of said thesis shall meet with no opposition from me, for I believe that God "enlightens the minds of men" as to ideas of religion by the word alone; but we intend to hold the writer to a strict account till he proves that all "comfort and strength in the heart of the Christian" are administered directly by the word. We call for the chapter and verse. We do not feel called upon to prove the contrary; but rather to point out some of the work to be done by the author of the notion before he can lay any claim to our assent.

1. He must prove a universal negative—that the Holy Spirit uses no other means than the Scriptures to impart comfort and strength to the Christian. He will scarcely attempt to prove a universal negative at all, especially this one, without the chapter and verse affirming it, for the Spirit may have a thousand ways of working not revealed to us; and, also, there may be other ways even mentioned in the Bible that our benighted "enlightened reason" has not yet "appreciated."

2. The Savior says: You, evil fathers, give bread to your children when they ask it, and shall not the Heavenly Father "give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Here the Holy Spirit is compared to the bread or food of this life which strengtheneth man's heart. The Spirit is the true "bread of life" for the inner man. Sigma must prove that this is all done by the word—that "the Holy Spirit given to them that ask him" means that if we pray to God he will set us to reading the Bible and parsing over its promises. He must also show that this bread of life, contrary to all analogy, is kept on the outside; for the Spirit never dwells *in* any one. Besides, if all spiritual strength derived from the bread of life is obtained through the word directly, why pray for it when the word is always nigh thee?

3. Paul says: "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us." Sigma must prove that this is done by the word alone. Or if he will first prove, from Scripture, his universal negative, we will admit that this passage may be reconciled with it. As I am not on the affirmative, it will be necessary for the Doctor to prove from the Scriptures that the love of God is always "shed abroad" in the heart by the Bible, and that the Holy Spirit "is given to us" for some other purpose—for "providential work."

4. Paul prays that the Ephesians might be strengthened with

might by the Spirit in the inner man." He must prove that when a man is "strengthened by the Spirit" that the "Spirit always does it by the word; and that there is no "communion of the Holy Spirit" except as a man reads his Bible. Hence the sentence, "The communion of the Holy Spirit be with you," means: May you read your Bibles regularly. "If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit." Here again "fellowship of the Spirit" must either mean Bible reading, or the newly discovered "providential work of the Spirit.

5. Paul says: "I know this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer and the *supply* (or *aid* as some translate it) of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." Paul was in the habit of looking to God for his daily "supply" of the bread of life. Sigma must show that the "supply of the Spirit" means the information the Spirit gives to the mind by reading the Bible. He must observe, too, that in this case it is not love, comfort, nor strength that is called for, but the Spirit itself, which is the sum of all "good things." Finally, he must reconcile with his theory all such passages as these: "When I am weak, then am I strong;" "My strength is made perfect in weakness;" I rejoice in my weakness "that the power of Christ may rest upon me;" "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me;" and show that all this strength and power of Christ are obtained by simply reading or hearing the word—all this and much more is to be done whenever he undertakes the task.

Here we close our review of this long essay of Bro. Christopher. It is a good thing that while men often fall below their theory, they frequently are better than their theory. I am happy to know that while some are even less orthodox than the essay before us, denying the communion of the Holy Spirit altogether, not even admitting his being *among* us except by the word, they nevertheless have the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, although they think it is all done by the word. In the case before us, the writer is evidently in advance of his theory, as the spirit and mellow tone of his elegantly written production plainly indicate. The theory itself, however, would ultimately tend to cheapen religion in the hearts of the people. The tendency of men at best is to shallowness in their religious experience, and every member of the church should be taught to keep the temple of his own body pure and sanctified for the indwelling Spirit of God. To every brother we would kindly say: Try to enjoy the love of God, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit.

"And thou shalt walk in sort, white light, with kings and priests abroad,
And thou shalt summer high in bliss upon the hills of God."

—POLYCARP.

THEIR TESTIMONY.

The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God. Rom. viii., 16.

FEW passages are more frequently cited in the pulpit than this; while not one is looked upon by many as being more important. That the passage is important we readily grant, and that it is right to cite it in the pulpit we firmly believe. Whether it is always construed correctly, or applied truly, are points which may be safely denied. Not that it is always construed incorrectly, or applied untruly; but only that it is sometimes so.

The meaning of the individual terms of the passage would seem to be exceedingly obvious. Yet their conjunct sense and full force may not be so apparent as at first sight they are felt to be. The terms are used of spirits—no easy topics to fathom. The sentiment expressed is something affirmed of spirits. It is hence bound closely up with the unknown and inscrutable. It is easy to trip here. Hence the need of caution is great and constant. When a predication brings the spiritual into thought, it submits the untriable to the test. In such a case, the boldest may question his skill, and the most prudent shrink from the task proposed. Yet it is not spirits which are here proposed as the subject to be investigated. It is what they do, their acts. But then how hard is it to separate the act wholly from the actor, and think of that apart from this? The doer flings the spell of his mystic nature over his deed, and ties them up in one. This makes the deed little less difficult than the doer. The one as cause goes out into the other as effect, and lends it obscurity; while the latter loses half of its own palpable nature and borrows half of the impalpable nature of the former from no circumstance save that of the relation which subsists between them. It is felt to be almost as hard to subject to appreciable examination the act of a spirit as it is the spirit itself. But the feeling is certainly deceptive. When a spirit speaks, we can try its voice by the ear, and subject its sayings to the criticism of the grammar and the logic, but not so the spirit itself. The deed speaks to the sense, the agents to the reason only; that may be known, and is designed so to be, but not so this, at least now. I shall, hence, show myself content to inquire into what the spirits of the passage do, with no wish to venture more.

Unless I have strangely miscollected the popular interpretation of this passage, that interpretation is out in its two most material features. These features are respectively, first, that when the sinner

is pardoned he is assured thereof in the instant of the act by a mysterious pleasurable sensation or feeling being imparted to his soul; and, second, that this sensation or feeling is an immediate impartation of the Holy Spirit. Now, I shall certainly not deny that the pardoned man is left in possession of an assurance, trustworthy in the highest sense, of his pardon. Such denial would be compelled to assume either what the pardoned knows in fact to be not true, or that a man may be pardoned and not know it—a circumstance which would rob pardon of its power to impart joy to the soul. I agree, then, with the authors of the popular interpretation in this, that the pardoned man has an assurance of his pardon. Let this agreement be fully understood, and the point it involves be allowed to lie, for the future, beyond agitation. But the authors of the popular interpretation assert further, that the assurance in the case consists in a sensation or feeling being imparted to the soul. *This I deny.* But let my denial be understood. I shall not be so unphilosophic as to deny the existence of what a man says he feels or claims to be conscious of. I shall admit, therefore, the existence of the sensation or feeling claimed in the premises, but deny that it is the assurance of pardon. This force and this extent has my denial, no other, no greater. Nor do I see how my brethren, claiming as they do to be guided by the Scriptures, can concede more or deny less. To concede more would be to concede what has never been, nor can ever be proved. This would be gratuitous and dangerous. To deny less would be to place us in a position illogical and false. This should not be done. I hence feel my denial to be necessary and just.

I have conceded, let it be observed, that the pardoned man has an assurance of the fact; only I have not said in what that assurance consists. This point will come up and be determined in the course of the present investigation.

But there yet remains the second feature of the popular interpretation to be denied, which must not be forgotten. It is alleged that the conceded sensation or feeling is an immediate impartation of the Holy Spirit. But of the truth of this there exists no proof. It is an assumption with no warrant from Holy Writ; and the wonder is that this fact has not been perceived by those who have taken it, and the assumption been abandoned. On one condition, and one only, could the sensation or feeling become the evidence of pardon. If it were known that the feeling never exists except when pardon has taken place, then the existence of the feeling would intuitively establish the fact of pardon. But this is not known, neither can it be. It must, hence, be denied. The true and safe conclusion, therefore, is, that though the feeling actually exists, nothing is thereby proved, and that, consequently, the assurance of pardon must be sought in something else.

But the assumption possesses other features which should not go overlooked. Though itself an assumption, it rests on an assumption. It assumes that the Holy Spirit sometimes excites in man a mere sensation or feeling, and nothing more. Now, this may be true; but suppose it were denied. What then? Certainly, it could not be proved. Indeed, it may be well questioned whether the work of the Spirit ever, in any case, ends in a mere sensation or feeling. I am much inclined to think that it either always falls below or always rises above this point. Strength in the inner man is never realized in the form of a sensation; and when information was imparted in the days of miracles, it was most probably imparted in all cases through the medium of speech. The Spirit, though in man, spoke to him when its object was to enlighten him, and never simply impressed him. But if to this it be rejoined that love, joy, and peace are sensations or feelings, that these are ascribed in the Word of God to the presence of the Spirit; and that, hence, what is here said can not be true, I answer, first, that, though sensations or feelings, they are not of the kind from which pardon is inferred; and, second, that if of that kind, then they prove too much; for since I am conscious of them they prove me to be pardoned, which is what the sects of the day deny. It hence seems to me that, as the assurance of pardon, we must abandon the sensation or feeling in question.

Further: of all the means of deception known to me, I can think of none so well adapted to the purposes of Satan as that of a blind sensation or feeling. That he has access to the human heart to a fearful extent can not be denied. Nor will his marvelous influence over the flesh and feelings be called in question. Whether he acts directly on us by touching us and thereby exciting in us such evil desires as will work out his will; or whether he acts on us indirectly through means effectual to his ends, are questions over which we may give ourselves little trouble. That he acts on us and excites in us emotions and feelings we must admit. How this is done is a different question. Now suppose the human family, in large part, or in small part, to recognize as a fact that a certain emotion or feeling, or a certain state of man's sensitive nature, is the proof of his pardon; but that the human family in this is wrong. The former we know some of them do; and the latter may be true. How in this case would Satan proceed? Of course he would excite the feeling which is accepted as the proof of pardon, but which in fact is not. The deception would be complete. And this I fear is the condition of thousands of the human family at this instant. We know that they have accepted their feelings as proof of pardon, and that they have not the slightest evidence of being right in this, save the simple existence of the feelings themselves. I think their position frightfully dangerous. Man needs some higher and more stable assurance of his acceptance with

God than a transient feeling, fitful emotion, or illegible sense. He needs something that shall speak to him in a voice as loud and distinct as that in which his outraged conscience cries—something that shall leave him no more doubt of his pardon than he has of his guilt in the sight of God. This is what he needs. A proof that makes his soul glow with faith to-day, but leaves that soul eclipsed with doubts to-morrow is not the proof for him. Yet such is the proof afforded in the sensation or feeling of which we have been speaking.

But the popular mode of treating the passage seems to me to be at fault in another respect. According to that mode the passage teaches that the fact of pardon is communicated *to* the soul in the act *by* the Holy Spirit. Thus the human spirit is made merely the passive recipient of the assurance. It affords none of that assurance itself. It gives us no testimony of its own, but merely receives that of another. But this is surely wrong. For the passage teaches that both the Holy Spirit and the human spirit bear their joint testimony, and not that the one merely receives the testimony of the other. But of this more fully elsewhere.

We now proceed to speak more immediately of what the passage does teach, of what it asserts and what it implies. And first as to the matter or point to which testimony is borne. Too much care can not be shown in determining this. Error here is fatal. Caution is necessary and exactitude indispensable. Now, that the following is the precise point to which testimony is borne is simply certain, namely, *we are children of God.* "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit *that we are the children of God.*" Doubt here is impossible. But what now is the nature of the point to which testimony is borne? *It is a fact.* It is not an opinion, a feeling, or a vague impression. It is not a fact respecting others, but a fact respecting ourselves, and embracing exclusively the children of God. Neither is it the mode of a fact or any mere accident connected therewith, but the fact itself. Such is the matter or point to be proved. Let this be distinctly apprehended and steadily kept in mind. It will free the passage from much confusion.

Of course no testimony can be borne to this fact till the fact has occurred. It must be completed, completed in all its parts and circumstances. Then, and not till then, can it be testified to. If the fact has not occurred, that is, if a man has not become actually and truly a child of God, it can not be avouched. Whatever the human spirit may testify in that case from being deceived, or from any other cause, the Holy Spirit can say nothing. If it speak at all it must speak against, not for, the fact. No testimony can be had before the fact, none while it is occurring, only when it is ended, only when a man *is born again*, does the Spirit testify. Let no man deceive himself here. The Spirit at least can not be deceived. We must not flatter our-

selves that we are children of God, if such be not the case. Our self-deception will surely be detected. Besides, if deceived on other points, the injury may be slight; but if deceived in this, no chance is left to escape the fatal result. Here at least, then, all must be reality, must be certainty.

Moreover, not only must the fact of our being children of God be completed, but the fact must be known, be known to be completed, be known both to the Holy Spirit and to the human. Otherwise, it is intuitively clear that no testimony can ever be borne thereto. The Holy Spirit can not testify to a nonentity; no more can the human, unless it testify falsely. All of which is not only a dictate of common sense, but in accordance with human procedure in like cases. In courts of common law we do not allow a witness to testify to what is conjectural, certainly not to what is not. Not only must the fact have actually transpired to which he bears testimony, but it, or so much of it as he bears testimony to, must be *known* to him. It must not be inferred, but be known. Not only so, but it is deemed legitimate, and necessary to the ends of justice, to inquire into a witness's means of knowledge in the case, his powers and modes of observation, and even his habits of life. And if caution be necessary here in life's common affair, how much more in its highest. Nor does it seem to me to be enough that the fact of our childship to God is simply known; it should be known as few facts are known, or known so well that none can be known better. This becomes apparent from the character of the witnesses in the case. One of these, be it remembered, is the Holy Spirit. With this the human spirit bears its joint testimony. How high, then, should be the degree of certainty with which it testifies. What it says, it should know to be true, and know it so well that it knows nothing better. Nothing here can be conjectural; all must be absolute certainty. Most cautious, then, and faultlessly accurate should the human spirit be in testifying, when it knows that its testimony is to lie along side of that of the Holy Spirit. How, in view of this, people can recite, in their experiences, the indistinct and varying emotions and sensations of their souls as the facts of consciousness on which they rely as the proof of pardon, is surely one of the mysteries of human life. These emotions they may certainly relate if they see fit. It is not to this that we object. But when they attempt to infer from them the fact of their acceptance on high, we feel that they commit an error in reasoning, which, in an ordinary affair of life, could have with them no parallel. How strange, yet how true! In an affair involving the value of a single cent a man is faultlessly accurate in his logical procedure, yet in one involving, it may be, the destiny of his spirit, he commits a blunder which the merest novice in the art of thinking should blush to be convicted of.

But how is it that the fact of being children of God—the fact to which the Holy Spirit and the human bear their testimony, how is it that this fact comes to be a matter of human knowledge? That it should be known to the Holy Spirit is nothing strange; but that it should be a matter of knowledge with the human, is the point that perplexes. What secret thing God does, how can we know? Certainly we can not know it at all unless he communicate it; and that the act of accepting a human being as his child is a secret act, or an act not knowable by us at the instant of occurrence will hardly be questioned; at least it will not be questioned that the act remains not known till communicated. Yet the act or the fact of acceptance is certainly known to the human spirit, for otherwise it could never bear testimony to it. How now does it become known? Repudiating the mode of communication by emotions and impressions, I can think of but two others: 1. Audibly announcing the fact in so many words. 2. Conditioning it so that compliance with the conditions necessitates the belief of it. Now, since the fact of acceptance must be conceded to be known to the human spirit in some way, I insist that it must become known in one of these two ways, there being left no admissible third way. Audibly announcing the fact in so many words must be rejected, since no one contends for it; and if any one did, the contention would have to be pronounced void. Only, then, in the second way is the fact knowable, namely, by being conditioned so that compliance with the conditions necessitates its belief. This I not only believe to be true, but believe it to be all that human reason demands or human happiness requires. In the first place, it is all that human reason demands. What human reason demands in our present state is certainly that which is best for us; and what is best for us is not that high degree of certainty which is implied in the word knowledge, but that strong assurance which is implied in the word faith—an assurance which fills the mind with happiness, hope, and caution. We need, in this life, happiness as a present enjoyment; hope, to stimulate to future duty; and caution, to guard against indolence and insecurity. If God so condition our acceptance with him, as his children. as to make the act of acceptance to depend on compliance with conditions, then will our caution be extreme to ascertain and comply with these conditions; our belief in our acceptance will be strong in proportion as we have no doubt of our compliance; while the strength of our hope will depend on that of our faith. This seems to me to approach that arrangement which in this life is best for man. In the second place, happiness, whatever may be its future meaning, is now a term of degree. It does not denote perfect blessedness, but only a measure of it; and this measure is more consistent with a life of faith than with any other. This we infer from the divine appointment, that in this life we must walk by faith and not by sight. Hence to believe

that upon compliance with certain known conditions, we become the children of God is all that is required in order to as large a measure of happiness as is designed to be our present lot.

But can such compliance beget the requisite assurance? We believe it can; nay, more; we believe that nothing else can beget a higher degree save that which gives knowledge itself. If God assures me that, on compliance with certain named conditions, I shall become this or that to him (and by the phrase this or that is meant a fact which I can not know in and of myself, but which has to be communicated to me); and if the named conditions are such that I may surely know them, and know when I have complied with them, then I hold that I am to feel, and can feel, as fully assured of the fact that I have become this or that to God as though he announced the fact to me after its occurrence, or after the compliance; and further, that the incredulity which rejects the assurance of the one case would reject that of the other. If God condition an event on one ground, and one only, can I question the happening thereof, namely, the ground of non-compliance with the condition or conditions. If the conditions are certainly complied with, doubt is absolutely precluded. This is intuitively clear. Hence the only ground of doubt lies in the question of compliance. Now is it reasonable, even in the lowest degree, that God would condition a matter of so much moment as that of our acceptance with him as his children, and at the same time leave the conditions of acceptance doubtful or indeterminate in any sense or to any extent? I at least can not believe it. And if it be not true, then the question of compliance can be indisputably determined. Indeed it then becomes a matter of knowledge, and hence a matter of positive experimental certainty. I certainly know whether I have complied with a given condition or not; and if I know this, doubt of anything else is impossible. I then know that I am a child of God, that is to say, I know It in the only sense in which the word know can be used in the case—I firmly believe it.

But the ground of assurance now under consideration deserves a still further notice. That I see and hear and think are facts taken notice of in my consciousness, of the reality of which I need no other proof, and of which I can certainly receive none that is more trustworthy. Of this every one is satisfied. But to this class of facts, the fact of pardon does not belong. It belongs to the class which lies without me, with which I am not sensibly connected, and of which, therefore, conceivably I may certainly be ignorant. It is the act of a being above me, beyond me, and wholly independent of me—a being with whom I am not living in such sensible and conscious intercourse as to give me of itself the knowledge of his acts. As the act is with himself alone, so is the knowledge of it. This knowledge he can communicate to me, and does, but not in an unusual way. He simply

tells me that I am pardoned. But he tells me this not absolutely, but contingently. He says to me: If you do this, I will do that; and then lets me know what the word this stands for, or the duty it expresses. This duty, then, becomes to me a thing of knowledge, and knowledge of the same kind to which the absolute communication of the Father would belong. That he commands me to repent is a thing I know as surely as I would know the fact of my pardon were he directly and in so many words to communicate it to me; and I know the one in the same way in which I would know the other. I hear the command to repent, and know I hear it. I could only hear the announcement of the fact of pardon, and know that I heard it. In both cases the communication is from the same party, and becomes matter of knowledge in the same way. No degree of certainty attends the one case which attends not the other. Now, if I know the meaning of the word repent, and this I shall at present take for granted, then may I certainly know when I have repented; and if I may certainly know when I repent, then may I with equal certainty know that I have the blessing conditioned on repentance. How I can be in doubt here, I confess appears not to my mind.

The only point for doubt in the case is, whether I understand the true meaning of the word repent, or the true meaning of the prescribed condition whatever it may be. If I understand this meaning, "whether I have complied with it or not, is a point about which I can not doubt. Here all is perfectly clear. But suppose the meaning of the term to be doubtful. To this extent of course, must doubt exist, as to whether I have complied with it. Even in this view, I hold that the doubt should not prejudice my case. The existence of the doubt is no fault of mine. I did not create it; neither am I to be held responsible for it. The doubt is in the term of him who prescribed the condition, and in the term in which the condition is prescribed. To whatever extent, then, it may modify my conduct, to that extent am I free. For otherwise, I am held accountable for what I have no means of remedying, and for modifications of conduct which I could not avoid. This would be unjust, if our sense of the just is any standard. In this case I hold that my honest attempt at compliance, being the best I could make, and the only one possible in the case, would have to be accepted; and that hence I would be entitled to the blessing. Nay more, that I would as certainly receive it as though no doubt existed, and should feel fully assured thereof. Hence the circumstance that the assurance of pardon depends on compliance with conditions, assuming such to be the case, is not a circumstance involving doubt as to pardon. The assurance even on this ground may rise so high as to be incapable of rational increase, and beyond this we may not expect it to rise.

But I said that not only must the fact of becoming children of God be

complete in itself, before any testimony can be borne to it; not only must it be complete in all its parts, but that it must *be known* to be complete. If the slightest doubt exists as to any one part of the fact, then that doubt attaches to the whole fact. For the fact that we are children of God can have no higher assurance than that which attends the most doubtful part of the process of becoming his children. But is the fact of becoming children of God a process including several parts? If so, what are these parts—and how can we know when each is complete in itself? I answer, becoming children of God is certainly a process, including more parts than one; and I shall now proceed to point out these parts, and show how they become known.

Accordingly, I cite the following: "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." (1 John v., 1.)

This passage of Scripture is absolutely invaluable. There is no such thing as exaggerating its importance. On the question now in hand, it is to the point and decisive. It asserts of every human being who believes that Jesus is the Christ, *that he is begotten of God*. Not that he is born, but simply that he is begotten; and let the distinction be steadily kept in the head, as it is deeply engraved on the sacred page. To be begotten of God is one thing; to be born of God is a partly different and subsequent thing. This includes that; but that does not imply this. This can not happen without that; though that may happen and this may never occur, as is often the case. For the begotten are many; the born are few. Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten; but thousands thus begotten will never be born, but will die in their sins and be lost. Countless numbers of the sects are in this condition to-day; and in this condition will end their lives. Mournful as is the thought, it is yet true.

But from the passage, one of two conclusions indisputably results: either to believe is to be begotten, or to believe includes it. If in every case where we have the believer of the passage we also have the begotten of the passage, and if we can not have the former without having the latter, as we certainly can not, then certainly must the two be identical, or, as already said, the believing includes the begetting. So clear is this that nothing more need be said on it. I shall simply add that I hold the believing and the begetting to be identical, and not that the former merely includes the latter; but shall content myself with stating the point, without arguing it.

Now, that no one can be born of God who is not begotten of God, is intuitively certain. And he only who is born of God is a child of God. In order, then, to feel assured that I am born of God, and hence a child, I must know that I am begotten of God. Hence, further, before I can testify that I am a child of God, I must know that I am begotten of him. How, then, can I know this? To whatever extent, moreover, I am doubtful of it, to that extent precisely am I doubtful of

being a child; and to whatever extent I fail to know it, to that extent am I unable to testify to being a child. These things are bound up together and can not be separated. I repeat, how, then, can I know that I am begotten of God?

In order to reach a satisfactory answer to this question, let us agree that to be begotten of God is a phrase denoting a change, a change in the inner man, a change in the soul or in the spirit, a change in whatever is to be begotten again to life, and in whatever is to be changed in order to everlasting life. To this we can all in general terms safely agree. In order, then, to know whether I am begotten of God, or not, I am by agreement to look within myself, to look into my soul or into my spirit. This determines *the subject* I am to inspect. Moreover, when I look into my spirit, I am to look for a *change*. This determines the thing I am to look for within certain general bounds. But it is just here that I encounter my first difficulty. On inspecting my spirit, I find it to be the subject of innumerable changes. These are as different among themselves as they are countless in number. Which one of all I am conscious of answers to the phrase "begotten of God," and is the one which the Scriptures mean to express by it? This is the question which perplexes. The change I am seeking may certainly be among those I find within me, but how am I to determine which one it is? I inspect my heart, inspect my spirit, inspect my whole inner man, but not one change do I find answering directly to the phrase "begotten of God;" at least I find not one of which I can with absolute confidence say: This answers to it, and this is the thing. Yet if that change be within me, then must I be able both to find it and to identify it. Otherwise, I shall never be able to testify with any certainty to the fact of being a child of God, which includes it.

Now, on inspecting my heart, I am conscious that I love God, as conscious that I love him as I am that at this instant I think; conscious that I love Christ; conscious that I love good people—of all this am I conscious. But is this the change denoted by the phrase "begotten of God?" Here I am not sure. It may be; it may not be. At least from this, and this only, I would not be willing to testify that I am begotten of God. I may hope that such is the case, but do not know it; I may be told by others that such is the case, but still I am not certain. Were I compelled to rest my inspection here, my uncertainty would give me exquisite pain. I should never feel certain that I am a child of God. Life-long would my spirit droop; it would be a mute swan in its cage, silently and gloomily awaiting its doubtful end.

But I inspect my heart further. I am conscious of many acts which the holy word of God defines to be sins. Of these I am conscious. Nor is this all. I am conscious of keen regret for each and

all of these acts; nay more, I am conscious of a grief for them which is mildly phrased painful. My sorrow over them is poignant and deep. My soul is in anguish as I recount them over. My spirit is troubled within me. Bitter, bitter are my sighs as I gaze on the long, unblotted list. They haunt me through the livelong day; they haunt me through the dreamy night. I scream over them as they wring my poor, bursting heart, and piteously beg for deliverance. Of all this am I conscious. But is this the change, or this the feeling denoted by the phrase "begotten of God?" Here again am I in doubt. It may be; it may not be. I can never be certain. I am merely sensible of the change, the feeling; but all beyond this hangs in doubt. I see nothing here of which I could testify, it is the thing—begotten of God. I think, I search, I investigate, I inquire; my bewilderment remains. Is there no relief? I appeal to the word of God. It names my spiritual state, sorrow, grief, a broken heart, contrition. If to this I add the purpose to forsake my sins, it calls my state repentance. But is even this the change implied in being begotten of God? The Scriptures do not so name it; and I dare not so call it. In something else, then, must I seek the change I am in quest of; otherwise I must content myself to remain in hopeless uncertainty.

Again, then, I inspect my heart. On looking into it, I discover among the thousand emotions, feelings, sensations, and states thereof, one which the word of God defines to be faith or belief. Of this I am most distinctly and vividly conscious. I know it as I know that I think; and can no more doubt it than I can doubt that I think. I can speak to it, and of it, with a certainty which is incapable of increase. Nor is this belief vague and general in its nature. It is specific and singularly direct. I am conscious that I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. This much I know, but this much is all I know; that is, it is all I know in and of myself, it is all I am conscious of; and from knowing only this much, I can draw no inference. I am cognizant of my belief as a fact, but simply as a fact, and not also as a premise. I know it simply as a reality, as a thing in itself actually existent; I know it not as a cause, not as an antecedent, not as something precedent to an ulterior end. I know it simply as an absolute entity, no more, no less.

But now comes in the Spirit of God through its word to shed new light on this fact, to tell us what else it is besides a simple fact, to interpret it, and disclose its additional value. "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ, *is begotten of God.*" The fact that I do believe is a fact furnished by my own consciousness, by my own spirit; *and this is the testimony of my spirit.* This is its deliverance, the thing it knows, the thing it says. On my own spirit supplying this fact, the Holy Spirit pronounces me begotten of God; *and this is*

its testimony. This is something it knows, and something that I can not know; something it says, and I receive. Hence I know that I am a believer, and can testify to this fact; the Spirit knows that, being a believer, I am begotten of God, and testifies to that fact. I accept this testimony, and thus believe that I am begotten of God. I know, then, that I am a believer, and believe that I am begotten of God. So stands the matter, if my conception of it be true.

Now, if I can not be mistaken in my knowledge, and if I am, then I have no knowledge; and if there can be no mistake in the Spirit's testimony, and if there is, then there is no truth in any testimony; it then follows that the fact that I am begotten of God is certain up to the highest degree of certainty attainable of things which are not wholly matters of knowledge. Beyond this point faith can not go; for immediately beyond this point faith ceases and knowledge sets in. I hence have an assurance that I am begotten of God, which is incapable of increase while I walk by faith, and not by sight, which will be as long as I dwell in the flesh.

And this testimony of the Spirit is the only testimony which I have or can have that I am begotten of God. All else is either inferential or conjectural. But since this testimony is of the Spirit, and hence infallible, it is all that I want, all that I ask. It is sufficient, adequate, and beyond this reason demands nothing.

An inferential proof might be found in the following train of reasoning. Christ says: "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." Now where are all saved persons—in or out of the kingdom? They must be one or the other. If saved and out of the kingdom, who then are in the kingdom? The answer must be, those who are born again. Is there, then, a difference between the saved and the born again? Can a man be saved, and not be born again? Hardly, I conjecture. He who is saved is born again. This I lay down as rationally indisputable. Now in the case of the saved two things have occurred—they have believed and been immersed. These two things, then, must include all that enters into being born again. But no one can be born again without being begotten of God. Which one of the two things, then, that occur in the case of the saved, must answer to being begotten of God? It can not be immersion. It must, then, be *belief*. Hence the inference that to believe is to be begotten of God, begotten of the Spirit, or begotten again. I confess that this conclusion to my mind, though strictly inferential, rises high, very high in the scale of the probable. It seems to me to fall but a degree below the positively certain.

But compare the testimony now adduced that I am begotten of God with that of those who rely on their feelings to establish the point. In one respect they agree; in a most material respect they differ. I am conscious of the existence of my faith; they are con-

scious of the existence of their feelings. So far we agree. The Holy Spirit decides that, being a believer, I am begotten of God; but it decides nothing respecting those feelings. This is a bold difference. But it may be replied, that those who have these feelings also have the faith. Be it so; I am glad. Then they are begotten of God. But the fact is decided on the ground of their faith, and not on that of their feelings. As proof, then, their feelings avail nothing, and should be disused for that purpose. Were this done, the folly of relating experiences would soon become an extinct thing; and we should have men returning to reason, as they resorted to the legitimate use of faith. That day would be a happy one in many places and with many people.

But to be begotten again is not to be born again; nor is the proof of the one necessarily the proof the other. To be begotten again is a part of being born again; but it may rest on its own independent proof. What that proof is we now know; but what is the proof of being born again? That the proof is to be furnished jointly by the Holy Spirit and by the human is simply certain; but what is it? How obtained? And in what form delivered? What fact is to be added to being begotten again to constitute being born again? And how do we become cognizant of that fact so as to be enabled to testify to it? These are the questions now before us for consideration.

To be born again is not a literal re-birth; still it must be a fact or an event more or less closely resembling a literal birth, otherwise it could never be called a birth. Even allowing the term birth to be applied to the fact figuratively, as it certainly is; still the figurative fact or the fact resembling must be strikingly like the literal fact or the fact resembled. Otherwise the term birth could never be applied to it even in a figurative sense. What fact or event, then, in my life, bears so strong a likeness to a literal birth as to justify calling it a birth?

I again inspect my inner man, and cause all the changes and facts thereof, of which I am conscious, to pass in review before me. These changes or facts are countless; but not one of them bears even the remotest possible resemblance to a birth. I hence at once conclude that no one of them could in any view or on any ground be called a birth, even in the most figurative sense of the term. Besides, while conducting this inspection, I apply to each and every fact furnished in consciousness, such scriptural tests as I have at hand, just as in the case of being begotten. To not a single fact will the term born apply. The Scriptures take hold of no fact bearing its own appropriate name, and call it besides a being born again, as in the case of belief, which they call being begotten of God. I am hence led to abandon my inner man as furnishing no fact constituting being born again.

I consequently come now to my outer life, to my life as mirrored in the eye of the world. What is there here that can be called being born again? Of course no fact can be so called, unless it bear some resemblance to a birth. Now, of all the facts of my life, which fact, as a religious one, bears the closest resemblance to a birth? There is but one answer to this question: *that fact is my immersion*. But do the Scriptures anywhere call my immersion a birth? Certainly they nowhere call my immersion a birth, as they call my belief a being begotten of God. How, then, do I succeed in making out a case of identity between my immersion and anything named a birth in the word of God?

From the Scriptures I learn, that in order to enter the kingdom of God_ I must be born *of water*. Now what is this being born of water? The question is not difficult. The word born may perplex me some, but the word water can not in the least; and this word is the clue to my case of identity. Water is never present but in one act connected with the kingdom of Christ. In that act it is always present, and from it never absent. It is never used except in that act, and the act itself is single. That act is immersion. In this act water is used; it is used in no other; and immersion is a single act. This single act then must, of necessity, constitute being born of water. But does immersion in any view resemble a birth? Strictly speaking, immersion does not; strictly speaking, emersion does. But it takes both these to complete immersion. Hence immersion, on that side of it which lies next to the kingdom of God, and from which the kingdom is entered, bears a striking likeness to a birth, and could in strict propriety be called one. When now we remember that he who is immersed is he who is begotten of God, and the conclusion that belief is the begetting and emersion the birth, becomes overwhelming. To my mind it is conclusive and final.

Now, of both of these facts—the fact of my belief and the fact of my immersion, I am distinctly cognizant, of the one immediately in consciousness, of the other mediately in an act of memory, and can testify to both in the clearest language. Thus my own spirit furnishes the two great facts on which the Holy Spirit declares me in the kingdom, in Christ, a child of God. Suppose my own spirit supplied not these facts. Where from the Holy Spirit, in the word of God or out of it, could I obtain testimony that I am a child of God? The thing is impossible. But allow my spirit to supply the facts. How, without the voice of the Holy Spirit, could I infer from the facts themselves that I am a child of God? I could never do it.

In this way, therefore, do I conclude that the Holy Spirit bears witness with my spirit that I am a child of God.

Precious testimony! dear to my heart! Life is uncertain and is eking out. Its successive sands fall fast, and its measuring glass is

rapidly turned. Death is abroad on stealthy wing, and my heart lies bare to his fatal shaft. I may drop in a moment more, and be gone. Then let no uncertainty hang over my present relation to God, none over an end which may be so near. Let me know that I am his, who spilled the blood of his heart to save me; let me know it without a doubt; let me know it up to the topmost height of certainty: O my soul, let me *know* that I am a child of God! What, then, will be time's fitful storms? What life's falling tears? What its deep-drawn sighs? What? Let me *know* that I *am* a child of God. Take ease, take friends, take health, take life, take all away; but leave me this—
I am a child of God!

THE SOUTH AS A MISSIONARY FIELD.—Not a spot on the American continent, perhaps not in the world, presents so inviting a field for missionary labor as the great South, over which the late war swept with such destruction. But in order to realize from this field the largest possible results which it is capable of yielding, it is necessary to till it with more than common skill. The only men who can do this are the preachers bred on its soil, and whose hearts beat in unison with its broken-hearted and sensitive citizens. To them strangers would be offensive just now. The people of the South feel that, though compelled to submit to laws and institutions not to their liking, they yet have an ancient natural right to be treated with delicacy in the matter of the gospel. In this view I am free to think them just. If, then, we want to benefit them, and this is the feeling of every *Christian* heart, let us send them no preachers of a class against whom lies an old hereditary grudge; but let us send them *money*, that their own preachers may thereby be enabled to minister to them in that which is now the last solace of their hearts. This would be felt by them to be both wise and kind. Have now our missionary societies any money to expend in this way? Or have wealthy brethren any? If so, we shall have pleasure in naming preaching brethren in the South, who are true men and sound, but who are silent now for want of the necessary material aid. True, our preaching brethren there are not numerous, but this only renders the necessity the greater to have them at work. They worked well before the great trouble set in; we have faith that they would do so again. Who of our wealthy brethren, or which of our societies, will be the first to respond to this call? While the heart of the South is yet bleeding, let it be seeded with the truth of Him who is the friend of all.

NATURE AND REVELATION.

INFIDELITY, in every age, has made unrelenting war against the truth of God. Its deadly hate has suffered no abatement. Its energies have never tired. Defeat does not lessen the one, nor weaken the other. The blush of modesty or shame from discomfiture has never crimsoned its cheek. No amount or strength of argument has ever, for a moment, forced upon it the modesty of silence. It is as immortal as Satan, and as versatile as his genius. In modern times, when science has unfolded to the world many of the hidden mysteries of nature, it has sought to arraign some of its discoveries in opposition to the truth of Revelation, that it might by this means discredit its claims upon the attention and interest of mankind, and destroy its influence over the mind and consciences of men. It has allowed no fact thus discovered, which promised the slightest hope of success, to pass unobserved or untried. When astronomy opened its wonderful discoveries to the world eager hold was laid on these, that some of them might be found in opposition to the truths or statements of the Bible, or show the inconsistency of nature with revelation. But, failing to find that God had contradicted his word, by anything he had done in this department of his works, it was not content to retire from the conflict and confess its weakness; but proceeded to seek in other fields some fact of nature contradictory of revelation.

Accordingly, when geology began to reveal its wonders to the world—mysteries of the most wonderful and interesting character, its hopes again revived, and it seized on the incontrovertible facts of the history of creation as unfolded by this science, and brought them into bold and defiant contrast with the history of creation as given by Moses, confidently affirming that the ages of geological history were wholly irreconcilable with the days of Moses, and hence that one or the other must be untrue. It saw, in the long line of living beings that flourished on the earth in past geological ages a solid ground for declaring that the first creation of plants and animals on this earth could not have taken place at the time as stated by Moses, namely, about six thousand years ago.

If the truth of the Mosaic history rested on the interpretation formerly given it, it must be confessed that the facts revealed by geology are in irreconcilable antagonism. The force of this objection depends on the correctness of such an interpretation. If this be wrong, the whole argument falls to the ground. The argument, therefore, is really based on our ignorance of the Mosaic account; and it will

never do to conclude that a thing which we do not understand is false because it appears inconsistent with what we do know. The argument is good, but it is deprived of all its force by the fact that it does not here apply. The facts of geology are incontrovertible, and the Mosaic account may be equally so, and will be proved to be so, when We come to understand it.

At the present day, no candid believer in revelation rejects or even doubts the account of Moses because it appears not to agree with the facts of geology. As good and as honest minds as have ever adorned the annals of our race firmly and conscientiously believe both; and this proves that the mind discovers no real discrepancy between the natural and the revealed histories of creation.

But, if their harmony and consistency were as luminous as the sun and as perfect as drops of water, infidelity would not thereby be abashed. Its voice can not be hushed by the most cogent argument, the most luminous reasons, nor by the profoundest learning. Its author is not shamed by the clearest absurdity, nor silenced by anything from earth or heaven. Were all the light in the universe concentrated on one fact to prove the truth of God, it would not silence him. He would still pronounce that truth a lie, and labor with all his industry to persuade men that his lie were the truth. He is pledged to a hostile opposition, no matter what floods of light may be thrown on his path. He will persevere in his efforts to deceive and destroy men, if the lie appeared as plain as a spot on the sun. If the truth of God were as luminous as the sun (as indeed it is), he would not hesitate to throw himself into that flood of light, with the hope that his shadow might fall on some mind and thus darken and obscure the truth. Here lies the cause of the versatility, and, we might say, of the immortality of infidelity. This origin explains the ceaseless efforts it makes to overturn the truth of God.

Failing to press the general facts of geology into its unhallowed service, it has looked deeper into the secrets revealed by this science, and discerned a "law of progressive development," which it has used to inflict, as it hoped, a fatal blow on revelation. It saw in paleontology the revelation of some wonderful and interesting facts, and these it wrought into a theory of the progressive development of life on the globe, at once perversive of the facts of the science from which it derived its knowledge, and destructive of the truth of God as revealed in the Bible. The essential and fundamental thought of this theory is, that all the animals which have lived on the globe, from the earliest geological age to the present, owe their origin to the power of physical forces acting at first on the elements of which the simplest organism is composed, and by their own natural and peculiar action giving existence at first to the simplest organism; and then from this, and through this organism, by the power of the same forces, produc-

ing the next highest and less simple; and then from this second a third, and so on, until the most perfect and complicated organism is reached, the last being as much the creature of the physical forces as the first. It views every animal as the creation of natural law, the higher being derived from the lower by a process of development; a process, in the view of the advocates of this theory, that is capable of carrying a being higher than its origin, thus denying a special creation in any case. It supposes that "the first step in creation of life upon this planet was a chemico-electric operation, by which simple germinal vesicles were produced."* After these were created by physical agents, it further supposes "that one species gives birth to another, until the second highest gives birth to man, the inferior organisms being used a generative medium for the production of the higher ones, even including man."** The series thus originated and developed does not stop with man, whom the author confesses to be the highest yet brought on the earth; but beyond him he supposes that other beings will arise, developed from him, manifesting a still higher grade of organism, which future being will exhibit more of the spiritual and less of the animal than is seen in man. ***

The infidelity of this theory of progressive development consists in the fact that it excludes God from the work of creation, and indeed denies any supernatural power in creation, ascribing all the living beings of the organic world to the power of physical agents; thus making mind a force of the organism, the product indeed of agents to which no one has ever ascribed any mental quality or power. And in asserting that man, though at present the highest of the series, is not the end and climax of the series of organized beings on the earth, he designs to insidiously undermine the truth of the divine record, and place that record in opposition to the facts of nature.

The real facts revealed by geology, which this theorist has so ingeniously perverted, and from which he has framed his deceptive theory of the origin of life on the globe, we find briefly, but comprehensively and clearly presented by Agassiz, in his "Essay on Classification," p. 158. He there says that "the general results of geology proper, and of paleontology, concur in the main to prove that, while the globe has been at repeated intervals, and indeed frequently, though after immeasurably long periods, altered and altered again, until it has assumed its present condition, so also have animals and plants living upon its surface been again and again extinguished and replaced by others, until those now living were called into existence with man at their head. The investigation is not in every case sufficiently complete to show everywhere a coincidence between this

* "Vestiges of Creation," p. 155.

*** *Ibid.*, pp. 270 and 271.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 170, 178, and 179.

renovation of animals and plants and the great physical revolutions which have altered the general aspect of the globe; but it is already extensive enough to exhibit a frequent synchronism and correlation, and to warrant the expectation that it will, in the end, lead to a complete demonstration of their mutual dependence, not as cause and effect, but as steps in the same progressive development of a plan which embraces the physical as well as the organic world." The two great systems of creation belonging to this planet being embraced in one great and general plan, we would expect that the development of the one would keep pace with the development of the other. And this has really been the case, as we learn from this distinguished source. From him we learn that there has been a remarkable correlation between the changes that the earth has undergone in past geological ages and the gradual development of the organic world, or the grades of animals successively introduced on the earth. In the grades of animals that have successively appeared, we find a gradual advance toward the production, successively, of higher and higher types, until man appears, who closes the series. Of the relation that exists between the successive grades, the same author says: "Through all these intricate relations there runs an evident tendency toward the production of higher and higher types, until at last man crowns the series." The relation between the members of this series is so close and intricate, that the series "appears like the development of a great conception, expressed in proportions so harmonious that every link appears necessary to the full comprehension of its meaning, and yet so independent and perfect in itself that it might be mistaken for a complete whole, and again so intimately connected with the preceding and following members of the series that one might be viewed as flowing out of the other."*

These are the substantial facts on which the visionary theory of "progressive development" is based. The theory finds its best refutation in the facts on which it pretends to be based. Everywhere and in every age these facts declare that the Author of nature is an intelligent being, manifesting a mind of infinite reach and grasp. On this subject we may quote again from the same learned author: "In order not to misapprehend the facts, and perhaps to fall back upon the idea that these changes may have been the cause of the differences observed between the fossils of different periods, it must be well understood that, while organized beings exhibit through all geological formations a regular order of succession, the character of which will be more fully illustrated hereafter, this succession has been from time to time violently interrupted by physical disturbances, without any of these altering in any way the progressive character of such suc-

* "Essay on Classification," p.166.

cession of organized beings. * * * The simultaneous disappearance of entire faunae, and the following simultaneous appearance of other faunae, show further, that, as all these faunas consist in every formation of a great variety of types combined into natural associations of animals and plants, between which there have been definite relations at all times, their origin can never be attributed to the limited influence of monotonous physical causes, which always act in the same way. Here again the intervention of a Creator is displayed in the most striking manner, in every stage of the history of the world."*

It is thus seen that, so far from geology affording any foundation for this visionary theory, it furnishes us with the best refutation. This refutation, however, has reference entirely to the originating cause assigned for the creation of the organic world. There is yet another error in this theory almost as great as the one already considered, which lies in the fact that it affirms that a higher species than man will yet appear, developed from him, and presenting in his organism more of the spiritual and less of the animal than is seen in man.

There is to be seen lurking in this supposition the modern system of spiritualism, the fundamental thought of which is a progressive development of the moral or spiritual nature of man, by means of the laws and spiritual forces of his organism, and moral agents within the reach and under the control of all men. Through these natural forces alone it is supposed that man will finally so subordinate his animal to his spiritual nature, and so subdue his animal passions, as to approach very closely the divine. It has just enough of divine truth in it, and resemblance in its pretended aims and purposes to the aims and purposes of the gospel of Jesus Christ,** to make it one of the most deceptive and destructive phases of infidelity that has yet appeared. In its essential features it bears a strong resemblance to the theory of progressive development in the organic world, and like it denies any special intervention of the Divine Being in the affairs of men. As the one maintains a progressive development of the organic world by evolution, so does Spiritualism maintain a progressive development of the spiritual nature of man; and there is about as much truth in the one as in the other. We have seen, from the extracts we have made from one who is competent to speak on this subject, that there has been a gradual and progressive development of life on the globe; but it was not a development by evolution through vital and physical laws, but the development of a great thought in the mind of the Creator. The organic world had its existence first in the mind of God, and the development on earth is only the unfolding of his mind to the world. There is also a system of progressive development in the revelation which

* "Essay on Classification," pp. 158, 159; and p. 17, note 2.

** 1 Peter i., 16.

God has made to man concerning his spiritual relations to the universe, and also a development of man's spiritual character through and by means of the principles of this system. The Bible recognizes a growth spiritual in man, from a state of infancy to manhood; from a state of sin to a state of holiness; a growth that has for its climax the holiness of God. Spiritualism, by perverting this great truth, and by ascribing this development of man's spiritual character to a cause not recognized by the Bible, has erected a system which undermines, nullifies, and destroys the truth of God.

We have now to consider the radical thought of this spiritualistic philosophy, which regards all men as capable of indefinite spiritual development through the exercise of powers inherent in their mental constitution, and supposes that these powers are energized in all by a special and direct influence, the degree of this influence being always in proportion to the spiritual development of the age and of man. It holds that this divine influence is of the character of inspiration; that all men, whatever their moral character, have the same divinity in them, their differences in character being wholly attributable to the degree of spiritual development which their spiritual natures have undergone by means of moral agents within the reach of and common alike to all men. In this it is kindred to the so-called philosophy of organic development, which regards life as the effect, not the cause, of organization, which is not true, and the manifestation of life as proportionate to the grade of the organism, which is true, the prime error being that the cause is regarded as an effect.

Spiritualism sees in the great lights of our race, who have been as suns in the moral darkness around them, an evidence of this universal law of inspiration. It sees no difference, but in degree; between Socrates, Plato, Zoroaster, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Christ and his apostles, the difference being wholly attributable to the degree of development of the age, and of the spiritual natures of these persons. Its universal law of inspiration places all these characters in the same category, the one excelling the other, not because of any special inspiration of God, but only because of the superior development of their moral and spiritual nature. According to this universal law, the modern lights of spiritualism fall, naturally and necessarily, in the same category, as well as all others who may hereafter appear. As there is no limit to the law of organic development, neither is there to spiritual development; no time in the history of the race when these superior men will not appear, and no time when superior revelations will not be needed and enjoyed. According to these theories, the organic world, and the revelations of God to man through the exaltation of his spiritual powers, will continue to progress forever. As the one does not regard man as the end of the

series of organized beings, neither does the other regard the religion of Jesus as the end of God's revelations to man. As man is but a step in the development of the organic system, so is Christianity no more than a step in the development of the spiritual system—a system that embraces within its ample folds Grecian, Persian, Egyptian, and Roman philosophers, Jewish prophets, and the founder and apostles of the Christian religion, and all the modern spiritual lights, from Swedenborg to Newman and Parker.

This spiritualistic philosophy pretends to have for its object the moral elevation of the race, the elevation of man's spirit nature above his animal, so that in his full and perfect development his animal nature shall be wholly subordinated to his spiritual, thus realizing that higher type contemplated by the theory of organic development* This object, a superior development, it hopes to realize by means of moral agents common and accessible to the race, by the strength of intuitions and impartations of the divinity, the fullness and richness of these to be enjoyed as man rises in his spiritual development. Hence, this philosophy places in the same category, and looks upon with equal favor, Socrates, Plato, Isaiah, Christ and his apostles, and all the modern spiritualistic philosophers.

From this general statement of the principles of this philosophy, which we regard as fair and truthful, it will be readily seen how closely it is allied to and connected with the theory of organic development, the spiritualistic beginning where the other in fact ends; or rather where the former has placed the terminus of the latter; for the spiritualistic philosophy looks for no higher type of animal than man, but commences and ends with him its system of moral development. The organic looks for a higher type than man, but supposes that the future being will possess in his organism more of the spiritual and less of the animal, so that in the end, the same object is realized by both, the one by the development of the animal organism, the other by the development of his spirit nature, the object of each being the exhibition of a being in whom the animal is wholly subordinated to the spiritual nature.

As thus contrasted, the infidelity of both glares out in all its native deformity, though wearing the attractive forms of philosophies; the first, in that it denies that man closes the series of organized beings on the earth, a truth clearly taught in the Bible; the other, in that it denies that Christianity closes divine revelation. We now propose a refutation of these theories, or pretended philosophies, by showing that man, viewed as an animal and a Christian, closes God's works on the earth. To do this, it is only necessary to show that man closes the series of organized beings, and that Christianity closes the revela-

* "*Vestiges of Creation*," pp. 270, 271.

tions of God to man. And we conceive there is no better and no more conclusive way of doing this than to show that the one is perfect as an organism, the other, perfect as a system.

Anything may be said to be perfect when it accomplishes the object for which it was ordained. Perfection is both relative and absolute. A being may be relatively and absolutely perfect at the same time; relatively perfect when compared with an absolute standard, and absolutely perfect when viewed in the light of its surrounding relations; as when we say of any particular fish, that it is a perfect fish, but an imperfect vertebrate. If, now, we can prove that man is absolutely perfect as to his animal organism, we prove that his organism closes the series, and therefore that no higher type of organism than he can be introduced on the earth, in accordance with the present system of organized beings.

In what, then, does the perfection of man's organism consist? In this: that his relations to the organic and inorganic worlds around him are as numerous, as varied, and as perfect as they can be; that he is connected through his organism with these worlds at every possible point of connection. This is the only absolute perfection that an organism can possess.

As has been already observed, the animal kingdom is divided into four great divisions, called branches, plans of structure peculiar, distinct, and independent of each other; yet connected and related as parts of one great system. That they are distinct and independent of each other, and not so connected that one can be said to begin where the other ends, or the one developed from the other, has been so satisfactorily determined by the most indubitable evidences, that these divisions of the animal kingdom are now no longer regarded in any other light than as natural divisions, as real and as distinct as divisions can be. This truth is demonstrated by the fact that the primordial cell (the initial form of all species), in its process of development, passes at once into the type of the branch to which the animal belongs. If it be the cell of a vertebrate, for instance, the first stage of development shows it to belong to this branch. It does not pass through the lower branches and present their type before reaching that to which it belongs, as would be the case if the theory of evolution were true. But passing at once into the type of the branch to which it naturally belongs, this fact demonstrates the natural divisions of the kingdom.* If these branches were so connected in the system of organized beings as to show that the higher was developed from the one immediately below it, the development of the primordial cell would have been different from what it is. If its development were such as this theory supposes, it would not have marked any natural divisions of the animal kingdom.

* Carpenter's "Comparative Physiology," p. 126, note 2.

What is thus shown to be true of the branches is true also of the classes, the next division of this kingdom. The classes are as distinct from each other, and as much natural divisions of the branches, as the branches are of the kingdom. The same is undoubtedly true of all the subdivisions; for it can not be denied that species was impressed on the primordial cell by the Creator in its creation. The germ-form of all animals is the same, and the accuracy and certainty with which the simple germ pursues its course in the process of its development in the line of its own species can be accounted for only on the supposition that species exist in the germ-cells. "However varied may be the series of forms through which the parent passes, the offspring repeats these with the greatest exactness; and the whole scheme of development may be described as one in which the primordial cell is tending toward the attainment of the perfect form and condition of its parent."*

The natural divisions and subdivisions of the animal kingdom fully demonstrate the falsity of that theory which supposes the higher grades to have been evolved from the lower during the progress of their development, and very clearly establishes for the animal kingdom an author, infinite in knowledge and wisdom to plan and determine, and power to execute. The power that carries the germ-cell through all the stages of its development along the line of its species without deviation is as great as that which is required to create a world. How, then, can we for a moment regard the physical forces of the inorganic world as capable of such an infinite work? The supposition is one of infinite absurdity.

The facts presented to our minds in the animal kingdom, when the divisions of this kingdom are viewed in their relations to each other, and to the whole system of organized beings, opens to our view one of the most wonderful and beautiful systems that is to be found in all the works of God. They discover some of the conceptions of that Great Mind which devised, planned, and created the universe. He has delineated, in the outlines and details of the organic system of this world, the grand conception which seems to have determined and originated the whole system. This grand conception is to be seen in the work which completes the system; in that organism which closes the series.

The four great branches of the animal kingdom have existed from the earliest ages of the earth's long history. The vertebrates were represented by the fishes in the paleozoic age, contemporaneously with the other branches; and these four branches have continued to be the only primary and grand divisions into which the animal kingdom has been divided during the whole period that living beings

* Carpenter's "Comparative Physiology," p. 126, note 2.

have inhabited the earth. This branch (the vertebrate) being represented by its lowest class in the first age of the world, and in all the subsequent ages to the present hour, its other classes appearing successively at long intervals, and the fact that no higher type than the vertebrate exists at the present time, we are perfectly safe in concluding that no higher type will yet appear, and that the vertebrate closes the divisions of the animal kingdom.

And when we consider the immense period of time that has elapsed since animals were introduced on the earth, and how varied and numerous have been the species by which the vertebra have been represented during all this time, and when we find that during this time no higher type than vertebrates has appeared up to the present time, we may be positively certain that no higher type will ever appear. There is, moreover, a substantial reason for believing, not only that there will not be, but that there can not be created, according to the present system, a higher grade than the vertebra. This reason is to be seen in the fact that the highest species that has yet appeared, or will appear, is a vertebrate.

What we have said of the branch we may affirm of the highest class of this branch, the mammal; and the argument is as cogent and as conclusive in regard to this class as it is in regard to the branch, since the highest species is also a mammal. We are, therefore, justified in affirming that the mammalia closes the subdivision of the classes.

If the physical forces of the inorganic world were capable of originating and developing the countless number of beings that have lived and flourished on the earth, of every grade and structure, from the first dawn of creation to the introduction of man, how does it happen that they have not been able, during a period of time estimated by ages, to produce a higher type than the vertebra, and during a very vast period no higher class than the mammalia? Why have they stopped at these divisions? Why have they not originated other types and other classes? Have they mind to determine natural or possible limits? Or have they acquired no wisdom, or knowledge, or power during the long history of the earth? Such would seem to be the case; for the highest species that has yet been introduced, is both a vertebrate and a mammal. Hence there appears to be a real limit reached. And if really a limit has been reached, this limit could have been determined only by mind.

The conception in the mind of the Creator, as now developed by his works, contemplated the existence of an animal whose relations to the world with which it should be connected, of which it should form a part, should be as varied, numerous, and as perfect as it was possible for its relations to be. Hence, in devising the system of organized beings where such immense diversity is seen in the individual species

and members of the system, and yet such unity in the different plans of structure, one great thought was ever present before the mind of the Creator to which he was constantly working in all the differentiations of the kingdom.

It is apparent to the most casual observer that the relations of the mammalia to the external world are more numerous and varied than those of the classes below them. It is equally apparent that the higher mammalia have more command over the systems of nature of which they are a part than the inferior. Hence, as the relations of an animal to these systems of nature become more numerous and varied, in that degree does that animal rise in the scale. And when we come to examine those of man, and the adaptation of his organism to unite these systems at all possible points of connection and relation, it will be found that an organism has been created which has filled all the spaces existing between animals and the organic and inorganic systems of nature. Hence, this being done, animal organism in him has reached its perfect differentiation. Therefore, beyond him no higher organism can be produced.

The vertebral class affords the best illustration of how an animal's relations and connections with the external world are developed. Each class has definite and peculiar relations to the external world, and these relations become more numerous and varied as we ascend the scale of classes. It is manifest to any observer that the reptiles are above fishes, birds above reptiles, and mammals above birds, and this is the order in which the classes advance in the scale of being. This relative development of the classes is beautifully marked in the development of the nervous centres of the vertebra. As the relation of these two centres, the cerebral and spinal, changes, their relative development measures the grade of the class. The relation of these nervous centres is measured by an angle; and as this angle is increased, it becomes the measure of the relative development of the classes, and of their grade in the organic system. To show this, it is only necessary to consider the general outline of the development of these nervous centres, which development will exhibit the gradual subordination of the spinal to the cerebral centre, or the subordination of the animal to the spiritual or intellectual.

In the lowest class of the vertebra, that of the fishes, "the brain is only a slight enlargement of the spinal marrow;" this enlargement, consisting of four divisions, among which the cerebrum, or brain proper, appears in its lowest stage of development; the sensory ganglia, the other divisions, being relatively larger, with one exception. In this class the brain and spinal marrow are on a horizontal line, the brain being simply an enlargement of the spinal column. In the class of reptiles the cerebrum appears much enlarged, overlapping in a small degree the adjoining ganglia. Ttu3 development of the

cerebral centre gives rise to a more complex structure, and more varied relations to the surrounding world, than are seen in the fishes; and the spinal marrow forms a considerable angle with the brain, allowing the head a marked elevation on the body. In the class of birds the cerebrum is still more enlarged, overlapping still more the sensory ganglia, and reaching the cerebellum, the posterior body of the four divisions. Hence, in birds, we observe a still greater freedom and elevation of the head on the body, and the angle formed by the brain and spinal marrow is considerably increased. In the mammals, the last and highest class of the vertebrates, all these features are still more enlarged, especially in the higher orders. Among the lowest orders of this class there is but a slight advance beyond the development of these centres in the birds. But as we advance through the ascending orders of the mammalia the cerebrum increases greatly in size, until it finally overlaps all the sensory ganglia and cerebellum, and presents the highest development of the brain. This superior development is seen in the brain of man, in whom the cerebral hemispheres appear the principal parts of the brain, the sensory ganglia of the fishes appearing as though they were but rudimentary, and the cerebellum, large as it absolutely is, appearing a subordinate part of the brain.

As the cerebrum enlarges in size and overlaps the other portions of the brain, as is seen when the different classes and their orders are compared, the angle formed by the brain and spinal marrow increases, until it reaches in man a right angle, beyond which there can be no further increase or advance. The angle formed by these nervous centres becomes the index or measure of the development or differentiations of the organism, and the measure of the relations the animal sustains to the external world. When, therefore, this angle has become the greatest possible, we know that the organism presenting this angle has reached its highest development; and that its relations to the systems of nature, its relations to all parts of the organic and inorganic worlds, are the most numerous, varied, and perfect, to which it is possible for an animal organism to attain. This being reached in the organism of man, and in man only, proves not only that he is the highest and last of the series, but that he is the highest organism that can be produced, according to the present plan on which organized beings are constructed. He is both the highest *in esse*, and the highest *in posse*.

We may produce here an extract from an author already frequently quoted, to substantiate the conclusion we have reached. In his "Essay on Classification," p. 34, Agassiz says: "Again, the first representatives of each class stand in definite relations to their successors in later periods, and as their order of appearance corresponds to the various degrees of complication of structure, and form a natural series

closely linked together, this natural gradation must have been contemplated from the beginning. There can be the less doubt upon this point, as man, who comes last, closes in his own cycle a series, the gradation of which points from the beginning to him as its last term. I think it can be shown by anatomical evidence that man is, not only the last and highest among the living beings of the present period, but that he is the last term of a series, beyond which there is no material progress possible in accordance with the plan upon which the whole animal kingdom is constructed; and that the only improvement we can look for upon earth must consist in the development of man's intellectual and moral faculties."

From such testimony as this it can be no longer doubted that man closes the series of animal organisms; and that the only further development that can take place is the expansion or development of the powers of the organism, whether these powers be physical or psychical. That the powers or faculties of the organism are perfect, is attested by the perfection of the organism. No other or greater powers of an organism can be created than those that are seen in man. That the intellectual powers of man are the greatest possible in an animal organism is evident from the fact that man's brain is the largest and most fully differentiated and developed of the series. And as the powers and capacities of the mind depend on the development of the cerebrum; that is, as the measure or development of mind keeps pace with the development of the cerebrum, and as the cerebrum is most fully developed in man's, it follows that the intellectual faculties of man are not only the most perfect of the whole series, but the largest and most perfect that can be developed through an animal organism. This conclusion is evident from the fact, that the psychological development keeps pace, *pari passu*, with the development of structure. On this subject we may again quote from Agassiz. In his great work, entitled "Contributions to the Natural History of the United States," Vol. I., pp. 296, 297, he says: "It is a question of the greatest interest, whether the psychological development of animals rises in the same degree as the development of the complication of their structure generally. If this be the case, it follows that the rank of the orders expresses at the same time the range of their psychological development. And we think this is really the case. Now, since we have shown that, owing to the complication of their structure, the turtles are really the highest among reptiles, we may expect to find in them also the highest psychological development of the whole class. * * * Though the orders have been represented as the natural groups which, being founded upon the complication of the structure of animals, above all determine their relative rank, it is equally true that the classes, when compared with one another, stand lower or higher, in proportion as the system of organs which are de-

veloped in them have a higher importance, or are built upon a more perfected pattern. In the branch of the vertebra there can be no doubt that the class of fishes, as a whole, occupies the lowest position, that the amphibious ranks next to them, that reptiles come next, that birds stand above these, and that mammalia are the highest. Their whole structure shows this plainly. But to consider only the points which have a bearing upon the question under consideration, it is obvious that the fishes, in which the whole bulk of the body is one undivided mass, the vertebral column continues in one horizontal line with the base of the skull, the muscular system is uniformly extended over the whole trunk, so as to allow only lateral motions, and the limbs reduced to branching digitations without concentrated activity, in which the brain is only a slight enlargement of the spinal marrow, and some of the organs of the senses are either wanting, or very imperfect, while others are blunt and obtuse; it is obvious, I say, that this class occupies, not only structurally, but also with reference to its psychological endowment, a much lower position than the classes of amphibious and of true reptiles, in which the different regions of the body are more distinct, the motions more localized, the organs of the senses more perfect, and the brain larger. In these two classes, the preponderance of the head is already fully indicated by its position being somewhat raised above the bulk of the body, and forming with it a more or less marked angle, while in most of them, the limbs are detached as locomotive appendages distinct from the trunk, though not yet so free as to move with perfect independence. In birds and mammals the progress is still more distinct. The different regions of the body are not only better marked, they are also more diversified in their structure, the body is no longer so prone upon the medium in which the animal lives; the head has acquired a special mobility in connection with the highly organized organs of the senses, the larger brain and the commanding position it has assumed; the motions are also more diversified, not only in themselves, but the anterior and posterior pairs of limbs are adapted to different purposes. All these features are brought to a climax in man, whose vertical station presents the highest contrast with the horizontal position of the body of the fishes, whose head is so raised as to stand free above the whole frame, while the hands have become the willing tools of the manifestations of his mental powers. The gradation, as far as the structure is concerned, is as evident as possible, from the unwieldy and massive horizontal body of the fish, up to the commanding altitude of man; and that this structural gradation stands in immediate correlation to the degree of psychological development is equally evident, when we compare the mental powers of man and the imperfect faculties of the fishes."

The general view here expressed corresponds to the conclusions to

which Carpenter has arrived in his general survey of the animal kingdom. From that general survey he regards "man's place in the animal kingdom as being, not at its head, nor at its centre, but at the extreme most remote from its point of contact with the kingdom of organic life; in fact, at the point at which we may believe it to touch another kingdom, that of pure intelligence." *

From what has now been said in reference to the structural perfection of man's organism, it is evident that in him an organism is reached which presents the most numerous and varied relations with the external world, and which constitutes him master of all the forces, powers, and agencies of nature, and which gives him a mind which enables him to subdue all things, and make them subservient to his will and desires. His mind is confessedly the greatest of earth's creations, and demonstrated by the structural perfection of his organism to be the greatest possible through an animal organism. Since then his body and brain are the most perfect that can be produced in accordance with the present plan on which animals are constructed, it follows that we can look for no further development in him, but that which pertains to the development of the power or capacities of his organism. In the development of these the greatest diversity is seen, so great at times as almost to constitute the lowest examples a separate species. The organism of Samson or Goliath did not differ structurally from that of other men; nor did the wonderful intellectual powers of Plato, Newton, or Bacon, depend on a more perfect organism than is seen in other men. But such men as these show to what extent the powers of the organism may be developed, but no more; and if the future shall present the world with men far transcending these, that advance will consist only in the development of their physical and intellectual powers.

It is only when the powers of man's mind are developed to that extent which we witness in such men as those above mentioned that they strike us with such wonder and awe, and lead us to suppose that they must rest on a higher and broader and deeper basis than we imagine man's organism capable of affording. They appear too wonderful and great to have no other foundation than the mind, which is manifested through the brain; than that which the vital principle or power is capable of exhibiting in an animal organism. But when we compare his brain with the brain of animals below him, and remember that mind is developed in animals as their brain is developed, we are constrained to conclude that his larger brain gives him, to a great extent, the wonderful mind which he manifests. We say, to a great extent, because we know from other sources of knowledge than that of his organism that he possesses a spirit nature, or rather, that there

* *Principles of Comparative Physiology*, p. 691.

is in him a spirit being, so distant from his animal being as to be capable of existing independently of the body; and because of this two-fold nature of his being, it is impossible for us to say how much of his wonderful mind rests on his spirit, and how much results from his organism; or, in other words, how much is spirit, and how much animal. We know that animals possess not an independent spirit as man, yet they manifest mind. Whence their mind? Mind in them can have no other foundation than the immaterial principle, Life; which is the generative cause of their organism, a power we have concluded to regard as spirit as to its essence or nature.* We know that mind is an essential attribute of spirit, and peculiar to it; that every spirit living manifests mind. As man, then, is both animal and spiritual, his mind results from both these constituents of his being. But, how much may be ascribed to the one, and how much to the other, we can not determine.

But we can not determine from the phenomena of his being that man possesses a spirit distinct from his organism, and capable of independent existence. From our inability in regard to this question has arisen materialism, which presumes there is no such independent spirit in man, because nature does not reveal it. While nature is silent on this subject, revelation is not. The great majority of mankind believe that man is more than an animal; that he possesses a something within himself which will live after the body is dead; and this they believe, not from any evidence afforded by the phenomena of his being, but because it is a fact revealed by God, who created him, and who therefore knows what man is. This is the only evidence that can settle the question.

But it matters not what may be the source of the evidence that has produced this conviction. The conviction is now too deeply rooted in the mind to be disturbed by any facts within the range of man's knowledge. The supposition (to regard it in no stronger light) accounts for all the phenomena of man's being and the facts in his history. There are some facts in man's history which can not be accounted for, unless we admit that man is more than an animal, indeed a peculiar being, on which peculiarity alone is based the moral character of his actions.

While, therefore, we may freely and unhesitatingly admit that we can not conclusively determine the fact that he possesses a spirit independent and distinct from his animal organism, from the light afforded by the phenomena of his being, yet we are not without competent and legitimate proof, to be found in man's moral condition in this world. This condition is peculiar, making him differ as widely from the condition of animals as dissimilarity itself. This condition was Introduced by the occurrence of sin among men. The existence

* Chap. iii. sec. 2.

of this evil is attested by the laws of every civilized country, as well as by the common sentiment of all peoples; for among all these a moral character is ascribed to the actions of men, of such a grade as to merit rewards and punishments. They regard his actions as right or wrong, as sinful or un sinful, and hence the objects of legislative enactments.

This being so, it follows that the actions of men have a character which we can not predicate of the actions of animals. If, therefore, we ascribe to the actions of men a quality which we refuse to the actions of animals, it follows conclusively that this moral quality of his actions must result from a source not found in animals; must depend upon something present indeed in man, but absent from animals. This something can be nothing else than that distinct, separable, and independent spirit, the reality and existence of which in man the Scriptures everywhere presume, acknowledge, and teach.

Being justified, then, in the conclusion that man possesses an independent and distinct spirit, we arrive at our final argument to prove that man is the end of God's creations on the earth, the nature of whose being shows that in him the organic system ends, and a spiritual begins, which reaches beyond time, and penetrates the unseen, embracing in its compass men on earth, and glorified men and angels in the heavens. His spirit allies him to another and a higher system than those of this world. His entire organism, therefore, connects two distinct and widely separated systems, the first ending in him, and the other beginning with him, thus showing, in the language of Dr. Carpenter, that "man's position is at the extreme most remote from its point of contact with the kingdom of organic life; at the point at which we may believe it to touch another kingdom, that of pure intelligence," or the spiritual realm of the heavens.

As man, then, closes the series of animal organisms on this earth, the "Theory of Progressive Development" is proved to be untrue in its facts, and false in its conclusions.

We have now to consider the theory of progressive development as it regards man's spiritual nature, as taught by the Spiritualists of the present day, the infidelity of which is to be seen in its denial of any special and particular intervention of God in the affairs of men; its denial of the authoritative character of the Bible as a special revelation of God's will to man, and of the peculiar and special claims which it makes on the hearts and consciences of men. Like the former theory, it denies any special intervention of God in the affairs of men, and ascribes all advancement to the agency of laws, in accordance with a common, general, and universal inspiration.

With these philosophers the great fact of the Bible, the existence of sin, is a myth, and the atonement an invention of men. That

which mankind has, from the earliest ages, regarded as sin and depravity, for which all nations have decreed punishments, and on account of which all nations have offered sacrifice, is with these moral lights of the world only a low degree of spiritual development. Every grade of moral character is only a grade of spiritual development, with no quality of sin attaching to it, the grade being proportionate to the spiritual advantages or education of the individual. The powers or agencies of this development belong to the race, both internal and external, both human and divine. But the divine is exerted within on the spirit, being of the nature of intuitions, not of special revelations such as the Holy Scriptures contain. An "external" revelation, or a revelation in human language, is not a necessity, and with some, not possible. Yet they acknowledge the prophets of these scriptures, but rank them no higher, nor regard them as more authoritative than Persian, Greek, or Roman sages. Virtually rejecting all divine revelation, they place before their minds no absolute and authoritative standard, such as Christians recognize and acknowledge in the Holy Scriptures of the Jewish and Christian ages. With them, the light afforded by prophets, sages, seers, philosophers, and by Christ and his apostles, is only the light of their intuitions, and of no more intrinsic authority than those of the Spiritualists of this or any former day, the amount of light in each one being the measure of the fullness of his intuitions and spiritual development.

Some spiritualists, indeed, acknowledge the inspiration of prophets and apostles, but it is only the inspiration of Plato, Socrates, or Swedenborg. They class the Jewish prophets with ancient and modern moral philosophers, and claim that God's revelations to man, as they conceive these to be given, will continue as man advances in intellectual and moral culture; and that the richness and fullness of these revelations will be in proportion to the degree of man's advancement, and the wants of the race in any particular age of the world. Therefore, as mankind advances in all that pertains to intellectual and moral culture, increasing thereby his spiritual wants, they maintain that other men, superior to all who have preceded them, will arise and instruct the world. With them there will be no period of time in the future when this increased light will not be needed and given. Such a religion, common alike to Jews, Pagans, and Christians, is essentially and intensely infidel, and subversive of the revelation of God as given in the Sacred Scriptures. It emphatically denies that the religion of Jesus is supreme, authoritative, and final; and denying these essential attributes of his religion, none can fail to see the infidel character of this spiritualistic philosophy or religion.

That the Scriptures of the Jewish and Christian ages are a revela-

tion from God, of supreme authority, and final, we have from the first page of this volume admitted and claimed as a fact. It has not been within the objects proposed to prove this; but, admitting it, to show the consistency and reasonableness of the system of redemption presented in them, and the phases of its development from man's ejection from Eden to his resurrection and glorification in heaven. These phases of development, we have seen, are well marked by the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations, the last of which we have regarded as the close of God's revelations to man, as under this dispensation all is accomplished for man that can be accomplished for him.

All that man needs is realized by the atonement and the church, the one to secure him life, the other to preserve it; and these institutions, being found in the provisions of the Gospel, demonstrates that the gospel dispensation closes what God proposes to do for man. This conclusion is universally admitted among Christians, and denied only by modern spiritualists. Various reasons and considerations have been incidentally presented in these pages, which have been sufficient to show that this universal judgment of the Christian world is founded on the truth and provisions of the system.

There is, however, a method of demonstrating the fact that Christianity closes God's revelations to man, which presents this whole question in a clear and forcible light. It is an argument based on the objects proposed by the Christian system, which object is, in a word, the restoration of man to his original relations to God in Eden. This method is similar to that by which we have demonstrated the theory of progressive development in the organic world to be untrue in fact, and false in its conclusions; an argument based on the object proposed by the organic system of nature, viz., the production of an organism whose relations and connections with all the systems and departments of nature should be as complete and perfect as it is possible for these to be. We have shown that man, as an animal, realized this grand object, and thus demonstrated at the same time the perfection and completeness of the organic system.

The evident object of the remedial system is to restore man to his normal relations with God. It is not simply a system of moral laws for the moral government of mankind, with reference to no other object or question, than the amelioration of the moral condition of man in this world. It is infinitely more than this. It has a logic that is never understood and appreciated, until we come to consider the system through the objects it proposes to accomplish. These objects relate to the whole question of sin, both as regards God and man. It proposes to undo the evil that sin has occasioned among men as far as it is possible for this to be done. In reference to God,

its success is complete; in reference to man, it will prove to be more than partial.

The method proposed, consists in showing that the provisions of Christianity, that phase of development of the remedial system inaugurated by Christ, and perfected by the Holy Spirit through the apostles, are all that infinite wisdom could desire to place man in the relation of favor and communion with God in which he was created. If the gospel of Jesus Christ does this, it does all that man's condition under sin needs, and all that God can do. If this be so, there can be no further development of the remedial system, nor any more revelations from God beyond what are to be found in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

But more than the salvation of men from sin is proposed by the remedial system. It is related, not only to man, but to God also. It contemplates, not only the recovery of man from all the consequences of sin, but the justification of God's character as Governor of the universe. While restoring man to his original relation with God, it justifies God in all that he has done, and leaves not a stain upon the purity and uprightness of his government. Being successful in these two important particulars and objects, it is a system perfect and complete in every particular, and therefore unsusceptible of further improvement. The first of these is seen in the relations of the atonement to man, and the second in the relations of the atonement to God.

The fact that the atonement is the central idea of the whole system proves conclusively that, as it regards man, the remission of sins is the prime object of the system. The infinite importance of this blessing is seen in the fact that, remission of sins having taken place, man returns to his original relation with God, the relation of favor and communion in Eden, the same essentially as that which he will enjoy when glorified in heaven. This relation of glory, honor, and immortality in the heavens, Christianity not only proposes to give and secure to him, but will actually give to him. It not only provides the means of enjoying the life of remission on earth, but it provides means of preserving this life until the day of the "redemption of the purchased possession."

The relation which man enjoyed in Eden, and which is restored under the Christian dispensation, so far as man's spirit is concerned, was one of favor, love, and communion with God. This relation, whether then or now, is based on the sinless character of man. If, therefore, the sinner shall attain to this character under the reign of the gospel, and by means of its provisions, then does the gospel remove every barrier to the communion of God with man, and restore man to his original relation of love and favor. And this is all that any system need or can do.

That a full and perfect remission of sins is provided for by the

Christian system, and is really and actually enjoyed under it, no one who has read the New Testament with any care or honesty can for a moment doubt. It is the grand and distinctive feature of Christ's religion, the superior excellence it possesses over the previous dispensations. The former dispensations failing to do this effectually, failed essentially; but Christianity succeeding in this, and providing for man's spiritual wants through life, proves itself to be perfect and complete in every respect.

This last provision is just as essential as the first; for what glory would it have been to God, if, having saved the people of Israel from Egypt, he had allowed them to perish in the wilderness? * And so what great good were it to man to save him from his sins, and make no provision for his salvation in heaven? Perfection is as essential here as in the atonement; and the church is just as essential to the Christian as the atonement is to the sinner. The remission of sins does not secure salvation in heaven, unless the immersed sinner die before he commits another sin. It must not be forgotten that man may forfeit and lose the relation secured by remission. It may be lost, as Adam lost his in Eden. There must be, then, ample provision in the Christian system for the maintenance of this relation of love, favor, and communion with God.

The provisions which are intended to preserve man's union with God are all found in the church, not out of it. They provide for remission for the Christian, and embrace all the means by which the Christian shall grow and advance in knowledge, piety, and holiness, which assimilate him to the character of God, and thus qualify him for the association of God and angels in the heavens. The scriptures of divine truth, which are the Christian's daily food, are calculated and fully competent to make man godlike in his character. They are "able to make him wise unto salvation and to furnish him thoroughly for every good word and work." The Sacred Scriptures will accomplish all for man's character that can be accomplished; for they are intended and calculated to mold man after a divine original, and make him in mind and heart like God. More than this can not be done, by this or any other conceivable system of religion.

To every one who understands the object, import, and necessity of the atonement, it alone is sufficient to demonstrate that the system of religion based on an effectual atonement must be perfect, complete, and final. For this atonement, as it is related to the government of God, is a measure put forth for certain specific objects, one of which is the justification of God from all complicity with sin, and the maintenance of his character pure and unspotted, even while pardoning the sinner. This was an object of very difficult accom-

* *Exodus xiv., 16.*

plishment, as is clearly demonstrated by the means instituted for the purpose. When this, object was realized, there was nothing left to be done, which pertained to a remedial system. On the atonement, mercy and justice meet in the salvation of the sinner, and the justification of God in the presence of his intelligent universe. Beyond these there is nothing left to be done. Hence, Christianity, under and through which both of these objects are realized, is perfect, complete, and final.

The spiritual relation of man with God being restored, there is thenceforth a character in harmony with this relation to be developed; a life of purity, holiness, and righteousness, having for its standard of perfection the character of God as revealed by himself. This is the character so much lauded, but never attained by the spiritualist. He rejects all the means which God has appointed for the development of this character, and relies on the ambiguous and deceptive teachings of his own reason. Even the divine revelations for which he contends are to be determined, as to their truth and authority, by his reason. His religion has no more light in it than what is afforded by human reason, which, in matters relating to man's eternal interests, is as blind as the instinct of worms. If, then, our "light be darkness, how great must the darkness be!"

But Christianity on this subject is as light as the meridian sun. The destiny of man is fully exposed to view; and the means by which that destiny may be one of eternal happiness, are revealed in all their richness and fullness. These means are capable of forming a character of purity and holiness, that will as assuredly, if properly used, secure his salvation in heaven, as the atonement secured his salvation from sin. Beyond these, his most ardent aspirations can not reach; and more than these no system can accomplish. Christianity, then, must be not only the best, but the only means, that God will or can ordain for man's present and eternal salvation. The Christian is all that God can or even desires to make of man. The system of organic life finds its crowning act, its last and supreme object, in man; and the divine system of redemption finds it supreme and only object realized in the Christian.

H. C.

H. C.'s ARTICLE.—Parts of the preceding elaborate article would hardly be intelligible to the reader, were it not added that it is the last chapter of a book which Dr. Christopher, of St. Louis, is about to give to the public. The article will give the reader some idea of the character of the book, while this short note will serve to herald its appearing. Of its merits we can not now speak, as we have seen no part of it save the foregoing.

CHRISTIAN UNION: REAL AND UNREAL.

AN ADDRESS, BY REV. T. ARMITAGE, D. D., DELIVERED AT A MEETING HELD IN THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH, FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, TO PROMOTE THE OBJECTS OF THE CHRISTIAN UNION ENTERPRISE.

The various denominations were represented by DR. SMITH, Episcopal; DR. RICE, Presbyterian; DR. VERMILYE, Reformed Dutch; Dr. ARMITAGE, Baptist.

I APPEAR before my brethren of various Christian denominations this evening, with great reluctance and even shrinking, to discuss the subject of Christian Union. And this, not because I do not love unity among Christ's disciples—for the intense earnestness with which the Redeemer prayed for oneness among his people were enough to hallow the theme to every feeling heart,—but I shrink because of what seems to me the amazing misconceptions of good men as to its real nature, as to the supposed obstructions in the way of its attainment, and as to the true method of promoting it.

Besides this, the fruitlessness and ill-feeling that have followed most of the attempts to promote union upon the current basis seem to forbid future attempts in the same direction as useless, if not worse than useless. Then what is to be done? Are we to settle down into the conviction that the Savior's prayer is a nullity—that real Christian unity is unattainable? I am frank to say that my own conviction is fixed and settled that the Redeemer's prayer remains unanswered, and that real Christian unity must be unattainable, until the great mass of Christ's followers do radically change their views of the nature of Christian union itself, and bend their energies in an entirely different direction in order to secure it.

I would not venture to trouble you with my views on this matter, if your Secretary had not pressed me to do so till I am tired of saying "no;" nor even then, but for the assurance that you desired a frank and manly avowal of sentiment here, and that I am perfectly at liberty as a Baptist to say what I think necessary, and that no offense is to be given or taken in the discussion. Assuming, then, the sincerity of this assurance, I will proceed, first of all, to examine the popular conception of Christian union.

I.—*As far as I can discover, my Pedobaptist brethren seem to think that it consists very largely in a warm-hearted, loving feeling toward each other as regenerated men.*

The general tone of newspaper articles and platform speeches would lead one to suppose that a new gift of tongues had been be-

stowed upon the churches, so eloquently do good men descant upon the progress of Christian union. But when you come to inquire as to what they mean, you find that the upshot of it all is that Christians of various denominations are either acting together now on some subject on which they have never differed before, or plan that they are meeting together in one place to worship, while their meeting is openly organized upon the avowed basis that on all other subjects but those then and there contemplated they are so positively disunited as to compel the disruption of their concord if one subject of their tenacious differences should happen to be broached. And this is called Christian union! Out of that particular body or assembly their disagreements are earnest, radical, and unalterable. But there they "*agree to disagree*;" and so disagreement, if you can agree about it, is unity! That is, kneeling on the same floor, sitting on the same seat, singing the same hymn, uniting in the same prayer (when you have never been divided at all as to the floor, the bench, the hymn, or the prayer), and being as different as possible in all other respects, constitutes Christian union! Men of every hue of faith and opinion, and every variety of practice, too, happen to meet in one Board, on one platform, or under one roof, and because they are not bitter, but feel kindly toward each other, they consider that they are making great attainments in the mysteries of Christian union. Yet not a point of difference is yielded in any respect; each man would suffer and die for his distinctive principles, as his fathers suffered and died for them; and each would distrust the other's honesty, if he were unwilling to die for them; and this is looked upon, very generally, as good, fair, Bible Christian union! Well, it may be; but if it is, things have changed vastly since apostolic times. The truth is, that kindly feeling is not Christian union, and may exist where "the unity of the faith" is rent into a thousand shreds.

Why, indeed, to love one another as brethren, so far as that we can meet together and keep the peace for a short time, like gentlemen, without the intervention of a constable, or even of unlovely feeling, is at the best a very low Christian attainment. We worship with publicans every time that we frequent God's house, but we don't think much of that as a bond of union with them. Jesus says that a publican loves a publican, and the first duty of a Christian is to love his *enemy* and persecutor so that a Christian has made no wonderful attainment, I think, when he comes to love his brother, and to worship with him in decency under one roof. But to claim that love as real Christian union to assume it as answering the prayer of Christ for the same oneness that subsists between himself and the Father—is simply preposterous, I can love any man of any Christian church well enough to worship with him, at any time that it may be convenient for us both. I can love him enough to tender him, if a minis-

ter, the use of my pulpit, or to accept the use of his—but what does that amount to in the great matter of Gospel oneness? I should certainly go out of his pulpit as stern and incorrigible a Baptist as when I entered it; and if he sacrificed his convictions simply on the ground of the interchange, I should much prefer not to exchange with him a second time. This is not Christian union, however popular and desirable it may be. It may be a certain result of Christian love, but Christian love is not Christian union. Unity can not exist without love, but love may exist where there is a real and serious discord of opinion and faith. Kindly Christian feeling is not Christian union.

II.—*Popular opinion seems to make Christian union consist in a common communion of all sects at the Lord's Table, as one consolidated mass of believers, and holds that the troublesome "close communion Baptists" are responsible for all the discords among Christians.*

The popular cry among our Pedobaptist brethren is for a pulling down of the middle wall of partition, and they persistently hold that these strict Baptists are the chief master-builders that strengthen it. Rev. John Chambers, of Philadelphia, says: "The world can not be converted until the church is united, and the church can not be united until Baptists renounce close communion." This reminds me of the fact that Roger Williams, and other early American Baptists, were excluded from the Pedobaptist churches of New England, not because they were bigots on the communion question, but because they would not embrace the doctrine of "Infant Baptism," so called. Of course, they were obliged to form a communion of their own, for they could in no wise be allowed to approach the Lord's Table in the Pedobaptist churches till they renounced their heresy. But because they did so, and the heresy grew, instead of dying, their communion is now denounced as "close," and their children are exhorted by Mr. Chambers to "renounce" that also, on the serious charge of bigotry, and of standing in the way of the world's conversion. This is something like the two old Baptist deacons who had fallen into a luckless quarrel. When they began to relent, one said to the other: "Brother, this is all wrong, we ought to be reconciled. Therefore, I do insist upon it that you shall be reconciled, for I can not be." Now, there is no more prominent public pleader for Christian union in the land than Mr. Chambers, and I assure you, my Presbyterian brethren, that when I read his way of promoting it, I really envied you the possession of so extraordinary a man; for I thought that if Brother Chambers had happened to have been on my side of the house, he would have made just one of the coolest Baptists that ever writhed before the whipping-post in Narragansett Bay. But this brother is only a type of a very large class. On a certain Fourth of July, several years ago, individual members of all the Christian sects met in the largest hall in Philadelphia, to celebrate our National Independence by holding a *union*

religious service. At that meeting, one of the most prominent speakers, who had shortly before published a pamphlet on Christian Unity, in which he declared the Baptists to be the greatest bigots in Christendom, said: "I hope, sir, the time will come when all Christians, of every name and denomination, will sit down together at the Communion Table; this is the spirit we want, *it is the spirit of union.*" Immense applause followed this utterance, and a telegraphic whisper flashed through the throng: "That's a capital hit at the Baptists." Now, mind you, brethren, all this took place at a union meeting! And to be frank with you, we Baptists have an idea that we are rather commonly lampooned in that way at union meetings, by very loving brethren, so that we get a fancy, somehow, that we are a sect very much in the way of some very excellent men. So much on that head.

Well, then, as to this matter of destroying "close communion," as a barrier to Christian union, I have this to say:

III.—*That communion at the Lord's Table is not at all, in any proper sense, a test of Christian union.*

Our Savior did not intend it to be a test of Christian union, so far as we find anything on the subject in the Bible. No Christian denomination so holds it, so far as they set forth their views upon the matter in their best expositors or authorized standards. It is never so used in their Articles of Faith, catechisms, or creeds. Intelligent and honest men never so use it in defining the import of the Supper. All Pedobaptists, when in controversy with Romanists, put a different interpretation from this upon the design of the Lord's Supper, but when it becomes desirable to dress down the Baptists, by stigmatizing them as "exclusive," and "bigots," they call the Supper a test of union. Is this honorable among gentlemen, to say nothing of Christians and ambassadors of Christ? Why give an interpretation to the Lord's Supper, when an appeal can be based upon the ignorance or prejudices of men, to the injury of Baptists, which is never put upon it under any other circumstance? The fact is, the Bible defines the object of the Supper to be specific. It was instituted for one thing, and for one thing only. What was that? To "show forth" your love for one another? Did Christ say that? No, sirs. To "show forth" your Christian union? No, sirs. Neither did Christ say that. To "show forth" Christ himself, as the Son of God—born in the manger—healing in the Temple—agonizing in the Garden? No, sirs; not even that. To "show forth" Christ, truly, but only in one act of his mediation, as Paul expresses it: "TO SHOW FORTH HIS DEATH." This, and only this. No more and no less. And our Pedobaptist brethren never give it any other interpretation, except when, in an unhappy moment, they stand behind the cross of Christ to make their Baptist brethren appear unmitigated bigots. Is

not this true? I appeal to my candid and honorable brethren of various denominations now present to say if this is not true.

Now then, take another view of the matter. Take the facts of the last Supper as Jesus himself administered it. Let me ask you, did John show his Christian union with Judas Iscariot when they took the sop together from the same divine hand? Certainly, if ever, that should have been the time. Did the male portion of the discipleship show their Christian unity with the mother of Jesus, and with his other female followers, when they celebrated the Supper alone? Did Jesus intend that they should? But if the Supper is a mark of Christian union, why were those holy women not present to celebrate it, seeing that the discipleship was emphatically one? Our Lord's prayer for union was offered *after* the Supper was administered. Therefore he prayed for a oneness among his disciples that the Supper did not, and could not, supply. The fact is, that the Lord's Supper is practically made of more importance in these days than other institutions of our Lord. Our Lord evidently intended that in gospel churches the Lord's Supper should be of no more importance than the Lord's baptism. If one is a naked form, the other is a naked form; if one is a saving vitality, the other is a saving vitality; if one is a means of divine grace, the other is a means of divine grace; and if one is but a symbolical act, the other is but a symbolical act. If one is a putting on of Christ, the other is a showing forth of his death when he is put on. Then what end for the truth, or the glory of God, can be secured by the foisting in of some mystical sense in the interpretation of the one, which you exclude from the other? Why do you treat the one as if it were of the most solemn import imaginable, and the other as if it were the emptiest form possible? Both of them are Christ's ordinances, enjoined upon his people; they are equally hallowed and binding, and neither of them is intended as a test of Christian union. And it seems to me that our Pedobaptist brethren are well satisfied of this themselves. Hence, none of them are really open communion. When it is convenient, they extol Robert Hall's liberality, but do they practice it? Do they even indorse his principles? Certainly they do not. He did not believe that baptism is essential to the Lord's Supper at all, but they do; hence the only really open communion churches that I know of are certain of the English Baptists, and the American Freewill Baptists. They do not believe that a man needs to be baptized at all in order to commune at the Lord's Table. I know of no Pedobaptist church that believes this, or that will admit its own converts, regenerated men, to its Table, until in the judgment of that church they are baptized. We Baptists take the same position with yourselves on this point. There is not a hair's breadth of difference between us here. We all hold that no man has a right to the Supper till he is baptized.

But, then, we hold that you are not baptized with gospel baptism, and of course the question between you and us becomes one, not of "close communion," but of "close" baptism. We ask to be fairly met on that question, and not on a false issue. Now, brethren, I wish you, in all candor, to look calmly upon the proposition which you submit to us Baptists. You ask us, while entertaining these views, to commune with those who have not been immersed on a profession of faith in Christ; that is, you ask us to commune with those that we hold to be unbaptized. Yet you would subject to discipline any one of your own ministers or churches that assumed to act on this principle by publicly inviting to the Lord's Table persons whom they believed to be unbaptized. Is this consistent with your profession that in this proposed union no consciences are to be sacrificed?

IV.— *Where open communion at the Lord's Table does exist, either among the different Pedobaptist denominations or between them and Baptists, it is never made the test of Christian union by any one of the parties interested.*

Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Reformed Dutch brethren, and Methodists, are open communion, so far as that they may all sit down together at the Supper Table spread in each other's congregations. But are they any more united among themselves, in consequence of this species of open communion, than they are with the Baptists? Nay, indeed, isolated individual cases excepted, do they commune together at the Lord's Table at all? It is notorious that, as denominations, they never think of such a thing. Who ever heard of Dr. Cotton Smith presiding at the Lord's Table in Dr. Gardiner Spring's church, or of Dr. Vermilye breaking bread in Dr. Tyng's church, or of Dr. Rice administering the Supper in Dr. McClintock's church. Well, why not? Do they not recognize each other as regenerated men? Certainly they do. Do they not regard each other as baptized? Most certainly they do. What is the trouble then? I do not know. I know that my Episcopalian brethren do not regard my Presbyterian brethren as properly qualified to administer the ordinance. But I can not see how that should be in their way as regenerated men, with their views of Baptists and baptism. A number of these brethren are here, they must answer for themselves. They are able. Some years ago, many members of various denominations celebrated the Supper in a public hall in Philadelphia, as an illustration of good-will toward each other, but there was no denominational or even church union about it; so far from it, indeed, that they could not meet in the church edifice of any one denomination for the purpose, but were compelled to meet on neutral ground. I wonder that they did not regard the Philadelphia Baptists as very "exclusive," for not opening one of their church edifices for the service when they would not open their own. It may be said that these various bodies can meet to-

gether at the Lord's Table, as churches, if they please. But the fact that they do not please so to sit down with each other shows either that they do not consider this act to be a test of Christian union among themselves, or else that, after all, they have but little concern for Christian union itself among themselves as Pedobaptists—so little, that they feel quite guiltless when they utterly neglect to apply the test. The fact is, the various Pedobaptist bodies find it a moral impossibility to commune with each other, till they can settle the points upon which they predicate their several existence as distinct bodies. If this is not correct, let me ask why Dr. Rice, a Presbyterian, Dr. Smith, an Episcopalian, and Dr. Vermilye, a member of the Reformed Dutch Church, are here this evening, all pleading for Christian union among Pedobaptists.

Again: many Baptists are open communion, but does that bind them closer to other Christian denominations than the strict communion Baptists are bound? The Free-Will Baptists in this country are open communion. They number over 50,000—and an excellent people they are too—but what Pedobaptist denomination takes special interest in them on these accounts? I have been a pastor in this city for seventeen years, and have watched with great interest the little Free-Will Baptist Church among us struggle for an existence. Those brethren have one small meeting-house, immediately in the rear of this elegant edifice, in Twenty-eighth Street, and they have been deliberating for years as to whether or not they could pay their debts, and keep it. Well, how many of you Pedobaptist brethren, who feel so deeply about our "close communion," have helped them, in order that you might enjoy Christian union with them? Yet you can sit down at the Lord's Table with them whenever you please. I have never heard of any of your churches so much as taking a collection, to save that edifice from the hammer of the sheriff. Does this show that open communion is the bond of Christian union? Another question. Does open communionism promote the prosperity of Free-Will Baptists? Are other Christians so enamored of their Baptist principles, aside from that, that they gladly embrace them, and unite with them? Let us see. In 1844 they numbered 61,372 in the United States; in 1865, twenty-one years afterward, they numbered 55,676, that is 6,000 less, while in those years our strict communion Baptists in America have increased more than 300,000. According to Bro. Chambers' views of Christian union, what prospect is there of the millennium?

But my Pedobaptist brethren say: "Yes, but they are Arminians, and it is this that interrupts our Christian union with them." Well, so are that glorious people, the Methodists, yet they increase more rapidly than any of us, and every new convert is as unyielding a Methodist as the old ones, and they are all open communion too; but

you have no Christian union of a denominational character with them, for all that, which you have not with the Free-Will Baptists. All this goes to show that open communion has nothing whatever to do with Christian union, and that you so consider it when the Baptists are counted out of the question.

Now, let me ask you to look in another direction. For the most part, the English Baptists are open communion. Well, does that system work differently in Great Britain from what it does here, in the matter of Christian union? Not at all. Who is so lusty a defender of open communionism as Mr. Spurgeon? But does that endear him to other Christians? Let facts speak. Recently he has very boldly attested that infant baptism, so called, is unscriptural, and injurious to the church of God; in consequence of which the bitterest war has been waged against him by Christian people in Great Britain that has been waged against any London pastor for the last century. True, he loves to belabor his own strict brethren, but does that render him more acceptable to his brethren of other churches? Not one jot or tittle, so long as he chooses to remain a Baptist. If he chooses to abandon his Baptist principles, they will love him well enough. Are the other religious bodies more closely bound to the open communion Baptists of England than to their strict communion brethren there? Not a whit. Scarcely a week passes that the English papers do not publish some scandalous act on the part of clergymen of the established church refusing to bury the infants of Baptist parents in consecrated ground, because, forsooth, they are unchristened. The honest truth is, that where other Baptist principles are held, it is a matter of no consequence with Pedobaptists whether Baptists are open communion or not. So far as appears to the contrary, you might annihilate strict communion to-day, and it would not inaugurate Christian union among the various sects. And this simply because communion at the Lord's Table is not and can not be made Christian union. Why, then, should those who plead for Christian union feel themselves at liberty to perpetually ring the changes of disunion over the heads of close communion Baptists with a sort of holy horror, as if they were the scapegoats to bear away the sins of all the religionists in the world? A man that does that may assume great pious complacency, and may cherish his own views of fairness, but I must claim the right to my views of his manliness, not to say meanness, nevertheless. I do respect a man who sincerely attempts to show that our baptism is not scriptural, and meets us in a fair, square, manly way, upon the real differences between us and others, namely, what is Bible baptism, and who are the proper subjects for it. But when an otherwise respectable man creates a false issue by attempting to show that my views of the Lord's Supper were wrong, when he knows them to be the same as his own to a shade, he must

excuse me if my frankness will not allow me to respect him, as I otherwise would, if I could believe him to be honest.

V.—*What, then, is Christian Union?*

Ah! truly, that is a delightful question. Let me attempt to answer it. There were no sects in the apostolic church; therefore we want no union of *sects* in the modern church, for that would be the sum total of sectarianism. *But we do want a union of Christians.* The prayer of Jesus is, that those "who believe on me may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one *in us.*" Not "one" as men may be one in one ecclesiastical body, but "one *in us.*" Jesus prays to the Father that "they may be one, as *we* are one." Now why would speak of the *Trinity as a union?* Yet all may speak of the Godhead as a *unity.* Then for what does Jesus pray? That all his followers may be one, precisely as he and his Father are one—not that they formed a union, but that they constitute a unity. Then his prayer contemplates that believers should attain a oneness of mind in the faith, and not merely a oneness of feeling—a oneness of heart in the obedience which they offer—and a oneness of effort in the works which they do.

And then Jesus measures this Christian unity by the standard of the divine nature. "That they may be one as we are one." If this unity among Christians consists in mere heart-kindness, there is no visible appositeness in this momentous petition. The Father and the Son are one in *feeling, action, counsel, name.* Therefore the prayer means that Christians are to be one in the same sense; that is, one in *feeling, action, counsel, name.* So completely are the Father and the Son one, that the same acts are ascribed to both, and the same purposes are formed by both. Such is their identity in these respects, that the eye of the keenest archangel can not see a shade of variation. This is the real picture of Christian unity, as Jesus hung it up in the supper chamber. Perfect oneness must subsist among the people of God, and their unity must agree in agreeing, and not in differing, just as the unity of the Father and the Son agrees. We are to hold the same affections, the same doctrines, and the same ordinances, and we are to hold them as Jesus held them, or else our union is a counterfeit and a pretension. This is Christian unity, as Jesus prays for it, and it seems to me, with the open Bible before me, that nothing else is. Who would suppose that the Father holds one form of truth, and the Son another, but that for the sake of peace they "agree to disagree"—that is, that they mutually agree to suppress the varying expressions of their mind, and that they call this being at one? The very thought is offensive. Christ was exclusively one with the Father in doing his will, and our unity must be like the unity of the Father and the Son. In other words, Christian unity must be scriptural, or it is unreal, it is nothing. Therefore, nothing but a return of all those

who love the Savior to the naked teachings of the Bible, as the Father and the Son avowed those teachings, can ever result in Christian unity. Christian bodies may declare an armistice and be peaceable, but it is one thing to be peaceable and another to be united. It is a shame that one man should denounce another as exclusive, because that other more literally and fully obeys the word of God than himself. God has expressed his will in the broadness of infinite thought, and that man who does not scruple to obey every part of it is the most catholic believer. His exclusiveness is exclusive oneness with Christ in obeying his will, and therefore he partakes of the spirit of the catholicity of God. But no man can obey that will without sympathy with the catholic God. Hence, David says, not "when thou shalt contract," but "when thou shalt *enlarge* my heart, I will run in the way of thy command merits."

I take it, then, that the only way in which we Christians can be united is to agree that we will mutually obey whatever is positively enjoined in the New Testament, and insist on nothing beyond that. Let each man appeal to the Bible only, and he will need to ask for no concession from his brethren. Opinion will then give place to Christian faith; convenience, and preference, and expediency, to divine authority. How common it is for Christians to retain their distinct peculiarities, because they are not *forbidden in the word of God*. This is a dangerous principle; it is one of the rocks on which Christian sects split. The things' that are specially required are the things that are to be done, and not the things that are not specially forbidden. Luther fell into this trap. Carlstadt demanded of him, "Where has Christ *commanded* us to elevate the host?" "Where has he forbidden it?" Luther retorted. So, because it was not positively forbidden, Luther concluded that it must be done. Our trouble springs largely from this false position. If we should only ask that each other's tastes and preferences should yield to God's word, we would soon begin to respect each other's views of it, and to grow into real unity. Do you wonder that when a man asserts, for instance, that my views of baptism are scriptural and apostolical, and then adds that, for some reason aside from their scripturalness, he prefers something else, and requires me to give up my views in order to accommodate him, that he may unite with me—do you wonder that I resent it as an insult to my convictions? I am tempted to say: "Rather give up what is a matter of indifference to you, be baptized with what you confess to be Bible baptism, and we are one in a moment." So far as I know, no denomination of Christians hold an immersed believer to be an unbaptized man. All say, that is gospel baptism. They sacrifice no conscience in so recognizing it. We hold that your sprinkling and pouring, either of a child or a believer, is not gospel baptism, and of course we should sacrifice

conscience in saying that it is, and in acting toward you as if it were. Who sacrifice conscience, then, and break the "unity of the faith;" we, in not submitting to a baptism that we think contrary to the gospel, or you, in refusing to submit to one which you conscientiously believe to be taught in the gospel? If you want union, submit to what you hold to be according to the gospel in this thing; we have done that already, and your act will at once restore the primitive "one faith, one baptism."

These are my views of Christian union, and the method of attaining it. I can see no other in harmony with the word of God. And if this be Christian union, its profound sanctity overwhelms me; its infinite tenderness moves my whole being. The delicious conception of its purity, and preciousness, and power make me tremble with holy awe. I remember that when my Redeemer bowed beneath the ponderous load of my sin this holy thought soothed his bleeding heart, and just before the purple blood-drops forced their passage through every pore of his body he breathed out this intercession for every ransomed disciple, and for me: "That they all may be one, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

NOTE.—At the close of this address Dr. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church, arose and said, he regretted that Dr. Armitage had misunderstood him in his previous remarks. For, so far from believing that "immersion" was gospel baptism, he did not believe that it was Christian baptism at all. He believed that *aspersion* was the only scriptural baptism, and hence he would not "immerse" any person even on his faith.

For this candid avowal, made in this public way, I do most heartily thank Dr. Rice; because it shows me,

1. That it is not Baptist views of communion that he objects to so much as their baptism.
2. That he at least is consistent with himself, whatever others of his brethren may be, and has abandoned the ground that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Table. For he complains that the Baptists are close communion, and that they thereby stand in the way of Christian unity, while he earnestly desires to commune with them, although, in his opinion, they are not baptized at all. He does not even require them to be "aspersed" in order to communion with other Christians. I like it. It gives us a new idea of things in their present shape on this union question. Will our Pedobaptist brethren abide by Dr. Rice's position?

T. A.

COMMENTS AND REFLECTIONS ON THE FOREGOING.

The subject of the union of Christians is just at this time engaging not a little of the attention of the American people. It is generally a popular theme; at present it is particularly so. We have not the

least objection to the discussion of the subject; though we know well how it is to end. It will end neither in making Christians nor in uniting them. The very men who are now engaged in the work neither desire this nor do they expect it. The evils of sectarianism are evils whose frightful and criminal nature they do not yet sufficiently understand to enable them to set about, in earnest, the work of abandoning sectarianism. They do not propose to cease to be sectarians in order to become united. Certainly not. No such thought has ever entered their heads. Each man named in the preceding document only hopes that his neighbor will relax a little, and become more like himself; but not for a moment has he ever thought of giving up anything he holds, and becoming more like his neighbor. Dr. Smith expects Dr. Rice to do all the changing essential to a union between them; while Dr. Rice expects Dr. Smith to do it all; but neither expects himself to change one particle. They both expect their present efforts to end where they began, leaving each occupying his present ground, without one inch being abandoned. Does Dr. Rice propose to give up his creed, or Dr. Smith his ritual? Does Dr. Smith propose to give up his plea of succession, or Dr. Rice his infant rantism? Far, very far from it. Not a tenet does either propose to abandon. In what, then, do they expect their union to consist? Or do they really expect any? We are much inclined to think that *union* is something they have never dreamed of; that they are guilty of a gross abuse of language when they talk of the thing. The cultivation of a more friendly feeling is all that they aim at; and in this we predict a failure. They will never learn to hate each other less, nor to love each other more. Among *sectarians* Christian union is an impossibility; and this is the only union Christ will ever have or bless.

It is really a difficult matter to see or conceive what those now taking the lead in these so-called union movements intend. It would be thought wrong to say they do not intend union; and yet union can never be inferred from their acts. Has any actual union been effected? We know perfectly it has not. Has Dr. Rice proposed to disband the Presbyterian body in order to effect a union with other disbanded bodies? Has Dr. Smith done the same? They have not. What, then, do they propose? Or do they really propose anything which shrewd men of the world can look upon as rising above a sham? What confidence can we have in their talk about union, while they neither unite nor submit any practicable plan of union? No two of them have agreed to walk together. Not even to this smallest extent has a union been effected. Do Dr. Smith and Dr. Rice ever expect to see the day when Dr. Smith will cease to be an Episcopalian, and Dr. Rice a Presbyterian; and when they shall together wear some new common name, and each belong to the same body? They know perfectly they never expect to see it. Why, then, do they talk to us of

union? Do they look on us as silly children who can not penetrate their hollow talk, and see that all beyond is division, endless, incurable division, without even the semblance of union? Does not Dr. Rice expect to die a Presbyterian as confidently as he expects to move from city to city every time an increase of a round thousand is proposed on his salary of the previous year? Does not Dr. Smith as much expect to die an Episcopalian as he does a Protestant? Yet these are the gentlemen who talk to us of *union*. Do Drs. Smith and Rice propose to abandon their baby rantism for the sake of a union with conscientious men who look on it as a relic of the scarlet woman? Not at all. Would Dr. Rice be engaged in the present movement if he thought it was to result in the diminution of Presbyterian influence or Presbyterian numbers? Would Dr. Smith have anything to do with it, if he expected a like result with high churchism? Never. The plain truth is that neither of these gentlemen expects to abandon a single tenet he now holds, or lose a single member from his present communion, in order to consummate the union of which they speak. On the contrary, each has a secret conviction at heart that somehow or some way, by the discussions now pending, his cause is to grow more popular, and his numbers to be increased. Never would they engage in it were such not the case. By it Dr. Rice expects to reclaim his erring brother, Dr. Smith, and bring him over to Presbyterianism; by it Dr. Smith expects to reclaim his erring brother, Dr. Rice, and bring him over to Episcopacy; by it Dr. Vermilye hopes to see them both become reformed Dutchmen; while Dr. Armitage, *perhaps*, has some feeble hope that he may immerse them all. Such, we venture to think, is the secret motive which underlies and shapes the present fruitless efforts at union.

But these union efforts, spasmodic and unproductive of good though they are, whether of Cincinnati, Cleveland, or New York, contain this in them which is gratifying: *they are an acknowledgment that division is wrong*. For this acknowledgment we are thankful; and when they have supplied us with this, we feel that their mission for good is at an end. Beyond conceding this, they will never effect anything. They will result in no union; for nothing of the kind is intended by them. Still it is something to have the truth confessed that the present divided state of Christendom is not the state intended by Christ. If the world will only seize on and make the proper use of this confession, the world may become much the gainer thereby. A meeting is held in the city of New York. In this meeting four different denominations are represented, each by its respective Doctor. The avowed object of this meeting is the union of the Lord's people. The Lord's people, then, are not united; yet they should be, otherwise this meeting would not have been held. To divide the Lord's people then is wrong; to unite them is right.

Now surely men of the world should be slow to connect themselves with bodies or denominations which themselves constitute in part the very division which is wrong, and which refuse to take the necessary steps to effect the union which is right. If division is wrong then these denominations are wrong, confessedly wrong. Hence men of the world should not go into them; for thereby they become parties to the crime of division. Nor should good men work for them or sanction them; for they are wrong, and it is not right to build up what is wrong. By the very confession which these denominations make, they certainly restrain all good men from working for them. Nay, more, they thereby show themselves to be under obligation to dissolve themselves and to cease to be. Will they do this? Never. I consequently conclude them to be in no condition to push to its consummation their plea for union.

A general concession by the denominations of the day that division is wrong, though of advantage to others, is of no practical value to them. Each denomination must concede that itself is wrong, and avow its own readiness for dissolution, before the concession can amount to anything. When all do this, then will people have confidence in the sincerity of the plea for union, not before. The general concession amounts, on the part of each particular denomination, only to this, that others are wrong in keeping up division, but not itself. It is right; others only are wrong. Does any one for a moment suppose that Dr. Rice is working in the present movement with a secret and well-defined concession in his heart that Presbyterians are wrong? He knows neither human nature nor the genius of partyism who so thinks. Dr. Rice believes all others to be wrong and Presbyterians to be right; and that in the discussion on union this fact will come out, and that in the end Presbyterians will be gainers. This he believes; and this is the reason why he works in the movement. And what is true of him in this respect is true of Dr. Smith and of every other partisan. No one of them is ready to confess himself wrong, and to engage in the work of pulling down his own party. Each intends only to pull down his neighbor, never himself. Each expects his neighbor to lose all that is lost, and himself to gain all that is gained. It requires but little sagacity to see that no good is to come out of a movement, when it is controlled by such motives and principles as these.

But on what ground do the gentlemen named in the foregoing document propose to effect the union in question? Have they submitted any basis for their action; or shown how it is that the result they affect to aim at is to be brought to pass? We hope they do not mean to trifle with our credulity when they tell us that union is desirable, and practicable, and that we should all set about effecting

it. Yet till they submit us some feasible plan of union, or lay us down some basis on which it can conceivably be effected, I confess their plea sounds to me much like trifling. But up to this writing this is something they have not, that I know of, done. On what basis, then, do they propose to unite? Here we are left to conjecture.

Now we can readily imagine that *the great essentials of Christianity* are to be that basis, if we are to have any at all. But what these essentials will turn out to be is a curious problem, whose solution we must yet wait for. Drs. Rice and Smith may have no little trouble in agreeing on them, and still greater trouble perhaps in getting others to adopt those to which they may agree. Difficulties loom up high before us here. But after agreeing on these essentials do they really propose a union on them? Does any man soberly believe it? If so, no long time will be required to prove to him how ill he has judged. The proposed union, gentle reader, is for others; it is not for Drs. Rice and Smith. These gentlemen are right now. It is you who are expected to change and unite, and not they. We greatly admire the covert complacency of some men.

But on that basis of union, we are urgent and anxious. Those essentials we are irrepressibly curious to see. Sure I am that not one of them now lies between the covers of the Bible. Whether Westminster or Geneva is to supply them, can not confidently be said; only the Bible is not. On that we may reckon in no timid mood. Give us, gentlemen, the ground on which you expect Arminians and Calvinists to coalesce; on which you expect creed-mongers and those who believe creeds to be of the pit, to become loving members of the same body; on which you expect baby rantizers and the robust believers in exclusive adult immersion to become tamely one; on which you expect the proud defenders of apostolic succession, and those who believe it to be a papal lie, to fraternize—give us first the basis on which you expect to achieve these results; and then shall we be in a condition to weigh your proposition for union. But till you do this, chide us not for being shy.

But let the basis of union be submitted, still on it no union will be effected. Dr. Rice and Dr. Smith may *agree* on what they call the essentials of religion; but on them they will never *unite*. Agreement on essentials is one thing, union on them is quite another. That possibly they may effect, this they never will. No; they will agree on the essentials, but divide on the non-essentials—this is what they will do. Union will never follow their agreement; only division will remain on their disagreement. And this by the way shows the importance they attach to their concatenation of boasted essentials. They are essentials it is true, the very vitals of vital religion; but they can form no ground of union. They can be agreed on, that is all. Union on them is impossible. The non-essentials are the

essentials after all; since they are matters of so much moment that unless an agreement can be come to on them they must be made the ground of that fearful sin, the sin of division. True, the essentials are the great matters, and union is not only right, but required; but then the non-essentials prevail over them and defeat their effect. Essentials are the common point and true ground of union; but here Drs. Smith and Rice will not unite. Rather they will divide on the non-essentials, and thereby show them, and not the essentials, to be the true elements of cohesion and separation. Because they are not agreed on, they are the elements of separation; could they be agreed on, they would become the actual basis of union. Would it not be well for Drs. Rice and Smith to abandon for a season their impotent essentials, and try the effect on their scheme of projected union of these magic non-essentials. Since essentials have achieved nothing, the most ordinary prudence, it seems to me, would be induced to try something else. As they doubtless agree on the essentials, and would be willing to unite so far as they are concerned, do they not see that non-essentials are keeping them apart, and thereby becoming essentials of great magnitude, if not essentials in the matter of union—at least essentials in that of destroying division. On many accounts we would just now commend these non-essentials to the very especial regard of the Reverend Doctors who are sitting at the helm in this *quasi* union movement. True, non-essentials may be no positive bond of union; but then it must be obvious to the most superficial looker on that they are the very life's blood of division; and as no union can be effected without the destruction of division, it becomes a matter of but very little less importance to remove the causes of this than to foster the grounds of that. If these non-essentials could be disposed of, since they are, if not the causes, at least the occasion of division, might we not naturally predict a union. Certainly we might, if we had not the experience of the past to hold us in check. But with the light of that as our guide, we are slow to forecast a union among sects. It is something we shall never see. Hence, were Drs. Smith and Rice as perfectly agreed on the non-essentials as possibly they may be on the essentials of religion, they would still not unite. If they stood not apart then as they stand now, still they would stand apart on other grounds, and there each would nurse his own little party, as he now does. We have no faith in union where sectarians and sect-makers project it.

But unless Christ shall interpose to defeat this and other proposed unions like it, which I hope he will, I confess I have some fear that it may be effected. The only check which we can now see on the mischief of sectarianism, is a check which sects impose on themselves. One preys on and wars against another; and thus their evil tendency is constantly restrained. Were they united, this let would be taken

out of the way, and no bound can be imagined to the evil and ruin they would work. They would at once agree on a code of essentials in religion, and alas for the man who dared to dissent from this code, or to stand in opposition to its authors. Soon would they stand in our halls of legislation, and with overwhelming voice would they demand the passage of merciless penal laws against dissenters. These laws once violated, and again should we have the fires of Smithfield blazing round us. Let no one think such a result beyond the range even of probability. We have not all quite forgotten what sectarianism is capable of when it holds the reigns of power. Cromwell and Calvin are still had in mind; and the relation of Drs. Smith and Rice to these is not the remotest that can be conceived. The spirit which is bound up in memory with the name of Servetus may not be wholly non-existent in this country; it may be only latent. The tendency of sectarianism in Pedobaptist hands has been, for years past, toward the repudiation of immersion. Presbyterians will not now immerse; and it is becoming exceedingly offensive to many Methodists. Episcopalians concede it in theory, but eschew it in practice. All these and other parties like them are rapidly setting aside the word of God in this and kindred particulars. These are the parties, if any, that will coalesce. Let them once become combined, and agree on the things that constitute orthodoxy and the things which constitute heresy, which they can soon do, and no living man can foresee the terrible consequences. Soon we should have a coalition of Church and State; for we know what party Dr. Smith represents; soon the old Jewish sabbath would be re-established by law; for we know what Presbyterians have long been bent on in this respect; soon it would be a crime for any man to teach school, vote, or hold office, who did not subscribe the creed; soon all men would be by law required to have their children christened so many days after birth by hands which could trace their consecration in a direct line up to the apostles; soon the hardy workers of the soil would be compelled to pay tithes to maintain the "establishment" and "the Lord's anointed;" soon immersionists would again hallow the whipping-post, and feed the fires of religious intolerance; soon we should have these and other like results following in the train of the union of which we are writing. As sure as the Devil is unfettered and has power to deceive, let these Pedobaptist sects consummate the alliance they are now seeking to effect in the North, and the day of religious liberty is past in this country. And let no one think the American people not in a mood tamely to bow down to the state of things here supposed. We have only to look at the complacency with which politicians, whether in or out of power, look on test oaths in Missouri to conjecture the facility with which they can lend a hand in the matter of proscription and intolerance. The men who are now engaged to effect this proposed

union, know not what spirit they are of. For very worthy ends, *ostensibly*, they now labor. But let them once succeed, and their is no unblinded reader of church history who can not foresee in what their efforts must end. That even one of them now intends evil, certainly I would not charge; for thy servant is surely not a dog that he should do this thing. No, no; but, then, thy servant may be king.

These men will never effect a union promotive of the interests of the gospel. That they may effect one which shall deeply affect the gospel and its adherents, I shall by no means deny. But a union on the New Testament basis, or for the true ends of the gospel, they will never effect. They are sectarians in the strictest sense of the word; nor will they ever cease to be such. The bodies they represent are sectarian bodies, and will continue so. Hence all the elements which are to enter into the proposed union, are sectarian elements. Nor will they be less sectarian after the union than before. They will undergo no change in their transition from the small sectarian body to the large one. What they are now, they will be then. They are now the enemies of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and they will be its enemies then. They will never change for the better. Were their basis of union now agreed on, and their union completed, the resulting compound would be as intensely sectarian as any of the composing elements; and it is hardly necessary to tell the intelligent student of the Bible that a union of sects and sectarians falls immeasurably short of being a union of Christians, or in any sense a Christian union. Their union once formed would simply be the sects united; and then they would only need, if any difference, converting to the gospel ten times more than they need it now. Our prayer is that Christ may defeat their machinations, and prevent the unholy alliance they are now seeking to form. There is nothing but mischief in it.

But in all projected unions, the first thing in order is to agree on the basis of union. Nor must it be merely a basis on which men *may* unite; it must be one on which they *must* unite. Neither must it be a basis for the union of parties. Parties united would form only a party, a schism, and would hence be condemned by the word of God. The large party would differ from the small parties, only as the mountain differs from the atoms which compose it. It would be simply an aggregation of sects, and no union of Christians. Such a union would be an overwhelming calamity. The only union contemplated in the New Testament is a union of individual Christians. For this union divine provision has been made, but for no other. Every other species and form of union is but an unsanctified coalition, whose career has always been and ever will be marked only by spiritual death. Human decrees constitute its rule of action, and tyrannical councils its regulative head. Popery is the living embodiment of this type of union; and should Protestant sects succeed

in forming the union at which many of them seem now aiming, the resemblance between them when united and Popery will be the resemblance between two peas of the same pod.

In order to effect the true scriptural union, the union of individuals, several preliminaries have to be settled. It may be well to enumerate some of these in order:

I. *The book-basis.* Christians can never be one without *one* book. This ought to have for every mind the force of a simple intuition. If they have two books, one of them must necessarily be human. The human book will be a constant cause of irritation and separation. Against it will always lie insuperable objections. These conscientious men can never waive. For the contents of the human book the loose and irreligious will contend in hot mood. Against them the pious and scrupulous will stand with unwavering firmness. Soon the strife will run criminally high; and now for the sake of peace, and feeling themselves in conscience bound thereto, the truly god-fearing will congregate to themselves. Thus a union is either broken or prevented. The very first thing, therefore, in the formation of a true union is to put away all books but the one, the Bible. Till Christian men get their whole heart's consent to do this, it is idle to talk of union. On any other basis Christians and sectarians may be confusedly jumbled together, but the assemblage is but a jumble and not a union. It is not the union which springs from principle, and which finds its continued existence in the unity of truth, but which springs from worldly policies, and which is therefore as dissoluble as the fibres of the rank summer weed. Such a union is neither to be desired nor worked for. When men get their consent to abandon all human creeds, and to take the Bible only as the source of the matter of their faith, and as their exclusive guide in practice, then, so far as the book-basis is concerned, may they talk of union, but not before. Will the gentlemen named on the title-page of the preceding address, and who represented "the various denominations" in the city of New York, consent to this? Dr. Armitage might; but if so, he is the only one named who would. Would Drs. Rice and Smith abandon their respective party creeds, and accept only the Bible as the ground of union? Never. He is a silly dreamer who amuses his brain with such a notion. No; instead of abandoning their creeds in order to effect their proposed union, *their* union could never be effected without a creed, a new creed, a creed differing from any and all existing creeds. Of course Dr. Smith would not consent to subscribe the creed of Dr. Rice, nor would Dr. Rice that of Dr. Smith. To effect a union, they would have to make a new creed embodying a new basis of union. This creed would embrace only the points common to their respective present creeds. Still it would be a creed, and hence a barrier to union with all men who stand conscientiously opposed to

creeds. Such creed could never become a bond of union. On no book-basis could all the children of God unite, save on that of the Bible alone; and as there is no probability that the sprinkling sects of the day will ever consent to take that and that only, there is hence no probability of a general union. The only union that will ever take place, if any ever does, will be the union of all immersed believers on the Bible alone, and the union of all Pedobaptists on a new creed. Immersed believers may become one on the basis of the one book, but with Pedobaptists they will never unite on any ground. Between the immersed and the unimmersed there is a ditch and a wall impassable and inerasable. Pedobaptists will never consent to cancel it; and the immersed will never unite till it is canceled. So they stand hopelessly two; and may heaven grant that it may ever be so.

2. *The matter of the faith.* By this I mean that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This is not the matter of faith simply and generally, but of the faith required by the gospel, and which saves the soul. It is the great proposition of the Bible, and the grandest truth known to the human mind. It carries with it the truth of the entire book; for without it there is no truth therein. It unitizes the book by rendering it all true; it is the basis on which the church stands and gives to it its unity; and is hence the great doctrinal truth which constitutes the centre of unity in the items of our belief. Agreement on and acceptance of this great truth is absolutely necessary; and this of itself will give mental unity to the children of God, without which any other unity is nothing. Hence, in order to effect a union, widespread, enduring, and grand, we must commence with *one book*, and then with *the one great truth* of this book now stated. This would of itself, though incomplete, be no mean form of unity. It would be unity as to the visible basis of union; and as to the most fundamental of all the truths of the Bible. Surely this should be regarded as no small advance in the right direction.

But not only should we be compelled to have agreement in regard to great general principles; we should have to agree in matters of detail. Here we should encounter our chief difficulties. Indeed we feel that even to propound unity here would be idle, at least in the present state of the religious world. These matters of detail would be:

3. *One body.* This is the first item in the series of items laid down by Paul, and constituting the unity of the Spirit. By the phrase "unity of the Spirit" is meant the unity which it inculcates among the children of God, and which consists in their being perfectly agreed on the several items, of which one body is the first named. It is not merely oneness of spirit or mind among them, but agreement on great doctrinal items. By the one body is meant the one church of which

Christ is the founder and head. It is one, a unit, and consists of all the individual Christians who have been since the founding of the kingdom to the present time. This one church has no branches consisting of the various parties of the day. It is an aggregation of units, but each unit is one individual Christian, and not a sect. It is a body whose members are regenerated persons, not parties. Among these persons unity is a solemn scriptural necessity; and division a gross sin. Such is the one body.

4. *One Spirit.* This is the Holy Spirit, who before the world is Christ's advocate, the revealer and finisher of the truth; whose great function in regard to the world is to convince it of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; who dwells in the Christian and strengthens him with might in the inner man, and helps his infirmities. Respecting this Spirit we must not speculate, but must speak of it in the precise language of the book, in the full and fair import of the terms thereof, ascribing to it no more, no less, than is therein ascribed. This done, union and silence must remain.

5. *One hope.* This is the hope of the resurrection of the righteous to immortality and eternal life, and is the great stimulant to purity, and constancy in the divine life. It is sharply defined in the New Testament, and is to be held without modification or change. Though not likely to become the occasion of dissension, it is still to be guarded as a great and precious doctrine, and no denial of it is to be allowed in any form.

6. *One Lord.* The one Lord is of course the Christ, who within was the Word, and who, so far, was eternal, and not merely of time; who was divine, or of the same nature with the Father, the Creator of all things, but himself not a creature; in his incarnate state, God with us; who has made a complete atonement for all, but will save only them who obey him; who is invested with all authority in heaven and on earth; through whom alone, as Mediator, the Father can be approached; and who is to be worshiped and adored as the Father himself deserves to be. This one Lord is to be accepted precisely as set forth in the word of God, to be spoken of in the terms there used of him, which terms are to be taken in all cases and at all times in their just and full sense. This done, speculation respecting him is to be excluded; and no purely scholastic view of him is to bind any heart or conscience of man, but is to be held as of the nature of a heresy, and to be eschewed.

7. *One faith.* This is the simple belief of the truth, or the conviction specifically that Jesus is the Christ, or generally that everything contained in the Bible is true. It is an act of the human mind its assent to the truth of Holy Writ, and is not an impartation to the human soul. It is a single thing, and not one of a kind. It is hence to be denominated neither saving, nor historic, nor evangelical, but is

to be called by its own scriptural name, without any human epithet. It is the great first condition of salvation, from which springs all acceptable obedience, and without which obedience is void. It comes by hearing the word of God, and not in some mystic or metaphysical way by a secret impulse of the Spirit. It is to be accepted precisely as defined in the word of God; and no modification of that definition is to be allowed.

8. *One baptism.* This is simply and strictly the immersion of the whole person of a believing penitent in water. It is, in language more closely scriptural, the burial of a person dead to sin, and his resurrection to live a new life. It is, in other words, an act, of which, and of its accompaniments, what is here said may be regarded as a description rather than a definition. This description, which is held to be true to the word of God, excludes, first, the unbelieving, and hence, of course, infants, and, second, the impenitent. None but a person who believes that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and who has determined to forsake his sins, is to be admitted to the rite. Nor is the rite to be allowed capable of the slightest modification or change. Hence he who is not literally immersed, as now said, is to be held in fact and to all intents and purposes as unbaptized, and as out of the kingdom of heaven, or not a member of the body of Christ. No matter what may be the intentions of such unbaptized person, or what may be claimed for him on the score of moral honesty or piety, he is to be held as now set forth. His good intentions have no power to transmute an act of sprinkling into an act of immersion, nor to cause that to be substituted for this. If the ability is possessed, and the fact of non-immersion exists, it is far safer to infer moral corruption as its cause than to conclude that any mental or moral state in the subject will cause God to set aside an act which he has ordained, and accept in its stead one which he has not. In matters in which God has not spoken, the will of the creature may be his rule of action; but in all cases where God has spoken, his voice is the sole rule of conduct. In the case of the Christian, a failure to conform *perfectly* is provided for, and will on certain conditions be forgiven; but this can not be said of the sinner. The sinner's obedience is in intent and in fact to be perfect; while the Christian's is to be so in intent, but may not be so in fact. Not that it is permitted to be defective in fact; only when it is so it may not be fatal, since it may be forgiven. No more is an act of sprinkling to be substituted for an act of immersion, and the party so sprinkled to be united with as a Christian, than is an act of faith in Mohammed to be substituted for a like act in Christ; or an act of repentance to be set aside, and the ability to compute numbers to be accepted in lieu of it. Hence no sort of union is possible between the immersed and the unimmersed. Between them lies a gulph which no human

power can cancel. The hand of Christ himself has dug it, and alas for the presumptuous spirit that would leap it or bridge it. Whether the immersed themselves shall ever be one or not is a question for them deeply to consider. But as to a union with the sprinkled, that is settled. It can never be. Hence, when the sprinkled talk of union, let them not talk with the immersed, unless they can first get their whole heart's consent to be immersed. Nor must they merely consent to immersion as a matter of policy, or out of charity to the infirmities of immersionists. Not at all. They must consent to it on the ground that it and it only is scriptural, that it is their solemn duty to submit to it; and that in the controversy they have been wrong. The sprinkled owe it to Christ and man to confess their deep sin in substituting sprinkling for immersion. By this act they have kept and are this day keeping millions out of the kingdom of heaven. I see not how they are ever to be forgiven. If in no other case, surely immersion is necessary to pardon in this.

9. *One God.* On this great cardinal item in the ground of union but little need be said. On it happily we are all agreed. Though last in the enumeration, few will fail to recognize it as first in point of importance. True, its essential necessity is not felt in this country as it would be in one of gods many, but it is none the less real on that account. We simply adduce it to complement the list of items, and with this shall let it pass.

Here now are nine great doctrinal items, reaching from the one book to the one God, on which we must be one—one in mind, in heart, in fact, before anything like a formal, practical union need be thought of. Of course, I do not mean to claim anything for the mere form in which I have worded these items. The verbal dress in which I set them forth is nothing. No one is required to accept this. The items themselves undressed, that is, in uninspired human speech, are the things which are material and necessary. On these no compromise can be made; nor can even one of them be dispensed with. They are all necessary, and if not all equally necessary, still are they all so much so, that all must be counted in in settling the basis of union.

Besides the foregoing, other items would have to be defined and agreed on before any real union could ever take place. The question of church government, also that of church dependence or independence, together with that of the powers and functions of preachers—all these would have to be settled. Nor would the work of settlement stop even here; for conscientious lovers of the Bible are scrupulous over what the world calls small items, no less than over great ones. But on these items I shall not here speak.

In regard to the speech of Dr. Armitage, I wish to commend it to the very careful reading of my brethren. It is much in advance of

what we usually get from the Baptists. Its principles will generally be found sound and well stated. Altogether it is an excellent document. I am delighted to see it, and to commend it. For some of its principles, we, as a people, have been long contending. We are glad to know that they are at last at work in the great heart of the Baptist people. With that people and our own lie the hopes of the world. Christianity is a dead thing in the hands of the sprinkling sects of the day. They all stand against the ancient gospel. They are its life-long enemies. Nothing can be expected from them save opposition to the principles and practice of immersionists. For this reason all the immersed should be one. That they are now tending to this result, I believe, can be clearly seen. The Lord hasten the day when our Baptist brethren shall lay aside the small budget of human traditions to which, under the title of Baptist usages, they still hold, and when they shall boldly take a clean stand on the Bible and that alone. That will be a glad day with us, and a hopeful one for Christianity.

But I can not close this piece without calling special attention to the position of Dr. Rice, as set forth by Dr. Armitage in the note at the end of his speech. At last Dr. Rice comes boldly forward and denies that immersion is baptism. For this announcement we were fully prepared. We have long known this to be the real heart-faith of the Presbyterians. Now we have the fact avowed. The less lights in Presbyterian ranks will soon learn to repeat the lesson their cunning master puts into their lips. The repudiation of immersion by them will soon be general. The Methodists are but a few rods behind in the same track. They have long been ridiculing immersion, and trying to bring it into disuse. Let now some prominent man put on the front to ape Dr. Rice, and then the work will go disgracefully on. The sprinklers will then have a common point around which to rally, and a common foe in the field. Their onset then will not be feeble, nor short-lived. It may be well for all the immersed to prepare for the conflict. The time is present when *immersion is denied to be scriptural*. Think of that, you Baptists, who have spoken against my brethren as heretics, and who are still not ashamed to sit in council with infidels, like Dr. Rice, and discuss plans for Christian union. I repeat, think of that.

THE PRESENT NUMBER.—The present number of the *Quarterly* appears late, owing to the fact that I have been waiting for names to come in, that I might be enabled to determine how many copies of each number to print. Printing now is very high, and it is hence very necessary to issue no more copies than will be called for.

A. W. ROBBINS.

It is difficult to realize that I am called upon, by sense of justice, to chronicle the death of this excellent man. Yet such is the case. Only one month ago I was with him in two fine meetings, reaching through more than two weeks, and now he is gone, to take part in such scenes no more. His earnest heart and nature are now at rest. His deep solicitude for the prosperity of the congregations to which he ministered will move our admiration no more. He acts his part on this bright morning in scenes far hence; and if he acts it there as well as he did here, I can but feel that his new home and new friends have no reason to feel ashamed of him. A mysterious Providence has allowed him to be cut down in the very midst of a career of usefulness, which endeared him to all who really knew him. This to us is strange and past finding out. Why a true man, in the prime of life, who was spending the whole energies of his soul in and for the cause of Christ, should have been taken hence, while thousands of worthless wretches, who are a disgrace to their race and a curse to their age, are left behind, is a problem which we are not only not in a condition to solve, but on which we are not in a condition to speculate. The event at least proves this, that God sees things not in the light in which we see them; and that he is fully competent to carry forward his work without the aid of any one of those human instrumentalities, the loss of which we so keenly feel when deprived of it. He thus shows us that he is dependent on no single man in any sense or to any extent, since he proudly calls away his best friends while still in the field with sickle in hand; and yet his great works move as grandly on as though he had but snapped a twig on some useless tree. The loss of a good man is an event which we lament; but the Heavenly Father is not thereby straitened, nor his means of accomplishing his ends in the least curtailed. At most, but feeble must be the aid which he derives from us. We are not to conclude that he is loser when we go out. His resources are still infinite.

On one popular notion I must here bestow a few remarks. Nothing is more common than to hear the death of an individual spoken of as an affliction, that is, as an event intended to afflict the living. This has always sounded to me strange. That God should cause or allow the death of one person in order to afflict another is utterly inconsistent with my notions of that great and merciful Being. If a man be a good man and prepared to go, my faith is that God takes him for his own sake, and not to afflict those left behind. The only thing the Heavenly Father *intends* is to bless him whom he takes. To afflict others is not in his purpose. But he can not bless him whom he takes without giving pain to those left. But this pain is not designed, at least we do not know that it is. It is an accident growing out of the

manner in which one life is bound up with another. Could God, without derangement of the present constitution of things, remove those whom he takes without causing pain to those left, I see no reason to conclude that he would not do so. Certainly each death *may* be designed to be an affliction; but, then, it seems to me unsafe to assume it as certain without some proof to that effect. That the death of friends and kin is felt to be an affliction, and is so in fact, I well know; but I feel slow to impute this to the intention of God. I much prefer to think that he intends only the good and not the pain, but that he can not bestow that without this; and that he, so ready is he to bestow the good, is willing to cause the pain in order to bestow it. But this only by the way.

Bro. Robbins was born in the village of Brattleboro', Vermont, in February, 1821, and died on the 8th instant (October). He was consequently forty-four years of age at the time of his death. He was raised, I take it, by parents in humble circumstances, as he seems to have been dependent on his own exertions for the education he acquired. At an early age he removed with his parents from Vermont to Massachusetts, where he lived till the age of fourteen. He next removed into the State of New York, and there lived till he was nineteen. Here he followed farming. At the age of nineteen he left New York, and alone came into Kentucky, where he engaged in school-teaching, that noble calling which has blessed earth with so many of its benefactors. Here he taught for four years, and then returned to New York, where he himself went to school some two years. At the end of this time he again came to Kentucky, which he made his home till his death; and he now lies sleeping in its dust.

Bro. Robbins was not a man whom one would be likely to select as destined to live a long life. His whole form and look seemed marked with signs of premature decay. I was struck with this the first time I ever saw him; nor did I ever count that his life would be a long one. The tokens of infirmity sat too visibly in that fixed, half haggard face, to justify the expectation of many years. Still his body seemed wiry, and to a sufficient degree endowed with toughness to justify the conclusion that he might reach fifty, possibly fifty-five. But where one man of his make and appearance reaches the latter age, I should think twenty would fall ten years short of it. On looking at him, Bro. Robbins impressed you peculiarly. It never occurred to you that he would die just then; yet you could not think that he would live long. There was something enigmatical in him in this respect. He was a man whom you did not like to study in this particular. You felt half conscious that conclusions would be forced upon you, with which you preferred not to grow familiar. True, his appearance suggested death to but few minds, hence those who knew him were not prepared for it; but, then, you must bestow no thought on him; for

if so, the painful anticipation at once seized you. I was hence not taken by surprise when the news reached me that he was gone; only I was not expecting it just then.

In personal appearance he was tall, being, I should think, little less, if any, than six feet. His build was light, wanting in compactness, and somewhat irregular. Robustness was an idea his frame never suggested to the mind. You never felt that his body was capable of enduring much, and always that it was overworked and needed rest. He excited a general sympathy by usually appearing to be broken down and exhausted. Nor was this always not true of him. Few men ever went to bed weary more frequently than he, a fact which in his case really arose from overwork; for he was a man of uncommon industry. To a stranger he presented a restless, uneasy appearance. His look was that of a man laboring under constant solicitude and wasted by long anxiety. When in his company, he impressed you as if he were just ready to start, and as if you were detaining him. You always felt as you feel in the presence of one with gloves on and whip in hand. You seemed constantly waiting to hear him say: Well, I must go. He appeared incapable of long physical repose; and this was really the case with him. He must be always at work; and when at work he worked hard. Everything he did cost him a needless waste of strength. When he walked, he walked too fast; when in his buggy, he literally worked his passage; and when at a meeting he would take twice as many steps as any one else on the ground. He would see more people, speak to more people, introduce you to more people, give more directions, and attend to more small matters while a meeting was in progress, than any man I ever saw. He left nothing to others, but superintended everything himself. I greatly admired his energy, but thought it often spent on objects he could well have left to the care of other hands.

In mingling with the world, Bro. Robbins made no profound and wide-spread impressions. All respected him, his brethren were ever glad to see him; but he awoke no deep emotions in any breast. His was not the nature to do so. I venture the assertion that he never had an impassioned friend or a bitter enemy in his life. The feelings with which his brethren were moved toward him were those of mild love and simple admiration, while the world looked on him merely with kindness and gentle respect; but there was nothing grand in the feelings he excited. When with the crowd, he was mediumly considered; when absent from it, he was soon lost sight of. His nature was energetic, not ardent; but it was the energy which moves the machine, and not that which springs from depth of soul. He hence never got very close to the world, nor the world very close to him. Yet the relations between them were amiable and courteous,

and such as enabled him to be useful to the full extent of his ability. There was nothing in him repulsive; but, then, the world never warmly courted his approaches. They felt rather pleased with his presence than pained by his absence. They never said we *must* see him; they only felt pleasant when they did see him. He was a man whose absence was simply regretted, not lamented. You never felt that you could not do without him, but only that you could do better with him. Such were the feelings with which the world felt bound to this its now fallen friend.

The whole appearance of Bro. Robbins was that of an ordinary man. On acquaintance, he struck you as excelling in energy, never in anything else. There was not an intellectual feature in his face. Indeed, his expression and appearance would generally have ranked him as standing none above the very common level. Yet he was not deficient in excellent sense, and his abilities were respectable; but when this is said, I believe the most has been said that can be. His face was unfortunate, and did him injustice. It was pinched and dull. It was the face of a third-rate Presbyterian preacher. It never glowed with genial humor, nor sparkled with brightness of thought. When in a state of repose, it looked as if he had never smiled in his life; and never did a broad laugh and a human face seem more ill matched than in his case. But let no one infer from this that his nature was sour. I never saw a trace of it in him, nor heard the semblance of it imputed to him. To me there was always something painful in Bro. Robbins's face. It was the face of a man who had died of melancholy, or whose whole existence had been passed under a cloud. Not that it indicated the presence of anything bad; it only seemed to express the lack of everything cheerful and happy. Nor should I think this wholly untrue of him. To me he seemed to be a man to whom life was a simple duty, and the world a perpetual burden. To live, I should say, gave him but little pleasure; to die, but little pain.

Of Bro. Robbins's real intellectual ability I am not able to speak with confidence; for my acquaintance with him was limited. His mind struck me as good, not great. I should say his endowments were ordinary, nothing more. Nor would education ever have improved him much. His mind was not of the type to be improved by hard study and deep consecutive thought. It seemed practical, well-balanced, and business-like, but not fitted for abstraction and invention. It exhibited no traces of originality; and his imagination lacked vividness and range. True, he thought, and thought much; but it was not the thought which either implies or brings greatness. It was the thought which dwarfs rather than makes great. The building of a meeting-house would cost him as much thought as the reading of Hamilton's *Metaphysics* would cost other men. The de-

tails of a protracted meeting, and the management of a congregation gave him intense solicitude, and absorbed his whole mind. And although such matters are eminently useful in themselves, they add nothing of greatness to him who is wholly engaged in them. His mind did not seem to lack sharpness and minuteness. With these, I should take it, he was rather liberally endowed. It lacked comprehension and depth. He had the shrewdness necessary to collect facts; but combining them, and drawing from them broad, general conclusions, was not his business. He would be regarded as a sharp preacher; but no competent judge would ever feel him to be great. In detailing facts and events, he would be interesting; but a generalization with him was a thing out of the question. Of grouping he knew nothing; and in matters of logic he felt lost. He stated things; seldom argued them. His nature was to be precise and painstaking. Of metaphysics he knew simply nothing; and although he used the language of logic, he was no logician. He was an excellent teacher of the common people, but with no qualities to be a leader. He worked generally not on a large scale, but very faithfully on a small one. Few men were better fitted for what he did than he, and few men did better than he what he undertook to do.

In matters of prudence, I take it, Bro. Robbins stood justly very high. Indeed I should not hesitate to pronounce his sound discretion the finest trait in his character. If he never did anything to dazzle the world, he did nothing of which it could feel ashamed. His speech may not have been great, but it was never foolish. In conversation he was cautious and moderate. Extravagance was neither an element in his nature nor a flaw in his life. He seemed never to do anything from impulse. All seemed studied. I never knew a man who seemed to be so constantly looking ahead; and who did every thing with an eye so singly to the future. I presume he did as few things to repent of, and said as few things to regret, as any man ever did of his age. The views of others he treated with becoming respect; and toward the feelings of all was tenderly regardful. Yet he was not a man to be easily swayed by what others thought. He by no means lacked independence; and although resolute to do what he thought right, he was free from the charge of arrogance. As a prudent man, I greatly admired our lamented brother.

As a Christian man, I can speak of Bro. Robbins in terms of highest praise. In heart and life he was pure, and devoted to the Savior with all his soul, and mind, and strength. Here at least he must be admitted to have been great. Not a fibre of his frail nature was reserved to himself; all was consecrated to Christ. A Christian from principle, not from passion, he was uniform and steady in the discharge of his duties. Indeed that can be said of him which can be said of few men, he actually worked too hard and too constantly for

his Master. With more physical ability this might have been allowable in his case, but in fact it was not. Nor was his activity sullied by any unworthy motive. No love of fame kept that slender form perpetually moving. It was simply and alone his love of Christ, and his ardent desire to see the truth spread. I think I never saw a man more intensely anxious for the conversion of sinners than he. There was no amount of labor which he thought too much, if thereby he could gain a soul. In all this how just his view! High over everything else rose his love of truth; and as was his love of truth, so was his wish to see it prevail. If in anything he ever became grand, it was here. To become a Christian had cost him much. It required the labor of a whole year to set him free from his old hereditary faith. He was reared a Presbyterian, which is to say he was reared a Pharisee. Nor even to the day of his death had Christianity wholly erased from his nature and manners the deep scars of that cold mean type of the apostasy. He could not deliver even an exhortation, without betraying his religious pedigree. He never stood up in the pulpit that he did not unconsciously exhibit more or less of the cant and formalism of the Presbyterian clergyman. The tenets and manners of the body had molded for him that hanging, half-unnatural face, had given him his peculiar intonations of voice, and had even determined the gestures of his body. I never saw a man in our ranks upon whom the faith of his fathers had so completely written its image and superscription. Yet let no one dream that his mind or his heart retained aught of the odor or tenets of the party. No smell of Presbyterianism lay on his soul. He was clean from all stain thereof. He never seemed to know how to feel sufficiently grateful for having escaped the bondage of the party. Indeed this very fact intensified his love of truth, and imparted to him his deep ardor in trying to reclaim sinners. Not only did he wish to save them for Christ; but especially did he wish to save them from sectarianism. Here his desire rose to a passion which never cooled. He appeared to think when a man was saved from sectarianism, that he was saved from a double ruin. And in this few intelligent Christians will think him wrong. The great aim of his life was the propagation of the Gospel. To this he was prompted by the two noblest motives that can influence human conduct—the love of truth and the love of man. Hence to preach the one and work for the other was the chief delight of his heart.

As a Christian gentleman, no man stood higher than Bro. Robbins; as a preacher he stood simply high. He was not regarded as a first-class preacher, but as an excellent one. His talents were simply fair, but his energy and prudence were faultless. These gained for him a fine position, which he sustained well. Few men accomplished more in the run of a year than he. True he did not work so magnificently as some, but none worked more persistently than he. This enabled, him

to foot up at the end of each year an amount of labor creditable to any preacher. Had his ability as a revivalist equaled his indomitable energy, not even John T. Johnson would have excelled him in the field. I can hardly regret his deficiency here. A man's ability to create should never exceed his power to preserve; nor should a preacher ever be able to bring into the kingdom more disciples than he can take care of. Here Bro. Robbins was a little at fault. His power to take care of disciples much exceeded his ability to produce them. Hence he was better in the church than in the open field. As an evangelist, he could never have been more than medium; in a church he could hardly be excelled. In only one thing did I think him deficient in the church. He was timid and shy in opposing the wrong-doer. He rather hinted at sin, and spoke against it in general terms than named it out and rebuked it specifically. This in him was a constitutional infirmity. He never *meant* to tolerate sin even for a moment; still in many cases he spoke against it too distantly and too mildly to uproot it. Demons are perfectly willing to be chided and even railed at, if only you will not expel them. So with sin. It matters little how much you scold it and frown on it, if only you will let it stay. But this will not do. You must have but one issue with the evil-doer in the church—reform him or expel him. This issue must be made sharply, boldly, and decisively. Otherwise you do not oust sin; you rather fix it in the church. The wind which does not uproot the forest tree, but plants it the more firmly in the soil. And the chiding which does not cast sin out, merely converts the church into its permanent home. Bro. Robbins was in no sense wanting in the courage to attack sin, he only lacked the courage to attack it in the right way. He was ready for the conflict, but he waged it too mildly. Under his rebukes sin never raved; it rather tucked its head and chuckled. It never felt that it must leave or die. All it felt was that it must behave itself modestly, and not wear too bold a front. When he got rid of sin he coaxed it out, never drove it.

The scholarship of Bro. Robbins was ordinary. This, however, arose from no fault of his. He highly prized an education; but it had been his misfortune not to receive one at the proper time of life, and he hence had to work without it. Even had he possessed one, it is doubtful whether it would have added much to his usefulness. He was a man for the active out-door business of life. For this his education was ample. His active, restless nature ill fitted him for the plodding work of the study. Still he possessed some of the traits of an excellent student. He was ambitious to stand high in his calling; he wished always to do his work well; and in purpose he was tenacious and unyielding. He lacked none of the ability necessary to success in the department of education. These traits would certainly have given him a fine standing had they been directed aright. But I

think he was clearly destined, not for the mazes of books, but for the very work in which his short life was spent. It is not every man whom much learning improves. It makes fools of many, and really benefits but few. When a man learns the sphere for which he was designed, let him simply educate himself to fill that well. All beyond this will prove simply useless. But Bro. Robbins, though ordinary in scholarship, was still a respectable student. He gave a fair share of his time to reading and thought. But the studying he did was not of the kind to expand and greatly enrich the mind. He studied almost with exclusive reference to the immediate work before him, which consisted in the delivery of so many discourses every month. For this he aimed to be well prepared; and to this all his reading and thought looked. He never felt it to be his duty to make himself profoundly acquainted with the difficult questions of the Bible; and on the great events of the day, their tendency and philosophy, he seldom bestowed a thought. He emphatically worked for to-day, and left to-morrow to provide for itself. This, in his case, I think wise and prudent.

In his devotion to the churches to which he preached, and in his management of them, I doubt whether he had a superior in the State. His untiring industry, kind heart, and admirable discretion eminently fitted him to direct the domestic affairs of a congregation. This was particularly his field; and in it he was hard to excel. While laboring for a church, it literally absorbed his whole time and mind. He thought of nothing else, talked of nothing, prayed for nothing else, worked for nothing else, but that single church. Its success was the profoundest sentiment of his nature. It was then almost painful to witness his solicitude. When toiling for his churches he rose to the full height of a splendid man. Nowhere else, nor in anything else, did he stand so high. Here he is entitled to our highest praise. Well may the young preacher afford to study his life in this respect, and imitate his example. He was a model preacher in the management of a church.

He was said to be without an equal in the settlement of feuds and difficulties among brethren. On this point the testimony of his brethren is one. A more necessary practical trait it is hard to name in a preacher. For this good but ill-requited work we confidently believe he is at this moment receiving at the hands of his Master the blessing which belongs to the peace-maker. Whatever may be the imperfections of a preacher in other respects, here he must not be deficient. To compose the dissensions which Satan will stir up among the children of God is one chief work of the good shepherd. In this Bro. Robbins was a master. Peace among the Lord's people is a lovely thing. To effect and preserve this our brother was peculiarly endowed. Hence, while others might excel him in the brilliancy of their discourses, none

surpassed him in leading a flock by the still waters. It was in labors like this that his true peace-loving heart found its highest pleasure.

But of all the traits of his life, the one which I most admired was his soundness in the faith. Here neither his mind nor his heart disclosed a flaw. He was sound doctrinally, practically—sound in every sense, in every way. With him the gospel neither required nor admitted of improvement. It and it only was the power of God for salvation, and with salvation he was content to stop. For the gospel he pleaded no apologies; neither did he attempt, by anything he ever did or said, to render it agreeable to the world. He preached it boldly, fearlessly, and told all candidly the result of rejecting it. This done, if it was rejected, he had nothing to say. He allowed of no innovations on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship. Not for a moment would he consent to see the gospel carnalized by any connection with worldly expedients to render it popular. If it was unpopular with any, he believed that to spring either from ignorance or corruption, and he had no compromises to offer. He stood for the simple truth, and that alone. Would that so much could be said for all in this licentious age. Never did we, as a people, seem to need his earnest, honest labors more than at the very moment when he was taken. But though we could have wished it otherwise, we are comforted by the reflection that it is some how for the best. And though we grieve, we shall be resigned.

In all the relations and transactions of life Bro. Robbins was honorable and just. He has left us a name without a stain on it. His bearing was always courteous and agreeable. His nature was not ardent; neither was it cold. His heart glowed ever with a steady warmth, which rendered him a sociable companion and a charming colaborer. Never was human heart endowed with a more genuine kindness than was his. He was generous in his impulses, and confiding in his nature. He trusted the world largely, and deserved himself to be trusted largely. He was confiding and full of hope. He never labored without expecting his reward. In all he did, he leaned on the Savior with unwavering confidence. He was a man of profound faith, pure heart, and deep piety. His religion was quiet, not noisy; but it never drooped nor grew mirky. Such was A. W. Robbins.

Of his death I shall not speak at length. It was, as might be expected in his case, full of hope and trust. He passed calmly away, seemingly with little pain and without a murmur. When told that he must die he was not in the least alarmed, but prepared for the struggle with as much composure as if he had merely been going to sleep. In a few hours afterward he sank, and now sleeps his last sleep. He leaves a frail and dutiful wife, ill fitted to battle with life's rough storm, and three penniless little children, to whom he was de-

voted with idolatrous tenderness. A delicate duty is here devolved on the brotherhood for whom he spent his life. May God incline them to discharge it nobly.

OUR CHURCHES.—Important as is the work of forming churches, and no one denies that it is important, still in no view can the work of preserving¹ them be deemed less so. Both works are laborious; but the former is lost without the latter. It is idle to create the material and form churches, unless they are subsequently taken care of. At present this work seems specially called for. Our churches in this country have passed through a period of great and dangerous excitement. From this excitement they have not yet wholly recovered, though obviously it is dying out. A few wretched men must keep it up, and that on political grounds. False standards of loyalty are still erected by these men, and every one who conforms not in thought and speech to these standards, must be proscribed as beyond the pale of hope. Their day has about ended. They can talk now, but their power to injure is at its end. We can well afford to let them growl, since they are now toothless. Happy will be the day for the cause of Christ when they go to themselves, and leave the true children of God to worship in peace.

Our churches are now like a man in whom a high fever suddenly cools. They are greatly relaxed, and many of them seem almost pulseless. They need constant watching and constant stimulants. They need excitement; but it is the healthful excitement which springs from returning life, and renewed efforts in the cause of Christ. Let all our preachers now see to it that our churches are put in fine working order. I wish to see them leap from the torpor of the last four years, renewed for their grand work, as will be the children of God when they spring into life in their spiritual bodies. Never did so broad a field of usefulness lie open before us as a people as now. I want us to enter it and reap it from side to side. No partial work can be accepted now. Thorough work must be our motto henceforward; and this thorough work must begin in our churches. Let these be first set in order. The rest will follow.

THE ROMAN CENSUS.

LUKE ii., 1-5.

BY GUMPACH.

I.—ACCORDING to the prophecy of Micah, as already interpreted by the Jewish scribes toward the commencement of our era, the then expected Messiah was to be born in the Davidian city of Bethlehem, it was in this very city that our Lord, in his human form, first saw the light of the world. As his reputed father, Joseph, however, was a citizen and an inhabitant of Nazareth, the Evangelist Luke, partly for the purpose of explaining the remarkable fact of the birth of Jesus in the former place, partly with the view of correcting the popular opinion that he was really a Nazarene, acquaints his readers with the particular circumstances which had *compelled* Joseph to undertake, with his wife Mary, on the eve of her confinement, the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem. But the explanatory statement of the Evangelist has, more especially in late times, been much questioned and impugned, without our orthodox theologians having been able to satisfactorily meet the objections raised against it by scepticism and infidelity.

These objections have been urged by no one with greater force than by Dr. Strauss, in his well-known work on "the Life of Christ;" a monument of subtlety and imaginative suspicion, rather than of learning and research, and a striking illustration of the power of prejudice to misguide even a strong intellect. Interpreting our passage in conformity with the translation of Luther, he contends:

Firstly.—It is highly improbable of itself that the Emperor Augustus should ever have ordered a general census of the Roman Empire to be taken, inasmuch as no cotemporary writer alludes to such a measure, and the taxing only of single provinces at different times is spoken of:

Secondly.—Since the birth of Jesus took place in the reign of Herod the Great, when Palestine had not as yet been reduced *informant provinciae*, the right of taxation did not belong to the Romans, but to the Jewish king, as it did to all *regibus sociis* generally.

Thirdly.—It is in opposition to the Roman custom, according to which each inhabitant was taxed in the district-town of his *residence*, that Joseph, for the purposes of the census, should have had to go to the place of his *origin*.

Fourthly.—No reason can be assigned why Mary, in her condition, instead of remaining at home, should have incurred the fatigue and inconvenience of a tedious journey, in order to accompany her husband.

Fifthly.—Although Quirinius, who entered not upon his government of Syria till after the death of Herod, did hold a census in Palestine: this census was taken subsequently even to the exile of Archelaus, and therefore *about ten years posterior to the time at which Luke and Matthew place the birth of Christ*.

A single glance at these objections shows that they derive their sole strength from the last named circumstance. For, independently of it, the bare possibility that Luke, "who, though nine times he have hit the truth, *may* have erred the tenth time," as Dr. Strauss expresses himself, ought not for one moment to weigh against the highest improbability—leaving the inspired character of the gospel narrative altogether out of consideration—that he, who upon every other occasion betrays so intimate a knowledge of the history of his time, should in this instance have been led into an exceptional error. But even the very point which seemingly does present a difficulty must at the same time suggest to every well-constituted mind a strong doubt as to the real existence of such a difficulty, when it is considered that the same evangelist, who is said to have committed so gross an anachronism, attaches a particular value to chronological dates; refers, in a later work, simply to *the* assessment, as a measure known to all the cotemporary world; and adduces minor circumstances in connection with it, the accuracy of which is attested by Josephus. And in this doubt we are still more confirmed, when we bear in mind that Luke composed his gospel for a man and a public who must have had a *personal* recollection of the historical events to which he alludes; and that consequently, if he had actually fallen into the mistake which is imputed to him, he must at once have destroyed his own credibility, as well as that of his gospel narrative.

We are thus, already by a first unprejudiced view of the question, led to the irresistible conclusion that the error, laid to the charge of Luke, is far more likely to rest with his commentators than with himself. Before proceeding, therefore, with our historical inquiry, it may be as well to cast a glance at the sacred text which, if we carry our minds back to the times at and the circumstances under which the evangelist wrote, we shall without any alteration in the reading, and the common punctuation, have to translate as follows:

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις
 ἐπέβη δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστο-
 τον ἀπογράψασθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμέ-
 νην—αὐτῆ, ἡ ἀπογραφή πρώτη, ἐγένετο
 ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηρίου,
 καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι,
 ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν. Ἀνέβη
 δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐν
 πόλει Ναζαρεθ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς
 πόλιν Δαβὶδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεὲμ—
 διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐκ οἴκου καὶ πατρῶος
 Δαβὶδ—ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαρίας
 τῇ ἐμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ γυναῖκα, οὕση
 ἐγγύφ.

Now in those days it came to pass, that there went out a decree from the Emperor Augustus, that all the world should be assessed *with a view to taxation*—this, *in Palestine* the first Roman assessment, was carried into effect, when Quirinius was governor of Syria—and all went to be assessed, every one to his own city. Thus, Joseph also went from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem—because he was of the house and lineage of David,—to be assessed with Mary, his espoused wife she being Dear her confinement.

Few words need to be said in support of this translation, so far as it bears upon our question. "In the historical books of the New Testament," Dr. Winer remarks very truly, "the sacred writers are given to introduce explanatory or supplementary remarks by way of parenthesis;" and that v. 2 of our text is distinguished by all the characteristics of the true parenthesis has already been recognized by our authorized translators, and, among modern commentators, by Mr. Huschke and others. Nor is it denied that the active form of ἀπογράφεσθαι — *censeri*, may mean both *to assess*, *i. e.*, to make out a list of the population and its property, and *to tax*, *i. e.*, to levy a tax on the ground of such a list. But what author, be he Greek or Roman, had ever used the verb in the latter sense? It invariably, where it occurs, signifies the mere *assessing*, though usually, it is true, with a view to taxation. And thus in our passage. For, on this point, the subsequent phrase αὐτῇ ἡ ἀπογραφῇ ἐγένετο, *census actus est*, expressive of the ἀπογράφεσθαι having been carried into effect as a taxation, can leave no doubt.

Prof. Bleek certainly was of opinion that, "if such a contrast were here meant, we might in v. 2 expect a very different and more positive term to have been used by the evangelist, such as ἀποτίμησις (instead of ἀπογραφῇ);" But this objection rests on a twofold misapprehension. In the first place, ἀποτίμησις, as Prof. Bleek himself implies, could only signify the levying of the tax; and what Luke desires to point out so particularly is, on the contrary, that the measure of which he speaks, and which, only considerably later, ἐγένετο, *was carried into effect*, was *no ἀποτίμησις*, but only an ἀπογραφῇ, a preliminary assessment. And, in the second place, the contrast in question between the terms ἀπογράφεσθαι and ἡ ἀπογραφῇ ἐγένετο, employed by Luke, is the same as between *censere* and *censum agere*, to *assess* with a view to taxation, and to *levy a tax* on the basis of such an assessment, and could not well have been pointed out more forcibly by the evangelist than he has done. For, as I have already remarked, the *verb* admits of no other meaning but that of the mere preliminary assessing; while we can not possibly, in accordance with the spirit of our passage, translate the technical formula ἡ ἀπογραφῇ ἐγένετο, "the assessment *was made*," as De Wette does. If such were its meaning, the parenthesis would assume an exclusively chronological character; but for a parenthetical remark of this nature there existed no more occasion than we should be able to assign to it an object. Yet, it evidently has an object; and this can only be an explanatory one. What Luke manifestly intends by it, is to prevent a misconception as to the true epoch of our Lord's birth; and with this view he reminds his readers, that the assessment for the first Roman taxation of the Jewish people was made a considerable time previously to its being carried into execution.

Thus the whole parenthesis, as to its occasion, its object, and its meaning, is perfectly clear, and the numerous conjectures and emendations proposed in regard to it prove, not only unnecessary, but erroneous as well. I need not say that ἀπογραφῆ has reference both to ἡ .. πρώτη and, αὕτη and is, consequently, to be supplied before the pronoun, as in our own language, "this, the first, assessment"—the first, as a matter of course, not in a wider sense, but with reference to *Palestine*; not as a taxation generally, but as a *Roman*, capitation and property tax. At that time every reader must have felt this without a further explanation; and in order to seize the true and natural import of our text, we have but to recall to our memory the historical circumstances under which the narrative was composed.

I may now revert to the objections of Dr. Strauss, which, in consequence of the preceding remarks, have already lost most of their weight. They may be put into the form of the following questions:

Can it, independently of Luke, be ascertained from history, whether Augustus about the epoch of the birth of Christ, issued a decree for a general census of the Roman Empire?

Can an actual census of Palestine at that period be proved?

Can, in such a case, reasons be assigned why Joseph should have had to go to Bethlehem, and why Mary should have been obliged to accompany her husband?

Can it be shown that the supposed measure, originated with a view to taxation, was really carried into effect in Palestine during the Syrian proconsulship of Quirinius?

In regard to the first of these questions, several commentators have contended that the expression *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*, is to be understood, not of the *orbis Romanus*, but of Palestine only. Certainly, the term is used in this restricted sense, not only by the LXX., but now and then also by Josephus, and even by some Greek classical authors; and, with reference to Egypt, in the hieroglyphic inscriptions commonly so. If Dr. Strauss, Prof. Lange, and others, therefore, object to such an interpretation, that the decree emanating from the Roman emperor must necessarily be understood of the *orbis Romanus*, the whole Roman Empire, this argument is by no means a valid one. Luke does not quote the decree literally; why, then, should he not, *as a Jewish historian*, have been able, while speaking of a measure of the Roman Emperor, to use the expression *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*, in the Jewish sense, for Palestine? Still, it is more probable that, because Luke's gospel was written for the use of the Roman and the whole Gentile world, he employed our term, as Dr. Strauss asserts, in its Roman-heathen sense. But if such a decree was really issued for Palestine—and the positive proof of this will be presently adduced—it is hardly credible that it should have been restricted to that small dependency, and not rather have extended

the whole empire. Under any circumstances, we possess in the census of Palestine one special testimony in support of the evangelist's statement, which raises its truth above every further doubt.

Nor are we without other proofs. From the institute of imperialism sprang, as a necessary consequence, an unitarian principle of government, and De Savigny justly remarks: "From the very commencement of the imperial rule, it appears to have been intended to introduce one uniform system of taxation into all the provinces..... as indicated by the extensive assessments made under Augustus." The chief object of the Roman emperor, no doubt, was to consolidate the State; and, on the one hand, restraining the extraordinary powers of the proconsuls, and exercising a control over their financial administration, to really insure the levied taxes finding their way into the (exhausted) treasury; and, on the other hand, to protect the provinces against the pecuniary extortions and the arbitrary oppression of the proconsuls, and thus to attach the former more firmly to the empire. For this purpose, too, Augustus made the subjects of dependent kings take the oath of allegiance, both to *himself* and to their native princes. But to enable the Roman emperors to properly conduct from their capital, as a centre, the uniform administration of their colossal empire, it was indispensably necessary for them to be in the possession of accurate statistical returns for every province and every dependency.

Hence the geographical survey of the whole empire, commenced by Caesar and finished by Augustus; and hence, also, the still more important census which the latter had taken, and must have had taken, to furnish him the materials for his celebrated *breviarium totius imperii*, which, written out with his own hand, he left at his death, as a legacy and a monument of his rule, to the State, and which contained a politico-financial and statistical view of the entire Roman empire. Tacitus informs us of the contents of the *libellus*, in which, he relates, "opes publicae continebantur; quantum civium *sociorumque* in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia et necessitates ac largitiones, quae cuncta sua manu perscripserat Augustus." And already of Servius Tullius it is recorded: "Ab hoc populus Romanus relatus in cenum, digestus in classes, curiis atque collegiis distributus: summaque regis solertia ita est ordinata respublica, ut omnia patrimonii, dignitatis, aetatis, artium, officiorumque discrimina in tabulas referrentur, *ac si maxima civitas minimae domus diligentia contineretur.*" And, no doubt, the breviary of Augustus was founded upon tables of a similar character.

Three facts thus combine to warrant me in answering our first question in the affirmative; namely, that Augustus pursued the policy of a systematic administration of the whole empire upon uniform principles, and occupied himself much, and personally, with its

details of administration; that he had collected minute statistical information concerning every portion of his vast dominions, which he possibly could have obtained only by means of a census of the whole empire; and that, as I shall presently show, such a census was actually taken in Palestine at the time of our Lord's birth. In no well-regulated mind these united facts can leave a doubt as to the accuracy of Luke's statement. Indeed, the attempt of a modern theologian, living nearly *two* thousand years after the events under consideration, to bring his naked suspicion to bear against the positive testimony of the sacred writer, who—altogether waiving, as I here do, the inspired character of the gospels—drew his information from cotemporary sources, if not from personal knowledge, can only be regarded as a striking illustration of human arrogance and presumption; and it is exclusively the ill-directed zeal of Borne of our orthodox divines, which has lent to the objections of Dr. Strauss, and others, an importance to which they are not entitled of themselves.

As regards our second question, it is universally admitted that, independently of Luke, there is no proof of a census having actually been taken in Palestine at the time of the birth of Christ; and most excellent reasons have even been assigned why no importance ought to be attached, as is done by Dr. Strauss, to the silence of Josephus upon such a point. Yet, it is Josephus himself who confirms Luke's statement in the most positive manner—a new, and not uninteresting, fact, which I will now place before the reader. Josephus writes thus, according to the translation of Whiston: "Moreover, Cyrenius [Quirinius] came himself into Judaea, which was now [after the banishment of Archelaus, the son and successor of Herod the Great], added to the province of Syria, to take an account of [to levy a tax on, ἀποτιμησόμενος] their substance, and to dispose of Archelaus's money. For the Jews, although *at the beginning* they took the report of a taxation heinously, yet had they left off any further opposition to it *by the persuasion of the high-priest Joazar, the son of Boethus*. So they, being over-persuaded by *Joazar's* words, gave an account of their estates, without any dispute about it. Yet, there was one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gainala, who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who said that this census was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted them to assert their liberty."

The Jews, then, as might have been expected, were at first opposed to the census as a preliminary to taxation; and, no doubt, it was this census, which really gave rise to the seditious attempt of Judas, the son of Saripheus, and Matthias, supported by the high-priest of the same name, and which is fully described by Josephus.

The attempt failed, and was, of course, punished. Judas would seem to have escaped; but Matthias, with some of his lower confederates, was burned alive during a night in which there occurred an eclipse of the moon. This eclipse happened on the 13th of March, B. C. 4. Now, as Herod the Great on the same occasion deprived Matthias of the high-priesthood, and conferred that dignity upon Joazar, the son of Boethus, this can have occurred at the most two or three days previously to the epoch named. But, as we have seen, *it was the same Joazar who persuaded the Jews to submit to the census*. Immediately after the death of Herod, probably about the middle of April, B. C. 4, he was again superseded by his brother Eleazar; as the latter was, soon afterward, by Jesus, the son of Sie.

Upon this, Josephus, certainly, relates that Quirinius, after having carried out the proposed taxation ten years subsequently to the census, deprived "Joazar" of the high-priesthood, and conferred it on Ananus, the son of Seth. But "Joazar" is one of those palpable errors of transcription which are of so frequent occurrence in the present text of the Jewish historian; and it is manifest that "Jesus" should here be read instead of "Joazar." The conclusive proof is easily established. In the first place, Josephus, who is always most particular in enumerating the Jewish high-priests in their due chronological succession, does not mention with one single word that Jesus, the son of Sie, has been deprived of his dignity, or succeeded in it; nor that Joazar had a second time been invested with the high-priesthood—a thing which is of itself out of the question. In the next place, he states the ground on which he was dismissed by Quirinius, to be, that he had formed an opposition party among the people—*καταστασιαστέντα ἀπὸ τῆς πλῆθους*, erroneously translated by Whiston: "which dignity had been conferred on him by the multitude;" and as erroneously by Dindorf: "cui cum plebe contentio fuerat;" while Joazar had persuaded the people to submit to the census. *He*, therefore, was a partisan of Rome, and would assuredly not have been displaced by Quirinius; whereas, the simple fact that Archelaus had raised Jesus, the son of Sie, to the high-priesthood, in the place of Eleazar, whom he probably did not find subservient enough to his will, shows that Jesus, the son of Sie, supported the Jewish, or anti-Roman party, and was, by Quirinius, only suffered to retain his position until the taxation should have been carried into effect.

Moreover, it is evident, from the narrative of Josephus, that Judas, the son of Saripheus, whom he mentions in the seventeenth book of his history, chap. vi., 2, as conspiring against Herod the Great, and Judas the Gaulonite, of whom he speaks in the eighteenth book, chap. i., 1, as inciting the people against the census, are one and the same

person. For, in the latter passage, he immediately connects the revolt of Judas with the high-priesthood of Joazar, whom we know to have been elevated to that dignity by Herod the Great shortly before his death, and immediately after it to have been superseded by Archelaus. And in the former passage we find Judas, the *leader* of the sedition, suddenly and silently disappear from the stage; while his companion, Matthias, alone is burned alive. The natural inference from this is, that, either Judas was one of those whom Herod "dealt leniently with," or else, that he succeeded in effecting his escape, and collected some followers in the country. True, on a subsequent occasion, Josephus expressly says, that the revolt of Judas occurred "when Cyrenius came to take an account of the substance of the Jews;" but his whole narrative of these events is so vague, disconnected, and unsatisfactory, and he so evidently mixes up together the occurrences connected with the census, and those connected with the taxation, that we can attach no importance to the statement in question, opposed as it is both to his own chronological data, and to the general historical thread of his narrative. Luke, also, places the revolt of Judas of Galilee, identical with the Judas of Josephus, who twice calls him a Galilean, in the time of the census. Under any circumstances, the error of transcription, to which I have previously called attention, can not admit of so much as the shadow of a doubt.

The Jewish historian, therefore, whose supposed silence constituted the sole strength of the objections raised by Dr. Strauss, and others, against Luke's statement that, at the time of our Lord's birth, a Roman census was taken in Palestine, *confirms that statement in the most positive manner.*

With reference to our third question, it was a somewhat anomalous proceeding on the part of Dr. Strauss, while denying the possibility of the Roman taxation in Palestine during the lifetime of Herod, to prove its improbability from its Jewish forms. These forms, however, are readily explained by the relation in which Herod stood to Augustus. Herod was the king of Palestine, but the subject of Rome. The decree for the census proceeded from the emperor; it was carried out by the king. The measure itself, and its internal forms, were Roman; the mode in which it was externally enforced was Jewish. And if, according to historical testimony, a Roman tax was never levied in a dependent state until it had been reduced *in formam provincial*, this rule, so far from being in contradiction with Luke's statement, as has been maintained, furnishes another striking proof in its favor; inasmuch as the evangelist expressly points out that the assessment, made at the time of the birth of Christ, when Palestine was still governed by a native prince, was not carried into effect until Judaea, ten years afterward, had actually been converted into a Roman province.

Now, in accordance with the Jewish custom, as insisted on by Dr. Strauss himself—and in this case the more so as the census, restricted to Judaea, did not extend to Galilee—every one had to be enregistered "in his own city." This constituted one of the external features of the census. One of the internal provisions demanded, at variance with the Jewish custom, the registration also of *women and children*. The latter had not to appear personally, as Dr. Tholuck maintains. At Rome, at least, the censor asked: "*Habesne uxorem ex animi tui sententia?*" Still, as would appear from Lactantius, the same regard was, in the provinces, not always paid to the other sex; and what may have been the will and pleasure of Herod in this respect, we know not. But this, at all events, we do know, that Luke himself assigns the reason, why Mary had to accompany her husband from Nazareth to Bethlehem, namely, *οὐση ἐγκύω*, because she was near her confinement.

It is somewhat surprising that this circumstance should have escaped general notice, while it has been in vain attempted to account for the journey of Mary. Prof. Hug candidly acknowledges his inability to do so; Prof. Lange assumes that Mary had to go as the representative of her parental house; Mr. Huschke submits her to a capitation tax; Dr. Olshausen and Prof. Kuinoel suppose her to have been a wealthy heiress; Dr. Schleiermacher suggests that she may have proceeded to Bethlehem in consequence of a *priestly* registration order, which Luke subsequently confounded with the better-known Roman census; but Dr. Strauss knows "the naked truth to be, that the prophecy of Micah, chap, v., 1, alone induced the evangelist to set the parents of Jesus, resident at Nazareth, into motion toward Bethlehem; and no motive offering, far and wide, save the famous census, time, of course, had to conform itself to his pleasure." Such assertions are best left to judge themselves.

Prof. Ebrard is, to my knowledge, the only commentator who has taken the words *οὐση ἐγκύω* in an explanatory sense; but he erroneously interprets them to the effect, that Joseph, "in those troubled times, when sedition and revolt were rife, must naturally have hesitated to leave his wife, near her confinement as she was, to the care of strangers, and have wished her to accompany him; the more so as they could not anticipate that they would find no accommodation in Bethlehem." On the contrary, Luke plainly intimates the condition of Mary, in connection with the census, to have been the cause which necessitated her journey. We must remember that Joseph was the subject of an eastern prince, and that this prince was Herod the Great. On the one hand, anxious to please the emperor Augustus, and, on the other, expecting resistance on the part of the Jews, he, no doubt, had issued orders that the forms of the census were to be strictly complied with, under the severest penalties, and, of course, on

a given day. Now, as those forms demanded a return of the *children* of both sexes—more especially, in all probability, of firstborn sons—as well as of women, and as Joseph could not possibly foresee the issue of his wife's confinement, there was no choice left for Mary but to accompany her husband.

Our fourth and last question, I need not say, is answered by Josephus. "That a census was taken in Judaea by Quirinius," Dr. Strauss admits, "is *certain*." But, owing to the erroneous construction put upon the passage, Luke ii., 1-5, and the assumption that the evangelist either speaks of two different taxations, or can speak only of the last one under Quirinius, an extraordinary variety of conjectures have been formed for the purpose of solving the imagined difficulty.

We have seen that all these conjectures and proposed emendations of the text are uncalled for; and that the much impugned historical credibility of Luke proves triumphant in reference to the Roman census at the birth of our Lord, as it does on every other occasion, so soon as, instead of expecting that the times of the evangelist will ascend to us, we take the trouble to descend to his times, and skeptical theologians can bring themselves to make history the test of their prejudices, instead of applying their prejudices as a test to history.

II.—What adds still to the interest of the preceding results is, that they enable us to determine the epoch of our Lord's birth, respecting which there continues to exist so great a difference of opinion, almost to the very day. It is not my intention to enter here into a chronological discussion of this all-important event; but simply to indicate the leading data, which prove, beyond any reasonable doubt, that it occurred about the 18th March, old style, B. C. 4; probably not three days earlier, and certainly not three days later.

There is sufficient reason to assume that Joseph and Mary arrived at Bethlehem not many days before the time appointed for the census, which compelled them to undertake the journey thither; and that the execution of Matthias and his companions, who had attempted to resist the measure, in the night of the 13th March, B. C. 4, took place either on the very day of the assessment, or else a day or two previously. Hence we may regard that date as the earliest epoch, within two or three days, at which the birth of Christ can have occurred; while its latest epoch is marked by the death of Herod the Great, who died, as I have elsewhere shown, during the first week in April; in all probability on the 2d April, B. C. 4. Our Lord, therefore, must have been born between the 10th March and the 6th April, B. C. 4. By various combinations, I have found the 18th March to be the most probable date; and although I can not, on the present occasion, establish this date more fully, I may be permitted to point out how

perfectly it is in accordance with the entire chronology of our Savior's life.

Assuming, then, the birth of Jesus to have taken place on the 18th March, we may infer that the Chaldaean astrologers, or "wise men of the east," as they are more familiarly named, arrived in Bethlehem on the feast of the circumcision, consequently, on the 25th March. The flight into Egypt must have followed immediately afterward, hardly later than on the 27th March; the massacre of the first-born, considering the vicinity of Bethlehem to Jerusalem, and the state of extreme irritability under which the prostrate Jewish king was laboring, probably on the 28th or 29th March; *i. e.*, simultaneously with the execution of his son, Antipater—four days anterior to Herod's own dissolution—and which is confirmed by the circumstance that the news of both these deeds of blood reached the ears of the Roman emperor, Augustus, at the same time.

To which part of Egypt Joseph retired, the evangelist does not say. Probably, he only just passed the frontier, then "the brook of Egypt," at a distance of less than a hundred miles from Jerusalem. The journey, therefore, may have occupied a week, scarcely more. This would bring us to the 3d of April. By the middle of the same month, at the very latest, Joseph must have received the news of Herod's death. And, as there existed no longer any reason for a protraction of his stay in a foreign country, while he had the strongest inducement to hasten his return home, we may conclude that, after a fortnight's residence in Egypt, he set out again for Jerusalem, and arrived at the borders of Judaea by the 22d April, *i. e.*, four or five days before the expiration of the legal term of Mary's purification, which would end on the 27th April. Yet, on learning that Archelaus had succeeded to the throne, Joseph hesitated *ἐκεῖ ἀποθῆεν*, from thence (the borders of Palestine) to continue his journey, not to Bethlehem, but to Nazareth; not by way of Peraea, where he had nothing to apprehend, but by way of Jerusalem, where the child Jesus had to be "presented to the Lord." In a dream, however, he was directed to proceed; and, after having complied with the requisitions of the Jewish law, he returned, with his family, to "their own city, Nazareth."

The birthday of our Lord may, therefore, with a high degree of probability, be concluded to have fallen on the 18th March, B. C. 4, in the Julian Calendar. In perfect accordance with this date is Luke's statement, that Jesus, at the age of about thirty years, entered upon his public ministry, in the fifteenth year of the Roman empire, Tiberius, who succeeded Augustus on the 19th August, U. C. 767=A. D. 14. But the Jews, commencing their civil year in autumn—on the 1 Thishri—dated his reign, according to their custom, from the 1 Thishri immediately preceding the true epoch, *i. e.*, on the 1 Thishri, U. C. 766==

A. D. 13. Hence, the Jewish epoch of the fifteenth year of Tiberius was the 1 Thishri, U. C. 780=A. D. 27. But the baptism of our Lord marked the beginning of his ministry; and there is every probability, on the one hand, that John made his public appearance in a sabbatical year; on the other, that he commenced baptizing at the earliest practicable season of the year.

The baptism of Jesus should, therefore, have taken place toward spring, U. C. 781=A. D. 28; and it can, indeed, be shown that such was the case, and that the more exact date of the event fell on some day within the two first weeks of February in that year. Now, the passover immediately following upon the baptism, the Evangelist John records to have happened forty-six full years after the restoration of the Temple by Herod, the epoch of which I have in another place shown to be the 1 Nisan, U. C. 735=B. C. 19. And, reckoning from this date forty-six completed years up to the 15 Nisan, we actually arrive at the passover of the year, U. C. 781=A. D. 28, in perfect harmony with our previous result.

Again: at the time of his baptism, our Lord is stated by Luke to have reached the ago of "about thirty years;" and as these thirty years, according to the Jewish rule of chronological expression, have to be taken as a completed period—for which, in the present instance, further reasons may be assigned—the age of Jesus at the time should have been between thirty and thirty-one Jewish years. And born, as was our Lord, in the month of Adar (March), U. C. 750=B. C. 4, such was actually the case in the month of Shebat (February), U. C. 781—A. D. 28. Besides which, I have elsewhere proved the Jewish year, 1 Thishri, A. D. 27, to 1 Thishri, A. D. 28, to have been a sabbatical year; so that there is here the most perfect chronological accord and consistency.

The first passover of his ministry our Lord celebrated in Jerusalem, as we have seen, in the year U. C. 781—A. D. 28; the next one in Galilee; and the third and last passover again in Jerusalem, consequently in the year U. C. 783=A. D. 30. The crucifixion, as I have shown on a former occasion, and, I venture to think, beyond any reasonable doubt, took place, according to the *unanimous* testimony of the four evangelists, on the 15 Nisan, mainly corresponding with our Friday, as plainly appears from the gospel narrative. Now, the new moon of Nisan, in the year, A. D. 30, happened astronomically on March 22d, 7 hours, 54 minutes, 25 seconds P. M., mean Jerusalem time. The 1 Nisan, determined by the moon's first visible phase, consequently commenced at sunset, March 23d, and mainly concurred with the 24th March. Hence, the 15 Nisan, the day of the crucifixion, answered, in the year A. D. 30, to the 7th April in the Julian Calendar. According to the evangelist, this date should have fallen on a Friday; and such we actually find it to be the case.

Thus, the principal moments in the life of our Lord may be considered as firmly established; and, although the brief argument adduced may appear conclusive to the scientific chronologer alone, it will not, I trust, prove altogether unsatisfactory even to the general reader.

THE MISSOURI TEST OATH.—We had intended preparing a short article for the present number of the *Quarterly* on this bad law, which is now silencing the preaching of the gospel in one of the largest States in the Union. But on further thought we have concluded to let it pass with the few points herein made:

1. God never yet founded a government, and empowered it to enact a law which imposes restrictions on the preaching of the gospel. Consequently, where an existing government does this, either the government itself is not of God, or it has usurped and is exercising an authority which he has never conferred upon it. In the former case, Christians are not bound to respect the government; in the latter case, they are not bound to respect its enactment. I hence conclude that no Christian man is bound to respect, as a law, the test oath of the Constitution of the State of Missouri. Nay, more, I believe that all preachers of the gospel in said State, and all other Christians affected in their natural rights by the law, are bound, in justice to Christ and to their brethren, who in conscience can not take the oath, either to preach and perform their other duties in defiance of the law, and suffer the consequences as martyrs to the truth, or to leave the State. Certainly I would advise the latter course, and not the former. And yet be this qualification of the preceding position added, that no Christian may innocently disregard any law of the land, *except where it interferes with his duty as a Christian*. Whether he likes the law or not, or thinks it wise and good, is not the question. Only where it interferes with his duty as a Christian, can he disregard it.

2. But where some brethren can conscientiously take the oath, and others can not, this difference should not be made a test of fellowship among brethren, nor be allowed to cool their love one for another. While the difference is a dangerous one, and one deeply to be regretted, yet it is no test in fact, and should be made none in practice. Brethren who can take the oath are not therefore to be rejected; those who can not are not therefore to be rejected. This I clearly think the rule in the case.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1866.

No. 2.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

THERE are two conditions necessary to an accurate and complete statement of any scripture doctrine. The first is, that it shall harmonize with every statement of the Scriptures upon the same subject. Truth is always consistent with itself; and inasmuch as every statement of the Word of God is true, a true doctrine can not conflict with any one of these statements. The fact that any doctrine does so is sufficient proof of its inaccuracy. Wherever such a conflict appears to exist, the advocates of the doctrine must show that it exists in appearance only, not in reality. This must be done, too, without abating aught from the doctrine to make it fit the scripture in particular cases, and without warping the scripture to make it fit the doctrine; otherwise the reconciliation is only apparent, while the conflict still exists. This is necessary to accuracy.

The second condition is necessary to completeness. It is that the doctrine, when fully stated, shall provide for a reconciliation of all scripture statements upon the subject with each other. This is necessary in order to assure us that the doctrine embraces every scripture idea upon the subject, in the exact form in which the Scriptures present it.

These conditions will suggest to the thoughtful mind the true method of ascertaining the teaching of the Scriptures on any given subject. Men have too often formed their conceptions of scripture themes by opposition to some error, or by deduction from some other truth. Thus the doctrine of a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion is derived, not from any plain statement of it in the Word of God, but from the previously admitted theory of total depravity. On the other hand, the popular theory of baptism, which counts it an empty rite unconnected with pardon, is the result of extreme opposition to the Romish idea of "baptismal regeneration;" and the theory of justification by faith only, to the Popish doctrine of salvation by meritorious works. Such theorizing is always dangerous, and generally leads to incorrect conclusions. Based upon a partial collation of scripture statements, it generally carries with it just

enough of the appearance of truth to deceive the unwary. It is necessary to a true theory of scripture teaching, that the Scriptures themselves furnish every thought, and that every thought to which they give utterance on the subject be allowed its proper place in the theory. In order to form such a theory, we must gather separately from the Scriptures all the individual thoughts which they furnish, and allow them to arrange themselves in the order in which they are naturally fitted to each other, or in that in which they are already arranged by the inspired penman. In this way a theory can be formed which is accurate, because it is true in every point; and complete, because it embraces every idea furnished by the Scriptures. It will be like a casting, taking all its elevations and depressions from the scripture mold in which it is cast.

With this method in view, it is easy to detect the incorrectness of any theory, and to remodel it in harmony with the truth. We propose to subject the popular theory of justification by faith to this test; and after exposing its incorrectness, to show the exact scripture teaching upon this subject.

The task before us may be brought into a bird's-eye view by placing side by side two statements of the New Testament; one from Paul, and the other from James:

"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii., 28.)

"You see, then, how that by works a man is justified; and not by faith only." (Jas. ii., 24.)

Each of these statements is a formal conclusion reached by a deliberate course of argument; yet there is a striking appearance of contradiction between them. If we leave out the terms which are used merely to connect each statement with its context, and then adopt a uniformity of expression for the same idea, this appearance will be still more striking. Substituting for "deeds," in the first, the equivalent term works, and omitting the article before "deeds" and "law," which is not in the original, and is not required in the translation, it would read thus: "Justified by faith, without works of law." The other: "Justified by works, and not by faith only." Inasmuch, however, as the second proposition admits justification by faith, we might with propriety read it: "Justified by faith, not without works." This makes the antithesis still more distinct, and brings out the precise difference between the two statements. They both admit that man is justified by faith; but Paul adds, "without works of law;" and James adds, "not without works." This is a contradiction in form, and it must be also in reality, unless there is some ambiguity in the leading terms. Look at it again: "Justified by faith, without works of law;" "Justified by faith, not without works." If the terms "justified," "faith," and "works" are used alike in both propositions,

then the contradiction is real and irreconcilable. But if either of these leading terms is used in different senses, then the statements may both be true. Those who grant the inspiration of both apostles, and do not, like Luther, the father of the doctrine of justification by faith only, doubt the genuineness of the Epistle of James because it denies this doctrine, must admit that there is an ambiguity in some of these terms, and must set about finding it.

If the ambiguity is in the word "faith," then the faith of which James speaks may require accompanying works in order to justification; while that of which Paul speaks may not. Or if it is in the term "justified," then the justification of which James speaks may require faith and works both; while that of which Paul speaks may be secured by faith without works. Or, finally, if the ambiguity is in the term "works," the works of which James speaks are necessary to justification; while those of which Paul speaks are not.

Where, then, shall we locate the ambiguity? Richard Watson, the great Methodist theologian, and the most exhaustive writer in favor of justification by faith only, finds it alternately in two of these words. He says: "By faith, James means not the same faith to which Paul attributes a saving efficacy. His argument sufficiently shows this. He speaks of a faith which is alone and dead; St. Paul of a faith which is never alone, though it alone justifieth." (*Theological Institutes*, vol. ii., p. 259.) This is a very strange remark to come from so acute a writer. It shows an intense straining to discover some avenue of escape from a difficulty. It is true, that James does speak of "a faith which is alone and dead," but only to put it in opposition to that faith which is made perfect by works and which justifies. He denies all value to "faith only," but contends that we are justified by faith not without works. The faith which he commends is the faith that justifies; and this is the same faith that Paul treats of. We will not pause here to discuss the question as to how many kinds of faith there are; for, however great the number, there is certainly but one kind that justifies, and Paul and James are both speaking of justifying faith. As a further proof of this, note the fact that James illustrates his proposition by the faith of Abraham, and that of Rahab, both of which secured justification.

But Watson does not rely upon this assumption; he merely states it, and then passes on to the assumption on which he chiefly depends, which is, that "Paul and James do not use the term justification in the same sense." The distinction for which he contends is stated as follows: "The former uses it, as we have seen, for the pardon of sin, the accepting and treating as righteous one who is guilty, but penitent. But that James does not speak of this kind of justification is most evident, from his reference to the case of Abraham. 'Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered up Isaac,

his son, upon the altar V Does James mean that Abraham was then justified in the sense of being forgiven? Certainly not; for Paul, when speaking of the justification of Abraham, in the sense of his forgiveness before God, by the imputation of his faith for righteousness, fixes that event many years previously, even before Isaac was born, and when the promise of a seed was made to him; for it is added by Moses, when he gives an account of this transaction: 'And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.' (Gen. xv., 6.) If, then, James speaks of the same kind of justification, he contradicts Paul and Moses, by implying that Abraham was not pardoned and received into God's favor until the offering of Isaac. If no one will maintain this, then the justification of Abraham mentioned by James, it is plain, does not mean the forgiveness of his sins, and he uses the term in a different sense to Paul." (Vol. ii., 251.)

In this extract the writer does not inform us what kind of justification James is speaking of; he merely denies that it is the kind that Paul speaks of, and asserts that the latter uses the term in the sense of forgiveness of sins. He assumes that up to the time referred to in Gen. xv., 6, when Moses says, "He believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness," Abraham was an unforgiven sinner, or, in modern phraseology, an unconverted man. That then, upon his exercising the faith referred to, he was "pardoned, and received into God's favor." But, unfortunately for the argument, this assumption is inconsistent with the facts of Abraham's history, as stated by both Moses and Paul. The period of Gen. xv., 6, was immediately subsequent to the battle with the kings, and the rescue of Lot. Before this he had left his native country, at the call of God, and had received the promise: "I will bless him that blesses thee, and curse him that curses thee, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." He had been protected in Egypt, had built an altar wherever he pitched his tent, and had just returned from receiving a blessing from Melchisedek, and the encouragement from God: "Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." Such had been his relation to God, as described by Moses; and Paul, commenting on this record, says: "By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go into a land which he should afterward receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise; for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Here, now, is a man of faith; a faith which leads him away from his father's house and his native land, to be a stranger in a strange country, and when there to be so contented with the everlasting city built by God that he erects no permanent home on earth. It is a faith by which he "obeyed" God, and received the most

precious blessings from the lips of God, and of God's royal high-priest; yet here is a Methodist doctor, the great champion of the doctrine of justification by faith only, declaring that Abraham was not yet justified in the sense of forgiveness. How strange that familiar facts can thus be hidden from view by the blinding effect of zeal for a favorite dogma! And how passing strange that an inconsistency so glaring should have escaped the notice of this distinguished theologian, and of his many thousands of admiring readers. It needs but half an eye to see that if faith only, or even faith and the most self-sacrificing obedience, could secure pardon in the patriarchal age, Abraham must have received forgiveness for the sins of his early life long before the period of Gen. xv., 6. It was at least fifteen years before this that he left his native land by faith, obeying God, who commanded him to go. This method of reconciling Paul and James must, therefore, be incorrect. Whatever may be the kind of justification of which James speaks, the assumption concerning Paul's meaning, which is essential to the argument, is proved false, and this vitiates the whole argument.

We may now spend a few moments in considering Watson's statement concerning the justification of which James speaks. He says: "The only sense in which James can take the term justification, when he says that Abraham was justified by works when he offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar, is, that his works manifested or proved that he was justified; proved that he was really justified by faith, or, in other words, that the faith by which he was justified was not dead and inoperative, but living and active." Will the reader please to read this quotation again, and see if it tells him what kind of justification James speaks of? What is the matter with our clear-headed and perspicuous expounder of theology? What mean this halting, and limping, and stammering? Notice: "The only sense in which James can take the term justification is, that his works manifested or proved that he was justified." But how can this be called a sense of the term justification? Is to justify a man the same as to prove that he is justified? But, not satisfied with this, he makes another effort, and says the sense is that works "proved that he was really justified by faith." But what sort of a "sense of the term justification" is this? It certainly would require a man of more than five senses to see it. But still another attempt is made, and he says the sense of the term is "that his works proved that the faith by which he was justified was not dead and inoperative." And this is another sense of the term justification as used by James. "The only sense in which James can take the term" thus resolves itself into at least three senses in the space of one short sentence, and neither of these senses seems appreciable to a man of common sense. If James intended to say that Abraham's works *proved* anything, he could just as well

have said it as to have said that by works Abraham was *justified*. Such confusion on the part of a writer whose pen generally leaves a stream of light behind is certain proof of a difficult cause.

Some more recent writers and speakers have done much better on this point than Watson. Conscious of the want of light in his attempt at a definition, they have found a more natural, if not a more truthful, explanation of the term. They affirm that James speaks of the justification of a saint; and that he uses the term in the sense of approval. This explanation goes upon the assumption that while the sinner is justified by faith only, the saint is justified by works, and must bring forth works that shall be approved by God as the ground of justification. This explanation is suited, in one respect, to Abraham's case, for he certainly was a saint at the time he offered Isaac upon the altar; but then it is inconsistent with the other case used by James, that of Rahab. She was certainly not a saint, for she had been, up to the time of which James speaks, a harlot. Yet he adduces her case to illustrate justification by works, saying: "Was not Rahab, the harlot, justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" By this we see that James applies his doctrine of justification by works, and not by faith only, to both the saint and the sinner. If Paul, then, is speaking of the justification of a sinner, so is James; and if Paul speaks of the saint, so does James, and there is no possibility of reconciling the apostles by supposing them to speak of two different kinds of justification.

This will be still more apparent when we consider the nature of justification, and the possibilities of the case. The term justify means to declare just. There are only two grounds on which this can be done: first, on the ground of innocence; second, on the ground of pardon. He who has committed no crime is justified on the ground of innocence. This is the primary sense of the term. He who is guilty of crime, but has been pardoned, is justified in a secondary sense; that is, he is treated as though he were really innocent; he is no longer held to account for the crimes he has committed. Now if a man is justified before God, it must be on one or the other of these grounds. It can never be on the former, for no man can plead entire innocence in the sight of God. Angels are thus justified, for they have never sinned; but men can not be, for they have all sinned. John says, even of Christians: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Doubtless it might be said of good men, that they meet with divine approval in reference to many of their individual actions; but God is not said in the Scriptures to justify any man in the sense of approval. The assumption, therefore, that James uses the term in this sense is not only inconsistent with the context, as we have shown above, but is also contrary to the possibilities of the case.

It is now very clear that the ambiguity we are seeking is to be found neither in the term "faith," nor the term "justified." It must, then, be in the term "works." That this term may be used ambiguously is evident from the fact that there are many kinds of works. There are works of the law, and works of the gospel; works of benevolence, and works of piety; works of the moral law, and works of positive law; and each of these classes of works has some characteristics peculiar to itself. If Paul refers to one class, and James to another, then the class that James speaks of is necessary to justification, and the class that Paul speaks of is not. Whether the ambiguity can be found here or not we are to determine by a separate examination of the two apostolic statements under discussion. As in all other cases of ambiguous words, the context must decide the meaning in each passage. We turn, then, first to the context of Paul's conclusion, to ascertain what class of works he refers to when he says, "we are justified by faith without works."

From the eighteenth verse of the first chapter of Romans to the sixteenth of the second chapter, Paul sets forth the moral condition of the Gentiles; showing, in the outset, that "the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse" (i., 18-20); and advancing from this to an exhibition of the gross corruption into which they had sunk by their inexcusable ignorance. At the seventeenth verse of the second chapter he takes up the case of the Jew; and after showing his superior advantages, asks him: "Thou, therefore, who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you." (ii., 21-24.) And still further: "What then? Are we better than they? (We Jews than they Gentiles?) No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." (iii., 9.) This conclusion forms a premise from which the apostle next proceeds to argue the ground of their justification. Seeing that "all are under sin," he concludes: "Therefore, by deeds of law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." (iii., 20.) This is a negative proposition, denying that we can be justified by deeds of law, but not showing how we can be justified. The apostle next proceeds to set forth briefly the primary ground of justification in the blood of Christ, and then shows on what condition we are justified, by stating the conclusion: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without deeds of law." (iii., 21-28.)

It will now be no difficult task to determine what works are meant by the expression "deeds of law;" for which we will substitute, for the sake of uniformity, the equivalent expression, "works of law." Some have mistaken it for works of the Jewish law, and a theory of justification based upon this idea, and first propounded by Bishop Bull, of the Church of England, has been received by many. It affirms that Paul is speaking of works of the Mosaic law, affirming that we are justified by faith without these; while James speaks of gospel obedience, and affirms that these are necessary to justification. The Common Version is very likely to lead one into this idea; for it uses the definite article both before the words "law" and "works." This is not authorized by the Greek, as we have stated above, nor is it demanded by the English. The context, indeed, forbids it. It is not *the* works of *the* law; because Paul has reference both to the Jewish law, and to the Gentile law, that law which the Gentiles had among themselves, the works of which were written in their hearts." (Rom. ii., 14, 15.) He had proved that the Gentiles were under sin according to this law, as the Jews were according to their law. It was, therefore, not merely by the works of the law that they could not be justified, but by works of law; by works of any law under which man had lived. In order to such justification they must be guilty of no transgression; for he alone can be justified by works of any law who has done no act forbidden by that law, and omitted none required by it. The reason why neither Jew nor Gentile could be justified by such works is, that they were all under sin. But nothing short of perfect obedience to law keeps one from being under sin. "He that keeps the whole law, and yet offends in one point, is guilty of all. (James ii., 10.) Paul's works of law are opposed to being under sin; but no works can be thus opposed except works of perfect obedience. The works, then, of which Paul speaks are clearly works of perfect obedience to moral law.

This conclusion is confirmed by the subsequent portion of Paul's argument. He says: "Now to him that works, the reward is not reckoned according to grace, but according to debt." (Rom. iv., 4.) The reward here mentioned, as the context clearly indicates, is the reward of justification. The working is that which would make it a matter of debt on the part of God to justify; but no working short of perfect obedience, like that of the angels, could have this effect. It is not according to grace, but according to debt, that God justifies sinless beings; but this can be said of none but those who are really without sin. In opposition to "him that works" in this sense, is placed "him that works not," in the statement: "But to him that works not, but believes on him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is imputed for righteousness." (Rom. iv., 5.) The expression, "him that works not," is placed in antithesis to "him that works;" and as the latter means

him that works perfect obedience, the law of antithesis requires us to understand the former as him that works not perfect obedience. He may have rendered no obedience at all, or he may have rendered obedience almost perfect. It is not the extent to which he falls short of perfect obedience that is referred to, but the simple fact that he had not rendered perfect obedience. He who fails in one point fails of justification by debt, and must be justified by favor if justified at all.

The same idea of works of law is maintained by Paul in his argument on justification in the Epistle to the Galatians, which was written about the same time with that to the Romans, and for a similar purpose. He there says: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. iii., 10.) In this argument the apostle omits one of the premises. Fully stated, it would be as follows: "Every one who fails to do all that is written in the law is under the curse; but as many as are of the works of the law make this failure; hence, as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." By those who are of the works of the law, are meant those who were seeking justification by works of law; and the argument shows that the reason why they failed was because their obedience was not perfect. As perfect obedience to moral law never has been rendered by man, and never will be, therefore it remains fixed forever, "that by works of law shall no flesh be justified."

We now see very clearly what kind of works are contemplated by Paul. They are such works of law as leave no room for pardon; such as leave nothing to be pardoned, but furnish the party a claim for justification as a moral debt due him at the hands of God. This conclusion is sustained by John Calvin himself, in giving a formal definition of justification by works. He says: "He must be said to be 'justified by works,' whose life discovers such purity and holiness as to deserve the character of righteousness before the throne of God; or who, by the integrity of his works, can answer and satisfy the divine judgment." (*Institutes*, vol. i., p. 651.) With such corroborative testimony added to what we have said, the reader could but regard it as superfluous for us to dwell longer upon this point; we will therefore leave it, as admitting of no further controversy.

We now turn to the epistle of James, and inquire in what sense he uses the term works when he says we are justified by works and not by faith only. The context must in this case, as in that of Paul, furnish the solution of the question. James introduces the subject at the fourteenth verse of the second chapter, by asking: "What does it profit, my brethren, though a man say he has faith and has not work? Can faith save him?" He does not answer the question; for to ask it is to answer it. He asks another question: "If a brother

or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say to them: Depart in peace; be warmed and filled; notwithstanding, you give them not those things that are needful to the body, what does it profit?" Here, the good wishes, without the corresponding actions, do no good. "Even so," he continues, "faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone." What kind of works are these? Certainly not the works of which Paul speaks, for they alone would suffice, without faith. They are works which faith must have so as not to be alone, and they are spoken of as subordinate to faith. The apostle repeats the idea: "But will you know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" Still we see that the works are such as accompany faith, and not, therefore, works of perfect obedience previous to faith. We do not yet see precisely what kind of works they are; but the apostle proceeds to illustrate his meaning. His illustrations are these: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar?" "Likewise, also, was not Rahab, the harlot, justified by works when she had received the messengers and sent them out another way?" Now what kind of works are these two? Certainly not works of perfect obedience to moral law. On the contrary, they would have been most criminal violations of the moral law, had they been performed under ordinary circumstances. One was child-murder, according to the moral law, and the other was treason. That which made them innocent was the express command of God. How this command was made known to Rahab, the brief narrative of Joshua does not inform us in express terms, but it justifies the conclusion that it was through the spies themselves, whom she credited as servants of the God of Israel, sent on this mission by the inspired authority of Joshua. To Abraham the command came direct from the voice of God. Both of these works belong to the same class with the gazing of the bitten Israelites upon the brazen serpent, and the bathing of Naaman, the Syrian, in the Jordan, to heal his leprosy. They were works of obedience to positive law, as distinguished from moral law. I need not pause here to distinguish these two kinds of works, further than to remark that the former are always such as the moral law does not require, and such as derive their propriety exclusively from the fact that they are commanded. The doctrine of James, then, is that we are justified by faith not without works of obedience to some positive law. That of Paul is, that we are justified by faith without previous works of perfect obedience to moral law. James asserts nothing of Paul's works; Paul denies nothing of James's works. The works of which they speak are entirely different, so that the declaration of each apostle harmonizes perfectly with that of the other. The man of faith, who is so far from having done the works of Paul's argument that he acknowledges himself a wretched and miserable sinner, is moved by

faith to perform some work of the class embraced in James's argument, appointed by God as a condition of pardon; and then, to use James's phraseology, he is justified by faith not without works; or, to use Paul's phraseology, his faith is imputed to him for righteousness. Here is the true ground of harmony between the two apostles, and a few more words will relieve it from all objections.

All the writers in favor of justification by faith only have treated the subject as though the requirement of even a single act of obedience as a condition of justification would be inconsistent with Paul's argument, and would nullify the grace of God. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is the breadth of the heavens between the man who attempts to show a clear record of perfect obedience, entitling him to justification as a debt, and the man who pleads guilty to a life of sin, but comes to God inquiring what to do, and willing to do anything, however great the sacrifice, in order to obtain pardon. Pardon is necessarily, from its very nature, a matter of grace or favor, and justification through pardon can not possibly be otherwise. If God should require, as a condition of pardon, one, two, or even a thousand acts of obedience, still the pardon would be a favor. If for the pardon of a single sin he should require the consecration of every other moment of life to his undivided service, still, when this one sin is forgiven, it is a matter of grace and not of debt. It is only he who deserves justification on the ground of perfect innocence that is above the need of justification by grace. To deserve pardon is a contradiction in terms. Justification by works, in Paul's sense, involves no pardon; and implies that there is no sin to be forgiven; but this, we have before seen, is an impossibility. While it is true, then, that justification is, and of necessity must be, without Paul's works of law, it may still be dependent on the works of which James speaks, and it certainly is so if James speaks the truth. That it is so does not in the least conflict with Paul's argument, nor vitiate the grace of God.

Having reached the conclusion that faith must be accompanied by works of positive law in order to justification, we are now prepared to inquire what particular works are required under the Christian dispensation. This inquiry naturally divides itself into two, one having respect to the sinner, and the other to the saint.

First, then, as it respects the sinner. James positively asserts that faith without works is dead. But when faith first originates in the mind it is without works, and remains so until the first work of faith is performed. All this time it is dead. In what sense is it dead? Many seem to think that a dead faith is no faith at all. This is not the meaning, for it is faith—actual, existing faith. It may be everything that faith ought to be or can be, in itself considered. It may be faith accompanied by repentance, by prayer, and by fasting; but

it is faith without works. The absence of works is the only limitation which James places upon it to render it dead faith. Even the faith of the demons is a real faith, for it makes them tremble; it is faith accompanied by that same wretchedness that brings about the sinner's repentance, differing from it only in the absence of all hope and of all gratitude. The dead faith, then, is simply faith that does not secure justification; faith as it exists before obedience, before it is perfected by works. But, as we have said above, it exists in this condition until the first act of formal obedience to positive law is performed. That first act, with the sinner, can be no other than baptism; for baptism is the only positive command enjoined upon the sinner, and it is the first overt act required of the sinner in coming to God. Faith, then, whatever else may accompany it, remains a dead faith, ineffective for justification, until it leads the believer into the water; then it is no longer without works, and the sinner is justified by faith not without works.

The history of Paul's own conversion is a striking illustration of this conclusion, demonstrating its correctness, and at the same time showing its perfect harmony with his own teaching in the Epistle to the Romans. He says, in the fifth chapter of Romans, at the conclusion of his argument on justification: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." In this statement he includes himself by speaking in the first person. He also undoubtedly means that he was justified by faith without such works of law as he had excluded in his previous argument. When, therefore, we examine the history of his conversion, we should find that he obtained justification not upon any such works; and at the same time, if James teaches the truth, that he did obtain it by some such works as James insists upon. Turning, then, to the history, we find that when he was arrested on his way to Damascus he was on a mission of threatening and slaughter against the disciples, which caused him afterward to pronounce himself the chief of sinners. Being a sinner, he was under the curse, and incapable of justification by his previous works. The Lord Jesus appears to him, and he becomes a penitent believer, exclaiming: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and passes the next three days in tears, and prayer, and fasting. It would be idle to search for an example of more undoubting faith, or of more heart-rending penitence, than that of the weeping, praying, and fasting Saul. Whatever may be the definitions or kinds of faith in the conceptions of men, there is no kind or degree of it above what we see exhibited here. If saving faith is, as it is so often incorrectly defined, a yielding up of the will to Christ, he had this faith; for he exclaims: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and he acted at the bidding of Jesus. If it is to trust in Christ, he had it; for he sacrificed his all to Jesus, and committed himself absolutely to his

keeping. He continually calls upon the name of Christ in the midst of unbelieving companions who stand in amazement around him. But notwithstanding such faith, accompanied by such exhibitions of penitence, he still finds no peace with God. Three days of unspeakable gloom and anguish pass over him, without one ray of light, or one moment's peace of mind. Could there possibly be imagined a clearer demonstration of the impotency of faith only to secure justification? Could the doctrine of James, that faith, be it ever so great, in the absence of works is dead, be more strongly confirmed? Why does not the man find peace with God? His agony continues without abatement till Ananias comes in, sent by the Lord Jesus himself. After restoring his sight, he says to him: "And now, why do you tarry; arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "He arose, and was baptized; and receiving food, he was strengthened." Not, then, till he arose and was baptized did he find peace with God, and break his long, miserable fast. Not till then was he justified by faith. He was justified by works, by an act of obedience to positive law, and not by faith only. His own experience confirms the doctrine of James, and shows that baptism is the work that must accompany the sinner's faith ere he is justified.

This fact accords perfectly with the position assigned to baptism, in the scheme of redemption. Being placed after faith and repentance as a condition of remission of sins, and being a work of positive law, deriving its value and propriety exclusively from the fact that it is commanded, it necessarily belongs to the class of works referred to by James, and connected with justification. This connection of baptism with justification has not escaped the notice of some eminent men of the Church of England, and Watson is himself constrained to admit it with some qualifications. Bishop Tomline says: "Faith, including repentance for former sins, was, as far as the person himself was concerned, the sole requisite for justification; no previous work was enjoined; but baptism was invariably the instrument, or external form, by which justification was conveyed." Watson justly pronounces this a confused statement; for it contains an attempt to take hold of baptism without letting go faith only. The two can not be held in the hand together. But still Watson concedes something in favor of the position which the bishop and some other Episcopalian writers assign to baptism. He says: "It will not be denied to Dr. Whitby, that the apostles baptized upon the profession of a belief in the messiahship and sonship of our Lord; nor is it denied to Bishop Tomline, that when baptism, in the case of true penitence, was not only an outward expression of the faith of assent, but accompanied by a solemn committal of the spiritual interests of the baptized to Christ, by an act of confidence, the power to do which was, no doubt, often given as a

part of the grace of baptism, justification would follow." (*Theological Institutes*, vol. ii., p. 260.) The charge of confusion which he prefers against Bishop Tomline may be retorted upon him here with interest; for it requires close analysis of this sentence to extract any meaning from it. Stripped of the unnecessary verbiage by which he aims to guard the faith contemplated in the case, it amounts to about this,—that when a truly penitent sinner, exercising the faith of confidence, was baptized, justification followed; and that the power to exercise that faith was often given in apostolic times in the act of baptism. This is very far from being a clear and accurate statement of the true relation of baptism to justification; but it shows that even our great champion of justification by faith only, could not overlook the fact that such a relation does really exist. For this purpose alone we have referred to it.

While thus aiming to set forth the true relation of works to justification, we have by no means forgotten that the justification of the New Testament is almost constantly represented as justification by faith. This fact must not be overlooked by one who is searching for the exact truth on this subject. Not only are we justified by faith, but by faith imputed for righteousness. Paul declares that Abraham's faith was imputed to him as righteousness, and adds: "It was written not on his account only, that it was imputed to him, but also on account of us, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." (Rom. iv., 23, 24.) We, then, who live under the Christian dispensation, are justified by having OUT faith in the Lord Jesus Christ imputed to us for righteousness. Whatever relation, therefore, may exist between works and justification, works must be subordinate, while faith is the chief thing. This is indicated by the manner in which James treats the subject; for his remark that we are "justified by works and not by faith" only, implies that faith is the chief thing, and seems only to demand a subordinate place for works.

It has been a puzzle to many minds how works can have any connection whatever with justification, when at the same time faith is imputed to us for righteousness. But there was no appearance of inconsistency between the two to the mind of James, for he makes one illustrate the other. He says: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered up his son Isaac upon the altar. And the scripture was fulfilled, which says: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Thus Abraham's justification by works is declared to be a fulfillment of the very scripture which says that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. This circumstance shows clearly that James had a conception of the whole subject quite different from that of modern theologians. The connecting link between the two thoughts is presented in a sentence

which lies between them in the text. He says: "You see that faith worked with his works, and by the works was the faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which says: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Thus it was a perfected faith which was imputed to him for righteousness, and the faith was made perfect by works. In the first place, "the faith worked with his works;" that is, his faith, instead of lying dormant or remaining alone, produced works, and exerted itself in connection with these works, and by this circumstance it became a perfected faith. Now the word rendered perfect here does not mean insusceptible of improvement; but it means mature, or complete, as a full-grown man, or a fruit-bearing tree, is perfect. When faith is made perfect in this sense it is not necessarily brought to its highest attainable degree of excellence, but it is brought to its chief and primary effect for salvation, the justification of its possessor. In other words, it is made perfect as a condition of justification. Bloomfield translates the clause: "By works his faith was rendered complete;" and explains the words "rendered complete," by the expression, "made available to justification." This is undoubtedly the sense which the context requires. If, then, it be true that Abraham's faith was made thus complete by works, it follows, as a necessary conclusion, that previous to works his faith was incomplete. Faith, therefore, previous to the obedience of faith, is incomplete; and, what is the exact thought of the passage, it is incomplete as a condition of justification. Thus, the faith of Saul, strong as it was, and great as were its effects upon his inner man, was not imputed to him for righteousness, so as to give him peace with God, until he arose and was baptized. When his faith worked with his works in baptism, by the works the faith was made perfect, and the scripture was fulfilled which says: "He believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." So it is in the case of every other sinner, who from the heart obeys the same form of doctrine.

We have thus far discussed this subject chiefly as it relates to the sinner. We have not forgotten that, while Paul and James discuss it without exclusive reference to either saint or sinner, they both illustrate their conclusions by the case of Abraham when he was a saint. They make no discrimination between the two characters in reference to justification, and this is sufficient proof that they intend none to be made, at least in the principles involved. It is of the principles, and not of the details, that they both treat. A moment's reflection will show that no such discrimination can be made. If the sinner can be justified only by the pardon of his sins, the saint requires equally the pardon of his; the only difference is in the number and perhaps the enormity of the sins. True, Paul says: "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" (Rom. viii., 1); but he undoubtedly includes in

walking after the spirit, compliance with the conditions on which a Christian's sins are forgiven; for John expressly declares that "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." We can not be justified from these sins by works in Paul's sense of the term "works," because it is the absence of some of the works required of the saint that renders his justification again and again necessary. If it were of works, he, like Abraham, in the case supposed by Paul, would have whereof to boast; he could boast that he was no longer dependent upon God's favor for justification, as he once had been, and as all sinners are. No man ever became capable of making this boast. His justification at any period of life, and in the hour of death, differs not in principle from his justification at the beginning; it is always by faith imputed for righteousness. At what period Abraham was first justified we are not informed; for when he is first introduced on the page of history he was an obedient believer; and, from the fixed principle of the divine government, he must have already been justified from the sins of his early life. At the time of his return from the battle with the kings, Moses notes the fact of his justification again. The faith which was then imputed to him for righteousness was not alone; for it was continually accompanied by works of positive law, in the sacrifices which he continually offered for the sins of himself and his family. His faith, taking hold of the promise of a seed, and constantly working with his works, was imputed to him for righteousness. Then again, when the same faith, after the seed had been given in Isaac, took so strong a hold of the promised posterity through him that he believed God would raise his son from the ashes of a burnt-offering to fulfill the promise, it was once more imputed to him for righteousness, being here made perfect by a special positive command designed fully to test its strength. At either of these periods, if Abraham had been made to stand before God in judgment upon his works, they would have been found imperfect, and he could not have been justified by them. So teaches Paul. In so far as he had done right, of course God approved; but in so far as he had failed to do his whole duty, he was condemned, and it was necessary that his faith, perfected by works, should be imputed to him for a perfect righteousness, which he did not, and could not actually possess. So it is with the Christian, with this single exception, that he is subjected to no special tests like those which so greatly tried the faith of Abraham. As Abraham was under the positive statute of sacrifice for sins, the Christian is under the positive law of confession so as to secure the benefits of the one sacrifice which has been made once for all. "We have an Advocate with the Father, who is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, if we confess them, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." (1 John i., 9.)

This specific act of confession, appointed as a condition of pardon

for the Christian, is not so readily classed among works of positive law as baptism is, because it has more perceptible inherent propriety; but, like baptism, it possesses no benevolent character, and has no appearance at all of a work of merit. It is, also, like that, an act of humiliation, and is the specific appointment of God as a condition of pardon. By it the faith which prompts it is made perfect, and is then imputed for righteousness, so that the righteous man, righteous in a limited sense, is made, through forgiveness of his short-comings, altogether righteous in the sight of God.

We now have the whole scripture scheme of justification before us, at least on the human side of it. We see that in all dispensations, men have been justified by faith imputed for righteousness. Faith has never been so imputed, except when it has developed itself in some outward expression. Unless it be in some exceptional cases, like that of the thief on the cross, where no work of faith could be performed, it has been requisite that some such work should be done. Under the Christian dispensation, this work is baptism for the sinner and confession for the saint. By this scheme alone can it be possible for any man to be justified in the great day of God. Let any man that ever lived appear before the bar of God stripped of the mantle which God's mercy has thrown over him, and he must be condemned as a sinner. This is true at every period of life; not in the days of youthful folly alone, but in the riper years of Christian manhood. The more we know of men, and of good men too, and the more we know of ourselves, the more freely must we admit this truth, and the more completely must we feel our dependence upon the mercy of God. If our faith is not imputed to us for righteousness, and we are left to the righteousness which we have, truly will we be arrayed in filthy rags. The white robe is that which is washed in the Redeemer's blood; for it is by this blood that God is enabled to be just in justifying us who believe in Jesus, in imputing to us our faith for righteousness. How completely, then, is all the glory due to God! And how rapturously will we be able to join with "the angels around the throne, and the living creatures, and the elders, the number of whom was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice: Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

M.

THE WICKED.—Will wicked men live on earth during the millennium? If so, where is the proof? If not, what will become of them before that event commences? Will some brother, who has made it his business to think on these questions, furnish us a satisfactory answer to them? They are curious, and none will say that they are not interesting.

THE MISSOURI OATH AND A. CAMPBELL.

It is a melancholy fact that at this moment, and for long months past, the preaching of the gospel has been almost hushed in the State of Missouri, by the oath prescribed for preachers in the so-called Constitution of that State. Of this Constitution itself we do not propose to speak. Whether legitimately, or not, the supreme law of the State is a question foreign to the objects of this paper. The question with the Christian is not *how* it became the law, but is it so in fact. Assuming this question to be, in the case in hand, settled, our first inquiry respects the nature of the restriction imposed.

Christ expressly declares that all authority in heaven and on earth is given into his hands. He further tells us that his kingdom is not of this world; and by the Holy Spirit has laid down the qualifications of those who are to preach, and assigned them the work they are to do. Now this Constitution, falsely claiming to be ordained and established by the people, in effect sets all this at defiance. It claims for the State, first, the right in general to interfere in matters of religion, and to regulate them. Otherwise, of course, it would never have exercised that right in the specific case in hand. Is this, its daring claim, just? If the State have the right to interfere and determine the conditions on which men shall be competent to teach and preach the gospel, then has the State the right to determine what the gospel is, and who is competent to obey it. For what the gospel is, is not more clearly determined by Christ, nor is the right to obey it any more indisputably derived from him than is the duty to teach it and preach it. Clearly the State of Missouri has just the same right to say who is competent to obey the gospel that it has to say who shall preach it. Not only so, but this Constitution claims for the State, second, the right positively to *annul* a solemn arrangement of Jesus Christ. Christ has ordained that certain men shall preach the gospel and live by it. But this Constitution says they shall "not be competent" thereto, except on a condition which it claims the right to lay down. A more insolent and heaven-daring usurpation the annals of States can not furnish. Let the State, ruled as it usually is, now-a-days, by its worst men, begin the work of setting aside the enactments of Christ, and where, in dread we may well ask, will its work end? When German atheists and frenzied upstarts, yclept politicians, conduct the process, it is not difficult, in the dark shadows of the past, to forecast the end. Until, then, brethren in Christ get their consent to see their Master's appointments interfered with, his authority annulled, and his servants stricken down while in the discharge of their duties, I see not how

they can ever get their consent to take the oath herein alluded to. When they do so, they recognize a principle which, when carried out to its full extent, brings back the days of the Inquisition.

That Christ never yet established a government, or sanctioned the enactment of a law, to interfere with the preaching of the gospel, has for my mind all the force of an intuition. That the constitutional oath of Missouri does so interfere can not be denied. I hence conclude that it not only has not the sanction of Christ, but that his detestation lies on it. From this I conclude it to be the solemn duty of every child of God in the State to resist the law, at least to the full extent of utterly refusing to take it. But now arises the question: Shall the preacher still continue to preach? I answer, he should not be silent one day. That he may choose between the only two alternatives left—leaving the State, or suffering—is, I deem, clearly allowed him by the Book. Still, while I would advise the former, I should certainly prefer to see the latter. And though incapable of wishing any human being harm, I wish that every preacher, elder, and deacon within the limits of the State were this day in prison, each for discharging the duties of his office in defiance of the oath. This I wish, not because I wish to see any one suffer, but because I want the world and heaven to gaze on the workings of this Constitution. As the case now stands, its enormities are not seen. Some preachers leave, others are silent, and a few take the oath. Thus the infamy of the thing is seen only in its lettering, and not read in the deep and shocking distress it is calculated to work. Five hundred preachers, the purest men in the State, in jail, with all their scanty earnings dragged to the sheriff's block, would be well calculated to wake slumbering Americans to the thing they are either smiling on or winking at. That such a scene would gladden the hearts of the Dutch atheists and other unfeeling tools who enacted the law we can easily believe; but millions of the good of earth would look on in horror. Still, while I say these things, I do not forget how easy it is to talk, but how hard to suffer. They are meant to be no reflection upon the conduct of any.

But my object on sitting down was not to argue the case of this odious law, nor even to state the case at any length. I had a different object in view, but inadvertently have been led into these rambling thoughts.

Many of the preachers of Missouri were born and raised in the South; their kin were all in the South; their sympathies from infancy had been with it; their ideas were formed in it and derived from it; and with it were bound up all the home feelings of their hearts. They did not look upon the action of the South as being of the nature of a *rebellion*. They regarded it as being wholly of the nature of a *revolution*. They deemed that its object was not in the least to interfere with the

laws and institutions of the adhering States, but to form a more congenial government in the seceding ones. This they believed the people of the South had the right to do. For if not, they argued, on what ground is the great American Revolution of 1776 to be justified? If our fathers were right then, how, said they, can the people of the South be wrong now? Now grant that in all this they may have been wrong; and the claim of infallibility has not been urged for them, still on a thousand scores they are entitled to this, that they were honest and sincere. Some of these preachers were among the first to lift their voices, west of the great Mississippi, in defense of the primitive gospel. They were venerable for their age and life-long devotion to the cause of Christ. Others still, in the prime of life, were, amid want and other hostile circumstances, spending the prayers of their hearts and the energies of their brains in the same great cause. In a few years they had increased the Lord's people to little, if any, less than thirty thousand. They were united and sound. Never were preachers more so. They loved each other as brethren should, and worked as only heroes do. They were intensely devoted to their beloved Missouri, and still more so to her beloved children. They took no part in the war; for this they conscientiously believed Christians may not do. They were neither rebellious nor disloyal; for this they knew the Word of God did not permit them to be; and they were men scrupulous even in the smallest matters. If they had sympathies with the South, they kept them to themselves; and while they steadily worked for Christ, they religiously gave tribute to whom tribute was due, and honor to whom honor. They neither fomented strife at home, nor shouted over the slaughter of their countrymen elsewhere. They fervently prayed for peace; yet they committed their cause to God, and in heart wished that his will might be done. They mourned over the desolations of Zion, and strove night and day to check them. They counseled all to be temperate in speech; in intercourse, gentle and kind; to cultivate fervent love one for another; and to suffer nothing to cool their affections for the children of God. In the pulpit they never alluded to the mad questions of the day, nor spoke so as to pain brethren of different views. They felt that their mission was to preach Christ, not Caesar; to comfort the broken-hearted; and work ever to keep down alienation and schism among the redeemed of the Lord. If they could not always agree with brethren of the adverse side, they at least hoped that they had not lived to the day when honest differences, in a case in which God had been silent, were crimes. These men were conscious of no sin against the State for whose good they had so long and faithfully toiled. They consequently felt the constitutional oath to be uncalled for and unjust. They declined to take it, most of them, from principle, nothing else. They looked on it as a horrid exaction; intended only to silence the con-

scientious and pure, or drive them from the State, and fill their places with the vicious and bad, who were ready for anything, or oath, provided only it gave them place and bread. They looked on it as the initiation of restrictions on religious duties, which, if not resisted in the very outset, would end in the suppression of all religious freedom. They hence not only felt called upon not to take the oath, but to decline to take it even at the risk of suffering. Their act was not the act of mere time-servers, but the act of noble men, who, under Christ, knew their rights, and were unwilling tamely to surrender them. That they are entitled to the respect and 'sympathy of all good men is a proposition we should respectfully decline to debate. Yet the coldness with which they are sometimes spoken of, and the cruelty with which they are twitted, and that, too, by men who claim that they are not cruel, strike us as a strange exhibition of brotherly kindness. As a sample of what we mean, read the following:

"The Missouri ministers are exceedingly exercised about the constitutional oath,—putting it that it binds their conscience, and must be resisted for Christ's sake. Well, it is hard on rebels; but we can not see why loyal teachers can not swear that they have not aided the accursed Southern rebellion. Perhaps the penitent ones could obtain pardon for their treason, and receive executive clemency, if they would sue for it. We advise them to do so, and go and sin no more."

This is from a monthly published in Kansas, calling itself *The Christian Messenger*. On it we decline to comment. How far it will soothe the feelings of our sorrowing brethren in Missouri, and cause them to love the *association of Christian brethren* by whom the *Messenger* is published, we shall leave brethren of Missouri who can not take the oath themselves to say. Will not Bro. Proctor and Bro. Wilkes aid in circulating this "*Christian*" *Messenger* in the State for which they have so long and faithfully worked?

From the same paper, and of the same date, we take the following, to which is appended its author's name:

" The reformation had become a real power in the world before A. Campbell embraced it. He did not bring so many excellent moral qualities into exercise as did his father, whose life and teaching were characterized by the *moral*; Alexander's by the *positive*. One was like Christ, as John was. The other was like Christ, as Peter was. It is true that we need both, and it is also true that there was *one* disciple, particularly, whom the Savior loved. It is true that we stood in absolute need of many good and noble qualities brought into exercise by A. Campbell. It is true also that, in vindictiveness and impiousness of manner, he sowed many tares with the wheat. Our progress might not have been so rapid if the influences exerted on the masses had been like that of Thomas Campbell, but we would have had less to *undo*, less to *repent* of."

Bro. Campbell is now a venerable old man, with his work all done, and waiting the will of the Lord to go hence. For forty years of his grand life he wrought for the cause of his great Master, as only one man in a thousand years works. He now rests from his toil, and watches for the beck of his God to sleep his last sleep; and while we are proud of his noble work, we shall not be shy to acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe him. We feel deeply mortified and pained at the preceding. *It is unjust, mean, and truthless.* It is the product of a mind too small to comprehend even one act of Bro. Campbell's life, and just small enough to hate him, and to seek to injure him in his sunset of life. The whole brotherhood have reason to feel insulted by the unmagnanimous thrust. With his brethren it can do Mr. Campbell no harm. This we well know. But after his noble heart ceases to beat, his bigoted religious enemies will wish to tell the world what he is. To them the preceding would be a gem, were it allowed to pass uncontradicted. But we shall particularize.

1. "The reformation had become a real power in the world before A. Campbell embraced it." This statement is untrue in every word and feature of it. It is, however, but another proof of the mournful fact that we have among us those who, though they owe their present position to the great work of Mr. Campbell, are yet unmanly enough to turn on him in his last years and wound him. But for the labors of Mr. Campbell, the writer of this piece would have remained in the Baptist nest which hatched him, and to which we suspect he still belongs, unknown to the world and fame in his life, and unwept and unsung in his death. Why was the statement made? No great truth is brought out by it. It was uncalled for, and is hence wholly gratuitous. The truth is, its sole object was to rob a great and true man of the honor which the world is willing to award him, and to sting his heart at a time when he is incapable of self-defense.

2. "It is true, also, that in vindictiveness and imperiousness of manner, he sowed many tares with the wheat." Here it is gravely implied that in manner Mr. Campbell is *imperious* and *vindictive*. Had he been accused of falsehood and theft, the accusation would have been as just as is the one here alleged. We do not believe there lives a man among the thousands who know Mr. Campbell well, who will pronounce the charge true. Indeed it can not be pronounced true, except by false lips. We have known Mr. Campbell for twenty years, and known him well. We have known him in the pulpit and out of it; known him in the college hall; seen him in public and in private; met him at home and abroad; traveled with him on the highway, and ate at his table; and we pronounce the foregoing charge to be without the semblance of truth.

But what were those *tares* which Mr. Campbell sowed with the wheat? Was it the great truth that the Bible, and that only, teaches

the true religion? Was it that we must accept only what the Bible says as the matter of our faith? Was it that we must do only what it bids as the matter of our duty? Was it that no man's opinion is authoritative in matters of religion; and that in all matters the expressed will of Christ is to be our supreme guide? Was it that all the children of God should be one body; and that there should be no sects and parties? Was it that Home is the scarlet woman, and infant sprinkling sects her harlot daughters? Are these the tares which Mr. Campbell sowed? These are certainly the things which he taught. Does the author of the foregoing piece believe them? If not, why is he in our ranks? If he does, why does he call them tares? We shrewdly suspect the soundness of any man in the faith the moment we see him turn impugner of Mr. Campbell.

3. "Our progress might not have been so rapid if the influences exerted on the masses had been like that of Thomas Campbell, but we would have had less to *undo*, less to *repent* of." What the writer of this left the Baptist ranks and came into ours for we never were at the pains to inquire, and hence did not know. We understand his case now, and wish others to understand it. He is among us to "*undo*" and "*repent*" of the things done by Mr. Campbell. We had heard the writer well spoken of, and were glad to welcome him among us. But if this be his work, we beg to tell him plainly his presence gives us pain; his departure will give us pleasure. Further than this let me tell him, that unless he rewrite the preceding sentences, and retract their offensive contents, he has cast a suspicion over himself, which he will not soon find it easy to remove. We want no men among us to "*undo*" what Mr. Campbell has done; and as for having brethren with us who are *repenting* of his work, we would not give them the pain. We have already had a few among us who have risen up to reform the reformation we plead for, men of the class who feel themselves called upon to "*undo*" what Mr. Campbell has done, and to "*repent*" of his work. We know their end, and feel ashamed of it. We shall be glad to have no more of them.

We shall only add, that to deal in personal reflections on brethren is no part of the business of the *Quarterly*. The thing was, however, to some extent, unavoidable in the present case. Bro. Campbell was attacked by name, without cause. The name of his assailant is signed to the attack. He then, we take for granted, wanted himself to be known as its author. We hence feel that we should do him no injustice were we to send his name and his slander abroad together. Still his name shall be withheld.

FAITH.—Who can give us the best translation of Paul's definition of faith. Let the article cover five *Quarterly* pages.

ORIGINAL SIN.

No inquiry is here proposed into the difficult and perplexing question of the origin of evil. Yet it is hard to touch on sin in any of its countless forms, or to treat even briefly of one of its no less countless features, without being enticed away into that profound and curious question. We may try to ignore it, but the question refuses to be ignored. Despite of us, it will obtrude itself on our notice; and ere we are aware of the fact it has absorbed many a moment's thought, and led us far, very far away into its mazes. Nor to us does it seem either wrong or dangerous, now and then, to bestow on it an inquisitive passing thought. Evil exists among us. This is a fact overwhelming and shocking, still a fact. How now can we, if we would, thrust aside the question: Whence came it? The mind will flush it, and then, when once on the wing, it has a strange vague pleasure in pursuing it. Whether the pursuit ends in anything practically profitable it is not necessary to inquire. It affords pleasure; and that is enough, crime apart, to justify it.

That evil had its origin in Satan and with him, and in and with him alone, may be safely taken for granted. But this is by no means the end of the question in hand. How came it to originate even with him? This is the question. That he was created pure and holy can not be doubted. To say that he was created impure and unholy, that he was created as he now is; in other words, that he has never changed, and that he is not fallen, but that he is to-day what he was when he came from the hands of the Almighty—to say this, is to make God the immediate and direct author of evil. This must not be. Granting, then, that he was created holy, still the question occurs: How came evil to originate with him? Did he know evil before it existed? Did he know it in thought, in conception? If so, who gave him the knowledge? Did the Heavenly Father? And if so, did he not know when giving it to him the use he would make of it? If this, how could he impart to him a knowledge when he knew to what it would lead? He could not have been willing that evil should be brought into actual existence; and if not willing, how could he give the knowledge which he knew would bring in the very thing he was unwilling to have brought in? Or did Satan possess in and of himself, and as belonging to him as Satan, this knowledge; and did he willfully abuse it, and thus bring in evil? Even allowing this, which is, perhaps, the view most accordant with human reason, and the question is still by no means freed from difficulty. For though he possessed this knowledge, still he was pure. The knowledge itself did not defile him. In

this was no evil; and although evil grew out of it, still the knowledge itself was not evil. The conception of sin is not sin; nor the conception of evil, evil. How, now, could a being absolutely pure, with a nature all unfallen, unperverted, but, grant, with only the bare, abstract knowledge of evil, how could this being, without being himself in any sense evil, conceive the purpose to introduce evil? It must be confessed that to this question there is but one answer, and that by no means a satisfactory one, namely, that, unless there be other than human modes of conception, the thing was impossible. Had there been some other great evil mind standing above Satan, and overmatching him in struggle, some other mind imparting to his the bad purpose which gave birth to actual evil, the question would be, as to Satan, easily explained. But such was not the case; at least, not the case that we know of. The purpose to bring in evil had no other origin than in Satan. It was unsuggested to him by another; unprovoked in him by another. It was his thought, his purpose, absolutely, wholly. But how it came to be his, in this life at least we shall never know.

But the case of Satan was not the case with man. Man is not the sole untempted author of human evil. And although he is responsible for it, he is not alone responsible for it. He is responsible jointly with another; for he acted at the suggestion of another, and this implicated both. In the affair of human evil, man acted not of his own accord. He was influenced thereto—influenced, too, by a great outplotting mind which was superior to his in the transaction, and whose cunning designs he could not penetrate. He was unfairly overmatched, and made a tool of, even in the matter of his own act; and although this may not diminish his own sin in the case, the guilt of the whole is at least thereby divided. And in this very circumstance, it may be, lies the foundation of human redemption. Had man sinned without being tempted thereto, as did Satan; and had the purpose to sin originated in his own mind as absolutely and completely as did the purpose to introduce evil originate in Satan's mind, why should God ever have proposed to redeem man any more than he has Satan? I confess I can not see why. God has not proposed to redeem Satan; at least we have no evidence thereof. But why? Satan is a creature; so is man. Both are fallen. If man needs redemption, if it is good for him, best for him, why not so for Satan? And if best for him, why has it not been offered him? It can not be because God is unwilling to save fallen beings; for then salvation would never have been tendered to man. It can not be because God does not love his creatures even when doing wrong, for this again would exclude man. I hence conclude that the reason exists not in God, but either in Satan himself or his act; and since I can not see how it can exist in him, I hence conclude that it must exist in his act. But how in his act? Thus: he was unmoved to his act by the power of another. His act and

the purpose which led to it, and of which his act was the embodiment, originated in himself alone and absolutely. No part of the blame thereof attached to another. He was not incited thereto, except as he incited himself. Hence he could plead absolutely no excuse whatever. He could not say: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Not at all. He could say nothing, except that I, of my own will, untempted and unprovoked thereto, did the deed. Now had this been the case with man, I repeat, I see not upon what ground God could have proposed to redeem him. The fair presumption is he could not have done it.

But these questions, though interesting, deeply so, are untaught, and must hence be pursued no further. They have not been introduced for the purpose of solving the question of the origin of evil. Very far from it. That question is for the present with us an insoluble one. On the contrary, they have been introduced merely to awaken thought, and as constituting a sort of necessary preface to the subject now before us. For the present we drop them.

What now is the doctrine of original sin as popularly understood and explained? Concisely this: *that Adam's first sin has been transmitted to all his descendants, and that, in consequence thereof, they are all guilty and corrupt in the sight of God.*

The extent to which this doctrine has tyrannized over the human mind for long ages past, and the influence it has exerted in shaping religious thought and determining religious practice, are points of such magnitude as to be difficult to define. To say that its sway has been almost absolute is certainly not going too far. Not a religious denomination in Christendom has been able to escape its influence; while many of them have had their tenets determined almost wholly by it. How it ever came to obtain the footing it has, or how it now succeeds in holding that footing as firmly as it does, we certainly know not. Not a book on religion can you read, nor a sermon hear, without being met at some point or turn therein by some feature of the doctrine. Even the social circle and the small neighborhood debate are affected by it. Creeds and commentaries, books, debates, heads, and hearts are filled with it. That a thing not once named in the Bible, nor even implied, should have wielded an influence so widespread, and shall I add so disastrous, is certainly matter for grave thought, if not for wonder. What is there in the doctrine which gives it this marvelous power? It is not an intuition; no facts in human history avouch it; nor is it sustained by the Bible. Whence, then, I repeat, has it its power? If in the course of this investigation we do not elicit an answer to this question, we shall at least, it may be, discover reasons to be satisfied without one.

The doctrine of original sin has always struck me as singularly arbitrary. And this is the first objectionable feature which I shall notice

in it. How is it that only the *first* sin of Adam has been fixed upon as transmissible? Why should the first sin only be so regarded and not the second also? With what properties was the first endowed which the second has not? Or what deadly influence inheres in that which is not in this, that the first and only the first should have been made transmissible? When men single out Adam's first sin, and say of that, it is transmissible, but deny this property to the second or any other of his sins, and all this in the silence of revelation, to me I am free to own their conduct seems arbitrary, if not whimsical. Did anything in the divine government demand the transmission of the first sin? Why did not that same thing demand the transmission of the second,—nay, the transmission of all sins? Is sin itself of such a nature as to demand its transmission? If so, then it demands to be universally transmitted; that is, all sin should be transmitted, and not one be transmitted and the rest be left. These positions strike the human mind as too clear and too just to need amplification or proof. To state them is enough. The plain truth is, that men have proceeded without reason and without revelation when they have made only the first sin of Adam transmissible. That it is transmissible is either an arbitrary assertion, or a conclusion resulting from premises which do not warrant it.

Again: how is it that only *Adam's* sin is held to have been transmissible, and not also the sins of others? Other men have sinned besides Adam; other men had children besides him. Yet, among all the countless millions of whom this is true, not one can be named of whom it is pretended to be said, "His sin has been transmitted," save Adam only. Why is it so? To answer, that God so decreed it would certainly be entirely satisfactory provided this were really the case; but it is not. Hence we are still left to press the question: Why is it so? Here again the doctrine of original sin seems arbitrary, and to proceed without warrant of reason.

But we are clearly proceeding too fast. The doctrine in question assumes that Adam's first sin *has been transmitted* to all his descendants. Now before this feature of the doctrine, which is its chief or main feature, can be subjected to a decisive test, we must first have a clear and true definition of sin. Without this definition we shall be constantly liable to fall into error; besides, our conclusions will not be felt to be final and irrefutable. We have said we must have a clear, true definition of sin. But this is only in effect saying we must have a scriptural definition; for if we have a scriptural definition, the strong probability is that it will be clear, and certainly it will be true.

The following, then, is what we are in quest of: "*Sin is the transgression of the law.*" In making an application of this definition we must not construe the word transgress too strictly; that is, take it in its

severe Latin acceptance. Transgress (from *transgredior*) literally and strictly means to go beyond a prescribed boundary or limit. It assumes that God has laid down a line, as his law, and then said: You shall not go beyond it, The transgression, of course, consists in passing over this line. But this is not so much a definition of sin generally, as a definition of a particular species of it. It is a definition of sin, it is true; but it is not a definition of all sin, not being sufficiently comprehensive. For, clearly, if God lay down a line, and require us in our conduct to come up to it, and we fail, this is as much a transgression as though we had gone beyond it. The definition, then, in this view, is too narrow. We shall hence take the word transgress to denote any violation of the divine law. And this is clearly the true view and the true nature of sin. It is simply the breaking of the divine law, no matter what may be the specific nature of the act done.

Having now ascertained what sin is, the next thing in order is to classify it. And this classification is not a matter of mere form, but one of necessity; not a necessity growing out of the force of mere logical rules, but one founded in the nature of the case. Without the classification our procedure would be confused, and our conclusions seem doubtful. To what class of things, then, does sin, as now defined, belong? We use the vague word things, because it is the most comprehensive word at command, and certainly includes the thing to be classified.

First, then, sin is not a human weakness. However much it may result from human weakness, it is not itself a weakness. Whatever is strictly a human weakness is no sin. And although sin may intensify human weakness, and for many forms and degrees of it we may be held responsible, still it is no sin. Weakness is either natural, such as belongs to all men, or derived, such as belongs to but few. But for neither this nor that can we be held accountable; for neither is sin. A weakness may be sinful; that is, it may strongly tend to sin, or incline to it, still it is itself no sin. Sin is something, not more real certainly, but more actual than a weakness.

Second, neither is sin a hereditament. Whatever a man inherits is no sin. What we hold by inheritance we hold without volition on our part; and what is thus held can never be sin. That which is unwilled and unsanctioned by us is in no sense sin. What else it may be I can not say; but it is not sin. This much can safely be said. But it may be replied that I am anticipating, and taking for granted the very point involved. The doctrine in question assumes that sin *is transmitted*; and here I am denying that a hereditament is a sin, which is the same thing as to deny that anything transmitted is a sin. True I am denying that anything inherited is a sin, and this by implication denies the truth of the doctrine in question; but this is not assuming the point in dispute, neither is it taking anything for

granted. To deny the truth of the doctrine I certainly have a legitimate right; and this right I shall exercise to the full extent of denying it in every form that a denial can assume. This much is aimed at; no more.

Since, then, sin is neither a human weakness nor a hereditament, the question recurs: What is it, or to what class of things docs it belong? In order to obtain an answer to this question, suppose we select any one sin of which we can form a conception, and analyze it with the view of discovering the most general conception which it contains. Perhaps this conception may enable us to effect the classification we are aiming at. We select, then, the sin of taking the name of God in vain. What now is the most comprehensive conception in this sin? Is it taking the name of God *in vain*? This, instead of being the most comprehensive, is the very narrowest conception in the sin, and is the sin itself. Or is it simply using the name of God? Certainly this is more comprehensive than using it in vain. But this is not necessarily a sin, and may be both right and a duty. But this is not the point we are in quest of. Is simply using the name of God the largest conception in the sin in hand? It is not. What, then, is that conception? This question can be best answered by asking another, namely, What is using the name of God? It is an *act*. And this is the most comprehensive conception in the sin. It is, then, the conception which enables us to classify the sin. What, then, is the sin of using the name of God in vain? *It is an act*. Now, as we classify this sin, we classify all sin. *Every sin is, therefore, in the last analysis, an act*. And nothing which is not an act is a sin. As to what the act is in itself, this is not the question. It may be an act of the mind, a mere thought; an act of the tongue; an act of the hand—this affects not the case. If it be a sin, then is it an act; and if it be not an act, then is it no sin.

Let the reader now form to himself the true conception of sin. This done, then let him try to conceive of a sin which is not an act. He will find the task impossible. When he has stripped the sin of everything which is purely accidental; when he has divested it of everything not essential; when, in other words, he has reduced it to its simplest and purest form, he will find it an act. Not that he will find an act merely essential to sin among other things necessary; but that he will find an act to be the very sin itself, and even the conception of sin impossible without it.

Let the reader carefully note our logical position here. It is strictly negative. We do not undertake to prove that there is no sin which is not an act. This might be very difficult, indeed impossible. We undertake no such task. Strictly speaking, we deny that there is a sin which is not an act. Hence, if any affirm that there is a sin which is not an act, on him we devolve the task of proving it. And in no

way, perhaps, could such person be more successfully refuted than by attempting to make his position good. His failure would be certain; and failure here would be conviction.

Assuming, then, that each individual sin is an act, and what follows? Simply *that sin is absolutely intransmissible*; for the reason that no act can be transmitted. To this reply is impossible. The conclusion is final; and though not an intuition, it possesses all the inherent force of one. But when we say that an act is intransmissible, let us be understood. We speak not of the consequences of an act. These may be transmitted indefinitely as to extent, and also as to number. We speak of the act itself proper. Of this only, do we say it can not be transmitted; but of the act itself, we do say this. Is the thing conceivable? If not, then it can never be realized. In other words, if the thing be impossible in thought, then is it so absolutely. Can we, then, conceive of the transmission of an act? Can we, in other words, think the thing? I do not mean think of it, or about it; for this I well know we can do; but I mean, strictly, can we think it. Let the effort be made. I lift my pen and write the word sin. Whose act is this? Of course it is mine. Now by what conceivable process would any human being set about proving or showing that this act can pass to another, and become his act as really as it is mine? It is idle to raise the question who the other is, whether he is my child or not. This changes not the case. For, obviously, it is just as easy to show how the act can be transmitted to my neighbor, as it is to show how it can be transmitted to my child. True, my act may affect my child in many ways, in not one of which it affects my neighbor; but this is not owing to the fact that my act is transmissible to the one, and not to the other, but to the relation which the one and not the other sustains to me. The question is not whether the *consequences* of my act can be shown to reach my neighbor as readily as they do my child. This, of course, they do not; hence it can not be shown. But whether it is not just as easy to conceive of the transmission of my *act*, not its consequences, to my neighbor as to my child, whether, in a word, it is possible to conceive of either. This is the question; and I must say I think it impossible to settle it in any but one way. The thing is inconceivable, and can not be. And what is in this respect inconceivable in my case has never occurred in that of another; that is, if it is impossible to conceive how my act can be transmitted to and become the act of my child or neighbor, then has Adam's Sin never been transmitted to his children. This is unanswerable.

If sin were some mere hue or taint of the soul, or if it were a mere moral weakness or physical infirmity, if it were an organic defect, or any common trait of human nature, then it might be argued with some show of reason that it is transmissible. But sin is none of these things. And although we talk and write of sin as if it were a sort

of abstract thing, as whiteness or virtue; or as if it might and did have an independent existence of action, still there is no such thing as sin in this sense. Sin exists only in action; and when we individualize it, as we always must to get the true conception of it; when, in other words, we conceive of it in the concrete, which is the only form in which it has any actual existence, then each sin stands apart by itself as an act, and is an act. It is consequently wholly and absolutely intransferable.

Now assuming the foregoing premises to be correct, and I confess I see not on what ground they can be shown to be false, it then follows that the doctrine in question, the doctrine of original sin, is wholly false—false in every feature and circumstance. The doctrine is, that Adam's first sin has been transmitted to all his descendants, and that they are all in virtue thereof guilty and corrupt in the sight of God. But Adam's first sin was an act. No act is transferable. Hence Adam's first sin has not been transferred. Consequently, the doctrine which so teaches is false. As a refutation, I must consider this complete. I see not how nor where it can be attacked.

But one reason, doubtless, why the doctrine has been so long and firmly held, is to be found in the difficulty of separating suffering from guilt. That we all suffer in consequence of Adam's sin is universally conceded. From this it has been inferred that we must be guilty. But this inference is not legitimate. Suffering certainly implies guilt somewhere, but not necessarily the guilt of the suffering party. Christ suffered while in the flesh, but this does not imply his guilt. Thousands suffer daily in ways which imply no guilt. Indeed, nothing is more common than to witness suffering where we know there is not even the imputation of guilt. A party, say, is in a pleasure-boat, on an excursion out at sea. The pilot intentionally runs the boat on a rock. The whole party is lost. Here many suffer; but surely their suffering does not prove their guilt. The guilt is the guilt of one, not of all. All suffer, though only one is guilty. This is too clear to need amplification. So in the case in hand. We all suffer, it is true, for Adam's sin, his first sin; but this by no means proves either that the act for which we suffer is our act, or that we are in any way implicated in its guilt. All the fact proves is, that the relation which we sustain to the guilty party is such as to involve us in the consequences of his deed. This much the fact proves, no more.

Very early in the history of Christianity men began to speculate on the nature of sin. They had already been long speculating on the nature of evil. These speculations, it is true, were confined chiefly to those countries where the Greek language was spoken, and where Greek modes of thought were in the ascendant. For the fact is well known, that the Greeks were a very speculative people. When, then, they of that day entered the kingdom where fact takes the place of

speculation, and faith that of opinion, they did not abandon their old habits to which they had been bred, but still continued to indulge their favorite pursuit. They soon introduced the question: Is sin transmissible. This question they continued to discuss for a long time. Many stood hotly for it; many stood hotly against it. Its fate seemed long doubtful. But Satan never awoke that debate with the intention of allowing it soon to lull. He saw too much in it subversive of Christianity, too much to subserve his cause, to allow it to cease. Not since the fall of man had so grand a field of ruin opened up before his mind. Never had question been started so fraught with the interests of man. No wonder, then, that the controversy ran long and high. No wonder that great dialecticians were ranged in scowling ranks on adverse sides. No wonder that parties sprang out of the contest, young, strong, and wrathful. No wonder that heresies were bred in countless numbers. No wonder that schism followed schism, declension followed declension, and apostasy followed apostasy; all this is no matter of wonder when we remember who had the deepest interest in the storm, and consequently who was guiding it.

At length the controversy was brought formally to a close; and it was decided that *sin is transmissible*. In that day and in that decision was laid the chief stone in the foundation of the great apostasy, which has ever since been the curse of earth. It is impossible to exaggerate, or to enumerate the effects of that decision. Eternity alone can fully disclose them. But it was not merely decided that sin is transmissible. Had the decision stopped here it would have proved a very harmless thing. It was decided that sin, that is, Adam's first sin, has actually been transmitted to all his children; and that they are all in God's sight guilty of it. This was the final decision; or rather the decision which became the great fruitful source of so many other decisions. The religious world now had its premise,—fertile, fatal premise. It had only to proceed to the task of drawing inferences; and this the world was in a mood to do.

The first question it now raised was this: Since sin has been transmitted, has it not been transmitted to all alike? This question, of course, it was compelled to decide in the affirmative. It dared not accuse God of partiality; that is, it dared not accuse him of causing sin to be transmitted to one person, and not to another. All, then, by the decision were involved in the guilt of original sin. Next they called to mind their infants, all of whom they had now decided to be sinners in Heaven's sight. Many of these infants they knew died in infancy. They now trembled to ask the question, which just here flashed upon their mind. Still they had no alternative left. Ask it they must, painful as it was. The question was this: Since our infants die, and since they are guilty of original sin, *may they not be damned?* To debate this question was idle. They had already yielded themselves

to the premises which forced the reluctant conclusion on them. That conclusion no mind was so blunt as not to see. It was that their infants were damned. Thus the doctrine of infant damnation arose from the doctrine of original sin. But this is only one of the many doctrines to which it gave rise, and perhaps one of the most innocent of all to which it did give rise.

Here it may be well to pause long enough to note the fact, that Calvinism in its most loathsome form, and the doctrine of original sin, different though they are, yet land their votaries very near the same mark. Calvinism places infants in hell, for no crime whatever, either of the parent or the child, personal or transmitted. Original sin places them there, for no sin of the child, but for a transmitted one of the parent. According to neither is the infant placed in hell for its own sin. Both, then, alike make God the author of the damnation of the innocent. In other words, both represent God as creating some infants for no purpose but to damn them, and as damning them for no reason except that he has created them. The difference between the two doctrines just at this point is a difference not worth the drawing.

I should perhaps rest here long enough to state that the word transmitted is not the word always used in discussions and defenses of the doctrine of original sin. The word imputed is also very often used. But of the two I confess I like the word transmitted the best. If sin can actually be transmitted, and this is what at least the advocates of the doctrine affect to believe, then the transmitted sin becomes as really the sin of the party to whom transmitted, as though he had committed it himself. In this case there is, to say no more, the semblance of justice in contending that he may be rightly condemned. But when the sin is said to be merely imputed, there is an implied confession that the party condemned is guilty in no sense. He neither commits the sin himself, nor is it transmitted to him. To contend that in this case he may be condemned, is to extinguish every vestige of the sense of justice in the human soul. I hence prefer the word transmitted.

But the consequences growing out of the doctrine of original sin, were by no means exhausted when infant damnation was deduced. Other doctrines still more disastrous than this resulted. The premise had now been laid, and men had only to ask what conclusions it warranted. Following more the guidance of their dark reason than the teachings of Holy Writ, they seldom paused to ask how far their bold deductions corresponded with the voice of inspiration. Many of them, it may be, did not care; and these lent themselves as the tools to complete the fearful superstructure which Satan was urging forward so actively. Others, if they lifted a remonstrating voice at all, were soon silenced in the clamor for innovation and improvement. Thus the work went on.

Men had now accepted, as a thing no longer in debate, the dogma of infant damnation. Yet in their souls they felt that it must be false. But how to escape from it was the difficulty. They had allowed themselves to be caught in the meshes of a cruel logic, and disengagement seemed impossible. Still the effort must be made. To live under the burden of a conclusion so shocking as the one they had now accepted, was felt to be little better than living without the consolations of religion altogether. They felt that surely relief would come, if relief were sought in the right way. And to whom could they so successfully go as the Savior, or to what so safely as the Word of God? They thus illustrated the truth, that when men are constructing heresy they have no use for the Bible; but when the day for correction comes, then that book is a precious thing. Accordingly they now resorted to the Bible to see what provision it had made for the salvation of infants. Its silence was ominous and oppressive; and no wonder. As it had not started the speculations which had landed them where they were, very naturally it provided no direct remedy for them. Still they felt that if the Bible afford no relief, then none was to be expected. So forward they carried their investigations. They soon found where it is said: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." But this, they said, can be no provision for our infants; for our infants can not believe. Hence they concluded that on the ground of faith, that great ground of salvation, their infants could expect nothing. So on they read. They next found where it is said: "God commands all men everywhere to repent." But this again contained no remedy for infants; for infants could not repent. Thus their prospects did not improve. At length they found where it is said: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Ah! they said, we have it now. The word "us" is to be taken in its most comprehensive sense, even as including the whole human family. From this word none are excluded, but in it all are included. Then it embraces our infants. This is clear; it is indisputable. Next the word "saved" meant saved from sin, saved from all sin, saved from original sin. The conclusion was now easy; a child could see it. And then it was so obviously scriptural that it was absolutely safe. *So they baptized their infants.* Thus also emerged infant baptism from the doctrine of original sin. Hence both infant damnation, except in the case of fatalists, and infant baptism have one and the same origin, being twin offshoots from the doctrine of original sin.

As to infant damnation, it may be looked upon as comparatively innocent; indeed innocent altogether, except in so far as it lent its influence to bring in infant baptism. No one is really injured by it, except the parent, and he only temporarily and in his groundless fears. But can we say so little for, infant baptism? Very far from it. Indeed, of all the delusions which have ever taken possession of any

portion of the human family, this must be pronounced the very chief. Combine them all in one, compute their whole joint effect, and infant baptism has kept, and is this day keeping, more people out of the kingdom of heaven than all the rest together. I positively think it, in the magnitude of its influence on the world for injury, second only to the fall itself. It has been and still is the deep broad channel which from century to century has poured into the bosom of the apostasy the countless millions whom that gigantic power has sent to hell. Indeed, what would the apostasy be without it? what could it do without it? What would be all the fragmentary bodies of the apostasy, as the Methodist body, the Presbyterian body, the Episcopalian body—what would all these be, were they to give back to the world all whom they now count as theirs in virtue solely of infant baptism, or rather infant rantism? They would be simply nothing; they would be extinct. I doubt whether the estimate does not fall below rather than rise above the truth, when I say that the kingdom of heaven does not this day contain one-tenth of the human beings it would have contained had it not been for the invention of infant baptism. Indeed even this estimate most likely falls millions short of the reality. And when we further consider the certainty of its continuance till the dawn of the millennium, and the fact of its still certainly holding in its strong grip those whom it now has there, the power of speech fails to depict its enormity. For let no one flatter himself that it will ever cease till the day in which the Savior returns. It is an engine of mischief and ruin of too grand proportions ever to become obsolete. Satan will fight his last battle before he will give it up, or allow it to fall into desuetude. He knows too well what he can accomplish by it ever to allow it to pass from his hand. No, no; while man can be deceived, and error has power to injure, it will never pass away.

But although the two preceding doctrines, upon which we have now been commenting, did not result from Adam's first sin, but only from erroneous views of it, still there were real evils which did grow out of that sin, to which we must now turn for awhile.

Among these we name as chief the fact that we were all thereby rendered mortal, or that we all die in consequence thereof. Let not the reader be startled, but no man, save Adam, ever yet died for his own sin. We all die for the sin of another, not for our own. And this we feel to be a great hardship, in heart we feel it; and I believe the Lord himself so regards it. But is it really so that we all die for another's sin, and not for our own? This can not be, says the objector. Is not a crime committed, he asks, against the State, and is not the guilty party arraigned, tried for it, condemned, and executed? Now, it is continued, does not this party die for his own sin, and not for that of another? Suppose the party had never committed the crime, would he not in that case as certainly have died as he does in this? Or sup-

pose the execution of sentence to be suspended, will he not still die any how? What, then, is the relation of his crime to his death? Simply this, that his crime is made the occasion of executing against him, for the sake of punishment, an old unrepealed statute which runs in these words: "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return." But this statute was enacted against him in consequence of Adam's sin, and not on account of his own, and in virtue of it he dies. So, then, he really, after all, dies for the sin of another. But suppose further, that after Adam committed his first sin, there had never been committed another, either by himself or by any one of his descendants, would not all the human family, nevertheless, as certainly have died as they do now? Surely so. Then it follows, truly, that all die, as now said, for Adam's first sin. No matter how a man may live, whether he sin or sin not, he dies, and dies only for the sin of another. Certainly his own sin may have the effect of enfeebling him, and shortening much his days, still for it he does not die. For Adam's sin we die; for our own sin we are judged. This is the true view.

But I said that it is a hardship to die for another's deed. This I believe to be the universal feeling of mankind. But I did not say it is unjust. Hard it is; unjust it is not. God can subject a man to what is hard; never to what is unjust. It was hard for Christ to die for the sins of others, yet it was not unjust. And though a hardship, still it is a hardship but for the time being. It is a hardship when seen ahead; it will not appear one when seen behind. When looked back on, from the Savior's side, I imagine death will not seem much of a hardship, if it seem any at all. It is in the prospect that it wears its terrors; in the reality it will have but few, if any.

But for the sake of carrying forward the train of thought now in hand, and for the sake of illustrating still more fully the principles now enounced, let me distribute the human family into three great classes, which shall exhaust the human family. I shall, then, let the Christian represent the first class; the sinner the second class; and the infant the third and remaining class. To one of these classes we shall refer every human being.

I. The Christian. And what do we mean by a Christian? Precisely a man who, under Christ, has his sins forgiven. For whatever else a man may be, if his sins be not remitted he is not a Christian; and whatever else he may be, if his sins are remitted he is a Christian.

Let us now suppose the doctrine of original sin to be true; that is, let us suppose that Adam's first sin has been transmitted to all the human family. When the Christian's own sins are forgiven, what becomes of the transmitted sin? Of course, it is either forgiven, or it is not. If it is not forgiven, how stands the case of the man? His own sins are forgiven, the transmitted sin is not. He is then partly for-

given, and partly not. Suppose he should now die in this condition, how is he to be saved? Surely he would have to be condemned. He could not be saved. Or when his own sins are forgiven, suppose the transmitted sin to be forgiven also. For whose sin, then, does the man die? Not for his own, for these are all forgiven; not for the transmitted sin, for that too is forgiven. For neither, therefore, does he die. Why, then, does he die at all? Surely the Lord does not forgive him, and then subject him to death for forgiven sins. The plain truth is, the man does not die for his own sins at all; hence the forgiveness of them has no effect to prevent his death. If he died for his own sins, then when his own sins are forgiven he should not die at all, but live forever. Clearly he dies for Adam's sin, not because it has been transmitted to him, but because the Heavenly Father has appointed death, the death of all, to be the penalty of that sin. Hence the forgiveness of his own sins can have no effect to prevent that penalty.

The Christian man, then, goes into the grave for another's deed, not his own. This looks, I repeat, very hard. To that deed he was in no sense privy. It had neither the approval of his mind, nor the sanction of his heart. All this the Heavenly Father takes fully into the account, and for it makes provision. For "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." That is, as on the one hand, all die and go into the grave for Adam's sin. So on the other, all come out of it and live again through Christ. Death and the grave come from Adam, life and the resurrection from Christ. Thus all that is lost in Adam is regained in Christ. In the one life is lost; in the other it is regained.

But this is not all the Heavenly Father does for us in Christ. He does not simply restore to us that which he took from us. This he does, it is true; but he does more than this. He gives us, besides life, a spiritual body. What a spiritual body is I know not. It is not spirit; it is only spiritual. It is a body; but then it must be either something more or something less. Certainly it is something different; for it is spiritual. Now this spiritual body is a better body than Adam's ever was. It is better in two respects: 1. It is spiritual; 2. Incorruptible. But Adam's body never was spiritual, neither was it ever incorruptible. It was at first incorrupt; but never incorruptible. It was from the first capable of being corrupted, which is the force of the word corruptible; and when he sinned, actually became corrupt. So, then, after the resurrection, the Christian will have all that Adam had, and, besides, a spiritual and incorruptible body. His condition, therefore, will be, even in this imperfect view of it, far better than Adam's ever was. But, besides an incorruptible body, he will never be liable to be tempted; hence will never sin. His great enemy will then be bound, forever bound. His influence over the righteous will, at the resurrection, cease forever. He will never touch them more.

This will make the second state of man incomparably better than the first of Adam. Whether the earth, when refitted up, will be greatly better than it was before the curse, I am unable to say. I doubt whether it will be much better; and am free to confess I see no reason in the nature of things why it should be any. If the spiritual body creates no necessity for any great improvement, I see nothing else which can. But be this as it may, still man's condition in his new estate is to be inconceivably better than ever Adam's was. So that the Heavenly Father does not merely compensate man, so to speak, in Christ for what he lost in Adam. He does far more than this. Indeed, by as much as man is now below what Adam was at first, by so much, do we conceive, he will then be above what Adam was at best. In view of all this, therefore, we can hardly any longer feel it to be a hardship even to die. Or if we so feel it still, yet is it a hardship from which we not only shrink not, but which we joyously welcome. So much, then, for the case of the Christian man.

Here seems a fitting place to turn aside long enough to notice a speculative point of sufficient importance, perhaps, to justify a brief passing notice. Since while Adam was yet pure he was tempted and sinned, why, it is sometimes asked, may not the Christian, even after he is invested with his new spiritual body, and placed in his new and everlasting home—why may he not again sin, and involve himself in ruin a second time? Certainly I can not answer why; yet I am firm in the faith that he never will sin. In the first place, the very word used to describe his spiritual body is sufficiently indicative of the fact. The spiritual body will be *incorruptible*. It will not be simply incorrupt or pure, but *incorruptible*; that is, incapable of being corrupted. No more can that body be corrupted than can the Father himself, for the same word is used to describe them both. Now the fact that the spiritual body will be incorruptible implies that in that state the Christian can not sin; for if he could sin he could corrupt his body, and if he did sin would corrupt it. Or if he *can not* sin, at least he *never will*, which amounts practically to the same thing, and is perhaps the better view. So that the Christian need have no fear, should he be so happy as to attain to the resurrection of the just, that he will ever sin more.

Again: the great enemy is then clearly to be imprisoned, never more to be released. And this implies that his power, over the righteous at least, is then to cease forever; for it is only while he is roaming abroad that he seems to be able to influence them. After he is finally cast away, ransomed man will be forever free from his power. Temptation will then cease forever, and with it sin.

II.—The case of the sinner. The sinner, like the Christian, dies not for his own sin, but for the sin of Adam. But since for another's deed he goes into the grave, so through Christ he comes out of it; and

this though he lives and dies rejecting him. Through Adam's sin all die; through Christ, all, whether saint or sinner, will be made alive. So that the sinner, in this particular, is just as much indebted to the Savior as is the Christian, since he receives from him precisely the same benefit. The difference, then, between the saint and the sinner, when both stand before God, will be no difference attributable to the Savior. Of that difference the sinner himself will be the sole author, and for it alone will be responsible. The Savior does for him in this life all he can possibly do. He provides for him salvation, tenders him an invitation to accept it, and warns him of the consequences of rejection. The rest is left with himself. Besides this, in the last day the Savior awakes him from the grave just as he does the Christian. If, then, a difference still exists, for it the sinner himself must account. He has wrought it. Thus the sinner also receives back through Christ all he lost in Adam. He, perhaps, receives nothing more; but this much he does receive. When, then, he is assigned his lot according to his deeds, so much below the Christian, for this he must blame himself alone; no one else. He enjoys all the provisions the Christian enjoys, has all his opportunities, all his chances. If, then, he uses them not as the Christian uses them, and hence attains not his estate, the sinner, not the Lord, is chargeable.

But here it will be asked: With what kind of body does the sinner come forth, since not with a spiritual body? Or does he come forth with any body at all? I answer: I know nothing about these matters, and feel no interest to speculate on them. The sinner comes forth to be punished in hell forever for his sins. This I pray to escape, but I am without even curiosity on the foregoing questions. Let him who wishes to spend his time over them, do so; I have none to spend. This much may be added, that it is not the sinner's spirit which is raised in the last day. This at death goes into the unseen, and there stays till the moment of return. It is his body which is raised; and if not his body, since it is not his spirit, then is he not raised at all. But this is against the Word of God, and therefore false. I hence conclude, at least, that the sinner's body will be raised. But whether it will differ from the body which he lays off at death, I know not. It will certainly differ in this respect, that it will now be immortal, and not liable to waste and decay as it now does. Beyond this I conjecture nothing, and shall say nothing.

III.—The case of the infant. Not even is the little infant an exception to the rule that all die for Adam's sin. It, like the Christian and the sinner, dies for no deed of its own. This is so clear, that to state it is enough. It dies in Adam, or for his deed, but through Christ is made alive from the grave. It lays down at death a mortal, but in the resurrection receives, like the Christian, a spiritual body. And so stands among the ransomed by the blood of Christ. But the case

of the infant, indeed all the cases now named, need, in one respect, a still fuller examination; and this seems a suitable place to give it.

Is suffering the only effect to which we have been subjected on account of Adam's sin? This much has certainly resulted from it, but has nothing more? I confess myself ready to admit other results; yet I wish to speak with caution; especially do I wish, where the Word of God is silent, to let everything said stand forth in its true conjectural character. Has not Adam's sin, then, besides inducing death, had the effect to corrupt all mankind? In one respect I feel satisfied it has; in another, confident it has not. This point was very briefly noticed in a former number of the *Quarterly*. Its importance entitles it, I believe, to a still further consideration.

That Adam's sin corrupted Adam, corrupted his whole nature, we are, it seems to me, compelled to admit, Surely he was not as pure, in the sight of God, after he sinned as before. Otherwise the Heavenly Father would never have withdrawn from his presence. That there is impurity and corruption in the sight of God none can deny. Sin alone can produce them. Adam sinned, and hence became corrupt in all his nature. But what was Adam's nature,—of what did it consist? Clearly, of Adam's flesh and Adam's spirit. Had God annihilated that flesh and extinguished that spirit, none of the man would have remained. But now to what extent have we inherited Adam's nature? for that to whatever extent we have inherited his nature we have inherited the corruption inherent therein after sin seems to me to be of the nature of an intuition. I see not how it can be questioned. We have, then, all inherited a body from Adam. This much, at least, is certain. That we are his descendants' is admitted on all hands; but this admission extends only to the body. This body we inherit from the fallen Adam, not from the unfallen. That is, his nature became corrupt before the inheritance began to run. Hence, since we inherit from a corrupted nature, the nature we inherit is corrupt. This determines the character of the body. In its origin and in itself it is a thing fallen and corrupt. But beyond this we boldly deny the derivation from Adam of any corruption. Beyond this, as to corruption, his sin has not affected us. It induces death and corrupts the body, but no more.

But our spirits we derive not from Adam. These we get immediately from God. At least we must so hold for the present; though, were the point disputed, it can not be said to be free from doubt. How well the doubt is founded we do not undertake to say; we merely state the fact.

The grounds on which the non-derivation of the spirit from Adam rests are chiefly these:

1. The general opinion of mankind. That it is the general conviction of the human family that the spirit is an immediate gift from God, may be taken for granted. Indeed, a man is very seldom met

with who denies it. Yet the ground is not conclusive. The opinion may be right, still its mere existence is not conclusive thereof. But in the light of logic, the existence of the opinion, and especially its very general prevalence, raise a presumption of its truth of such a nature as to devolve the burden of proof on him who should deny it. This, however, merely indicates the state of the question.

2. "The Lord layeth the foundation of the earth, *and formeth the spirit of man within him.*" (Zech. xii., 1.) From this it is clear: 1. That the spirit of man is not eternal, but created. 2. That the Lord forms it within him. The inference from this, which seems easiest is, that at the formation of the body, the Lord creates within each man his spirit, and hence that it is not derived. The passage is not decisive of the point, but I believe is fairly presumptive of it.

3. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, *and the spirit shall return to God, who gave it.*" This passage, as a proof, is defective in this: that it does not assert that the spirit is an *immediate* gift from God. Yet that this is its most natural implication I think clear. Hardly is it consistent with the idea that the spirit is a gift from God only as it is derived through Adam. With one of the two views it must agree; and with the former the agreement seems least difficult. I shall hence accept it as correct.

Since, then, we derive not our spirits from Adam (*most probably*), it follows that they have never been corrupted by his sin. From him we get our bodies; and as is the source from which they come, so are they—corrupt. But from God we get our spirits; and as is the source from which we get them, so are they—pure. Not only so, but they remain pure up to the time when we commit our first sin; but the instant we commit this it corrupts our spirits. Adam's sin has corrupted my body; but my own sin alone has power to corrupt my spirit. For that I die, and not for this; for this I am judged, and not for that; that is, I die for the sin which corrupts my body, but am judged for the one which corrupts my spirit.

Consequently when the infant comes into the world, it comes with a body corrupted by Adam's sin, but with a spirit pure from the hand of God. It dies, however, before it commits any sin of its own. Hence at death its spirit is unstained by sin, and consequently returns to Him who gave it. If this be not the true solution of the case of the infant, I confess my inability to see it.

The man who is a Christian lives to the time when he commits sins. These corrupt his spirit. Adam's sin has corrupted his body, to which his own sins have added. His own sins, however, through the blood of Christ, are all forgiven. For these, consequently, he can never be condemned. Hence, though he dies in Adam, he rises in Christ; and there being no sin standing against him, he rises to a spiritual body and eternal life. Such is a compressed view of the case of the Christian.

The man who is a sinner lives to the age when he commits sin. These are not forgiven. He dies for Adam's sin, but through Christ is made alive. On rising, he finds his own sins standing against him. For these he is condemned, and driven from the presence of God forever. Such is the mournful fate of the sinner.

The view of sin now presented, and it alone, solves the questions of original sin and human depravity. There is no such thing as original sin in the popular sense of the phrase; that is, in the sense of Adam's sin being transmitted to all his children. This is an invention of the Devil, to enable him the more effectually to introduce direct spiritual influence, as essential to conversion, and infant sprinkling. By the former, he is keeping thousands out of the church who otherwise would be in it; by the latter, he is bringing thousands into the (*so-called*) church, who can not enter the true. The invention is a grand one. Neither is there any such thing as total depravity, in the popular sense of the phrase, which is, that Adam's sin has wholly corrupted man in both body and spirit. It has corrupted his body, but not his spirit. His own sin alone, not Adam's, corrupts his spirit. When he sins, not before, then is he corrupt in both his natures, flesh and spirit, but this is not the total depravity of the day. I hence conclude the total depravity of the day to be false.

There yet remains only one point more to be noticed. Paul says: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned.*" (Rom. v., 12.) Accepting this as the true sense of the original, which is doubtful, and the apostle asserts that "*all have sinned;*" and this *all* has to be so construed as to include the whole human family, and hence, of course, infants. In what sense, then, have infants sinned? By being in their flesh represented in Adam when he sinned; and this is the sin which is not "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." It was not the actual personal sin of the descendant; hence it neither corrupted his spirit, nor, on his part, created any responsibility. It was the sin of the descendant in so far only as he was present in his parent as representative, when his parent sinned, which was only in his flesh. But to the extent of this representation it both corrupted him and caused his death. But in no sense did this either involve or affect his spirit, it not being represented. And this is a transaction of the same kind as that in which Levi, long before he was born, paid tenths in Abraham. If any object to it, with him I can have no quarrel, since he calls in question the justice of the appointments of God.

Here, now, we close our examination of one of the most difficult questions which can arise in the Christian's thought. In treating it, our claims to exemption from error are low. If any is not satisfied, and can do better, we shall gladly welcome his courteous and well-written piece to our pages.

CREEDS.

HE that makes or accepts a creed—a human thing, a monument of impudent folly, thus rejecting the Bible, virtually and actually, as the creed of the party to which he belongs, must assume one of the following positions, one horn of a four-horned monster:

1. The Bible, as a creed, is *too short*; or does not contain enough.
2. The Bible, as a creed, is *too long*; or it contains more than should be found in a creed.
3. The Bible, as a creed, though it contains, as to quantity and quality of matter, neither more nor less than should be found in a creed, is not in the *very best form*.
4. His party is, in some way or by some means, authorized to make the addition, subtraction, or emendation demanded.

More briefly: it seems to me to be intuitively certain that he who assumes that the Bible contains just what it ought, neither more nor less, and that, after all, it is now in the very best possible form for man's good, could not make or accept a human creed. So, I conclude, the creed-maker does really assume one or more of the positions above stated.

How strange it is that any man or set of men will deliberately say and publish to the world that the Bible is the only infallible rule (creed) of faith and practice, and then, in the very same paper or volume, proceed to make a human and, of course, a fallible one. Yet this is just what creed-makers are not ashamed to do.

The mother of sects and the prime author of creeds meets the question promptly and directly. She holds that the Bible is not, in either matter or form, sufficiently adapted to man for all time, and in all exigencies and emergencies, and that consequently the church may alter or amend it at pleasure. She allows fairly, as in reason she is bound to do, that she must either make no human creed, or assume that the divine one is for some reason or some how defective. The latter she has not hesitated to do. What docs the balance of the family say to this? I repeat and insist that they must assume one or more of the four positions now named. This they should do distinctly, that we might know *what* they propose to do, and *why*. Will they add to the words of the prophecy of this book? Then will God add to them the plagues which are written in this book. Will they take anything from this blessed, perfect, and only blood-sanctified guide, and hand me the remaining fragment, all marred, as sin once marred the Son of man? Will they sunder that which the Supreme Architect has joined together, and then offer me a mere scrap of the heaven-arranged system, deranged and east into a human

mould, with interlineations, explanations, and augmentations made by themselves? Do they demand that my faith shall thus be hoisted upon human stilts, and stand in the wisdom of man and not in the power of God? Shall I, at the end of four years, be liable to lose my faith, and be compelled to receive another, as the wisdom of men may decree? Will creed-makers do all this and more? Then will God take away their part from the tree of life, and from the holy city, and from the things written in this book.

But I think that no Protestant creed-maker, would intentionally allow himself to take either of these horns—to assume either of these positions. His position is, if I mistake not, that the Bible is not in the best possible form; that for the purposes of faith and discipline it is necessary to change the form, preserving the substance. Thus they make the third assumption, and must make the fourth also; else, though the form may be changed, or ought to be changed, it could not be done for want of authority.

May we, then, change the form of the divine record? Whence the necessity? Shall we do it to make the matter of faith and duty plainer? Then we charge the infinitely benevolent One with lack of wisdom, power, or goodness to make his messages of salvation plain. Did not God *wish* to make them plain so far as we are interested in knowing them? Then he is not good, so far as we can judge, and is not, therefore, God. Did God *wish* to make them plain, and fail? Then is his wisdom or power, one or both, limited, and hence he is not God.

Now, since we can not, must not, assume that God lacked the will, power, or wisdom to make his own creed-book, given to man to enlighten him on the questions of faith and discipline plain—plainer than any human skill could make it, I shall hence assume, with all the force of a merciless logician, that the Bible prescriptions for faith and duty are in the Bible made divinely plain; by which I mean, that they are made as plain as the omnipotent and omniscient One, moved by infinite love, could make them.

Let God's Bible alone; only give it to us, all of it, nothing more. Give the light and love of God to man, in pure translations and revisions of the Holy Book, and then, in the glorious noon-day light of the Sun of Righteousness, point the eye of the poor wanderer to the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, and there is hope of saving him. But let his eye never fall upon that murky thing—a human creed.

Did it never occur to a creed-maker, when putting his pen to paper to bring order out of confusion, and to set in a plainer and more practical light that jumble and chaos of holy truth which, it would seem, God has left at loose ends, that the blessed Spirit had already done, infinitely better than he could, the very thing that he proposed

to do? Does he not know that God has made the narrow road from earth to heaven straighter and plainer than he can make it? That is, so plain that the wayfarer, though unlearned, may make no mistake. Does he not know that the Scriptures, given us by inspiration of God, are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God (because a man of the Bible) may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work? These things, it is positively certain, the Scriptures could not do if not in the best and plainest possible form. They therefore are in that form, and hence the attempt of the creed-maker is predicated upon a false assumption.

The principle which gives birth to any human creed is of the nature and essence of the apostasy; and his presumption is as high and daring, who deliberately takes one single step in this fatal direction, as is his who takes a thousand.

God's purpose has ever been to govern man by his own laws, just as given. To deny this is to give the lie to every word of God. Man's determination has always been that he would make his own laws, creeds, or codes, and govern himself. To deny this is to give the lie to every word of history, sacred and profane, from the fall of man till now. To this perverse and lawless disposition I fear we shall be bound to trace the true history of all human creeds.

These creeds—are they from heaven or of men? If we say from heaven, they will say: Why do you not obey them? But we can not obey them all, for each contradicts the other. Nor can we know which is right without having some acknowledged standard of right by which to test them. This brings us to the Bible as the true standard, and the only true standard, by which to measure all our faith, and all our practice. Having arrived in this safe and blessed haven of rest; let me here abide till the time of his coming. I can afford to attempt no experiments here. Will the world never learn that what God teaches us is just what and all that we ought to know? That what God commands is just what and all that we ought to obey? That what God promises is just what and all that we may hope? It seems not. With these teachings, commands, and promises, nothing more, I am satisfied. But are these creeds of men, say we? Then they will beat us; as they do.

But granting for the present, what we feel to be most palpably and grievously false, that the divine arrangement is not the best, and that human skill is competent to make it better, still it remains to be shown, shown clearly, most distinctly shown, that any man or set of men is *authorized* to make the change. I take it to be self-evident, that if no one is authorized to change the form of God's book it would be impious to do it; and if it were done, it would be equally sinful for any one to encourage it by joining the party who did it. In examining creeds, therefore, it is a dictate of common

reason that I should trace them back to their authors, and ask them, with all the sternness that the interest which I have in knowing the truth would demand, by what authority did you this thing?

Remember, reader, the claim is the right to change the *form* of the Bible; for all parties hold their creeds to be the same in substance with the Bible, differing only in form. My question demands the authority for making the change. Surely no pious man will attempt such work without at least feeling that he is in some way authorized to do it.

Do they claim that the Bible commissions them? Not very distinctly nor generally. I read a number of grand commissions in the Bible. Each one designates the work to be done, and the parties who are to do it. But I fail to find the commission for making creeds, and hence find no authority for them in the Bible. The majority of creed-makers rely upon a source of authority very wide of this. They claim that their charter is to be found in the unwritten book, the book of God's providences, that God raises up men every now and then to make creeds. Thus, for example, it is thought that God raised up Calvin, Luther, Wesley, etc., to give us Calvinism, Lutherism, and Methodism. We are not told how the Lord led these men into these different and contradictory systems of faith and practice. That they were, somehow, led by the Holy Spirit (perhaps not inspired by it) is, I believe, claimed, on the score of their success. But success is no positive proof of inspiration by the Holy Spirit, nor that the work done by the successful party is of God, in any sense. Besides, we know that God is not the author of the works of all these men, nor is he the author of all the works of any one of them. Hence the fact of eminent success is not proof that God ordered any one of the works of any one of the men.

I therefore shall deny that it is in proof, and also that it is provable, that any one of these men was authorized of God to give us any one of the systems mentioned. As to the ambiguous phrase, "raised up," I have nothing here to say; only the men were not authorized from heaven to give us the systems which they did.

I am curious to know if this claim of authority be good, or entitled to the least possible respect, how it happens that, after one set of men have been raised up and have given us a creed, another set in a few years must be raised up to make for us another very different and even contradictory creed? This process has gone on till at this date it is said we have more than thirty score of these human productions; all made, it is urged, by raised up men. Still more wonderful is it that each of these creeds needs and receives revision every few years. These things can not be of God. Whence come they? Even of our lusts; of men who are carnal and walk as men; of men who can not endure sound doctrine. I am not advised whether these revisions are made by raised up men or not. If they

are not, it is certain that they take very unwarrantable liberties with the works of those who are said to be raised up. Do you smile at these things, reader? Far better would it be should you weep: God does not raise up these men for any such purposes.

As long as I find them breeding discord and divisions as they do, and when produced fixing and stereotyping them in the forms of the various creeds of the day, I shall believe that those thus engaged are carnal, sensual, and demoniac. (1 Cor. iii., 3, 4. Gal. v., 19-21.)

But, dear reader, will you say that such expressions are unkind? Suppose I answer you that I feel that I am raised up, especially, for this very purpose, what could you say? Could you deny it? If not, then you will not chide me, I am sure. Charge me not with being unkind. You could not know the charge, if made, to be true; I can and do know it to be false. Ask rather whether what I here write is truth. We, with all our little animosities and vanities and carnalities, will soon be gone. But there is an after-thought,—after death is the judgment. Then and there you and I will be judged out of the things written in the books.

In the language of the Master, let us ask: What is written in the law? For by that law we stand or fall. Plainness of speech best befits that man who has a plain and simple story of truth to tell. In my heart, and with all my heart, I believe that the spirit which lies at the foundation and gives rise to the making of human creeds is essentially antichristian. It is hence to be, by the honest and zealous worker for God and truth, promptly and plainly deprecated. If, then, you think me at all hard, be this my apology: the sin against which I inveigh is hard.

If it be right to make and use creeds as they are used, I can not see the necessity for the enormous labor and expense employed in translating the Holy Scriptures faithfully into our own and other languages. Why not allow a few raised up men to give us, in the form of a creed, what they conceive to be the teachings of the Bible, and thus save ourselves the immense outlay of toil and money necessary to make faithful translations and revisions? Am I answered, that the creed might be wrong; that it is better to preserve the divine creed correctly translated, to fall back on in case we should find the human standard at any time wrong? The answer is correct; and believing that I have found all human creeds wrong, or that I have, at least, found the divine one right, I have fallen back on it; and with my brethren, good and true, hope never to fall away. On principle we stand on the Word of God alone. This legitimately demands that we should use every effort and make every possible sacrifice to obtain that word pure as the Spirit gave it. Hence my brethren are all, and must be, in favor of every enterprise, promising success, which looks in the direction of a faithful translation of God's word. But translate and revise as you will, creed-makers will relax

not a whit of their efforts. Creeds will still be made, and will have, with the parties making them, all the force of divine law, and more too. So it might be expected that they would oppose all translation and revision movements; and so they do. Ask a friend of human creeds to assist in circulating Bro. Anderson's translation, or that of the Bible Union, and his brow spontaneously lowers like a thunder-cloud, as he growls his answer: No.

I rejoice to know that there are a few honorable exceptions; but the rule is: the friends of translation movements to obtain God's pure word are opposed to human creeds, and the friends of human creeds are opposed to translation movements. Thus it seems, and so I believe, that the spirit which now opposes all attempts at giving us the Word of God in the English and other languages, pure as possible, and that which gives us human creeds as bonds of union and communion, in essence are the same. Nor is either of them from God. True, the parties do, mainly, I doubt not, *feel* that they are doing for the best. But this changes not the character of their work—a work which the Holy Spirit never does. It is charitable to suppose that they know not what spirit they are of.

All the pseudo union movements of the present day among the sects—those claiming that they are sects and rejoicing in the fact—are, I fear, begotten by the same divisive and carnal spirit. A few days since I was visited by an agent of the American Bible Society, who requested me to solicit and take up a contribution in our church, and pay the proceeds over into their treasury. I asked him why he was opposed to giving us a revised translation of the Bible, and persisted in circulating one which he acknowledged contains many errors—*known errors*.

His answer was brief, truthful, and to the point. He said: "You know that in our Society several leading (influential) denominations are represented." In this brief explanation we have, at every gap, crack, and corner, lurking, peeping, and grinning, the genuine spirit of the antichrist.

I pressed him: "Sir, what has that to do with the question? Is it true, as your answer unmistakably intimates, that your parties will not come into the pure, full, meridian light of the Sun of Righteousness, but intentionally and intelligently refuse? Do they hate or fear the noon-day light? He had nothing further to say, was in a hurry. I bade him good-bye, promising that I would raise all the money I could for circulating the best versions of the Bible that I could find. The occupation of Demetrius, the silversmith, and of Aaron, when making the calf, were about as honorable and serviceable to the truth as that of creed-makers, as a body.

I see a paragraph in a Chicago paper, dated January 6, 1866, which illustrates the point that I have before me. The editor says that: "A movement has been set on foot . . . by the Protestant clerical

professions," in the city of Chicago, to organize a union prayer meeting. These clergymen issue a call upon the good people of that city, the first words of which are as follows: "Cheering indications of the Holy Spirit's presence are manifest in our city 1" This document is signed by thirteen D. Ds. and by twenty-two not so commissioned. Thus we find that, in the opinion of thirty-five commissioned and non-commissioned clergymen of the city of Chicago, the Holy Spirit has actually made its appearance in that place 1 Do they mean that the Holy Spirit has not been there much of late, and that hence his appearance is a thing a little remarkable. This may be; but, according to the theory of these gentlemen concerning the Spirit's operations and movements, it is no very flattering compliment to the city. It must have been quite a Sodom of a place.

The language of the call seems to import that the Holy Spirit goes around *occasionally* among the people; and that, if duly received and properly treated when he comes, will work to the conversion of some sinners. More than this may be fairly deduced from the language. Since the Holy Spirit is the sent of the Father and the Son, this view represents them as whimsical and spasmodic in their work of saving sinners—as sometimes willing, and then, of course, the Spirit comes: as sometimes not willing, and then he does not come. So, if the language of the call be not complimentary to the people of Chicago, they may be content to know that it is still less so to God and to his Christ. This call intimates to Christians that they should watch the Spirit's movements; that if he is not present, or at least so near at hand that he may be called, in aid of their work, they might as well wait till it is manifest from cheering indications that he is present. The sinner, from such teaching, would learn to wait also.

Meantime the Bible is mainly left out of the account. Such teachers do not believe that the gospel is God's power to save the sinner, though God **says** in the Bible that it is. If they did so believe they could not teach as they do. You are, reader, prepared by this time to hear me say that all these clerical gentlemen traffic in human creeds, and are opposed to all the translation and revision movements of the present day; and so I believe they are. If there be one exception to this conclusion among the whole thirteen doctors and twenty-two non-doctors of divinity, he is a weak disciple indeed.

Now, since no additions to nor subtractions from the Bible can be made with impunity; and since no change in the *form* of the divine creed-book, made by human hands, can be allowed to be an improvement on the divine work; and since no man can show *authority*, from what is written in the Bible or is found out of it, for **making such** change; I conclude that every human creed, when made, is a calamity, and the making of any human creed is a sin against God and the Bible.

W.

THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT¹ IN CHRISTIANS.

No subject, perhaps, has been more intently studied of late years than that of spiritual influence. It has been a constant theme for the pulpit, and the press has teemed with essays and discussions devoted to its elucidation, until it would seem that every conceivable view had been presented and fully canvassed. But the interest seems still to continue; and the indications are quite clear that the public mind is not yet prepared to settle down in any view that has been presented as being clearly the whole truth. The theme is an interesting and important one, well worthy the unusual degree of attention that has been given to it. It is to be hoped that the investigation may go on until the argument is fairly exhausted. Truth, upon a question like this, can not be purchased at too great a cost of time and intellectual effort.

This agitation of this question has, no doubt, been chiefly owing to the teachings of Bro. Campbell, and other leaders in the present reformation. But it was evidently not the intention of those great and good men to become the founders of a new school of theology, having as its distinguishing characteristic a new view of spiritual influence. No one can read candidly the pages of the *Christian Baptist* and the earlier volumes of the *Harbinger* without perceiving an evident unwillingness to assume the championship of any theory whatever. They were most anxious to call the public mind away from empty and unprofitable speculations, and to get it fixed upon the facts and commandments of the gospel. And I here venture the assertion, that, so far as the names of these brethren have become identified with any peculiar view of the nature of divine influence, it was in a manner forced upon them by the persistent slanders and misrepresentations of their enemies. In those days the country was overrun with enthusiastic preachers; and upon some subjects, especially that of Christian experience, as it was popularly called, the most alarmingly fanatical notions were prevalent. A false view of spiritual influence evidently formed in the minds of the uneducated masses, the basis of these wild and visionary conceits. To call in question the pet notions of these vain dreamers was, as they understood it, to deny the work of the Holy Spirit. This false charge, boldly made and persistently urged, led to an earnest and thorough canvassing of the popular notion of divine influence. Gradually an issue was formed, and the resulting controversy is not yet ended.

In the warfare which has now been waged for almost a half century, the gist of the whole contest is contained in a single point. On one side the notion is entertained that the Holy Spirit operates immedi-

ately upon the human soul; that there is a direct impact or contact of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man. On the other it is earnestly maintained that divine influence is not direct, but mediate; that the Spirit operates not by naked impact, but through the truth.

Our brethren, as the reader doubtless understands, maintain with great unanimity the latter position. Quite a number, however, limit the application of this view to the sinner, and reject it unhesitatingly as it relates to the Christian. But a large majority, as the writer believes, consider it true in both cases; believing, if it can be shown that the divine Spirit works by a direct impact in "strengthening the Christian," and "helping his infirmities," that it can never be proved that he does not work in the same way in the conversion of sinners. So far, then, as there is any difference among our brethren on this subject, it relates solely to the Christian; and sifting the real practical issue from out the quantity of irrelevant and unimportant matter that has been brought into the discussion, it is simply our old controversy with the sects revived and limited to the Christian. The writer of this article devoutly believes that the fathers of this reformation were right in maintaining that the idea of spiritual influence by direct impact or contact is not in the Bible. He maintains this position as equally applicable to both saints and sinners. With him it is the grand distinctive issue upon this much-agitated subject; and he can not help feeling that those of our brethren who deny its application to any but the latter class, are giving active aid and no little comfort to our old enemies.

The controversy, in that phase of it peculiar to ourselves as a people, after having been permitted to sleep for several years, has at length been revived in the *Quarterly*. The learned editor himself led the way in an article displaying his usual ability, entitled "The Influence of the Holy Spirit as it Relates to Christians." This was soon followed by another article from our gifted and estimable brother, Dr. Christopher, presenting and arguing with marked ability a view differing, in some points, very widely from the position taken by the editor. Others have come forward to contribute to the development of the subject, until the theme has become the centre of more interest perhaps than any that has yet appeared on the pages of the *Quarterly*. The writer confesses that he is not prepared to indorse fully any article that has yet appeared. While he finds in all of them many things which he heartily approves, he still finds some from which he candidly dissents. He does not think that the subject has yet been exhausted. And while he feels the most profound respect for the very able brethren who have written, he proposes, with their permission, to enter the arena, relying not upon his own strength, but upon the power of the truth for any interest which he may hope, by his feeble words, to awaken in any heart. He does not propose to review formally any-

thing which has been written by others, but rather to write an independent article, embodying a view essentially different from any that has yet been presented, only noticing what others have said incidentally, and then only so far as may seem necessary to the better development, and the more complete establishment of his own position. He confesses that, in differing with these very able brethren, he lays himself open to the charge of vanity. He does not, however, plead guilty to such charge. As relates to himself, he claims to entertain at least a moderate degree of diffidence, and proposes to write with becoming modesty. The spirit of dogmatism, always unlovely, is among brethren positively insufferable. He desires to write in the interest of truth, and to banish from his bosom every impulse inconsistent with a deep, ardent, and unconquerable devotion to it.

It is proposed to devote this article, which is not intended to be a long one, to the development of two points only: first, the presence of the Holy Spirit in Christians; second, the nature of the influence he exerts when thus present in them. I present, as a commencing point, the following passages from the Word of God: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive; because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

The New Testament reader will at once recognize in the first quotation the words of the Lord Jesus; in the second, the answer of Peter to the convicted Jews on the day of Pentecost. The words of the Savior contain the promise of the Holy Spirit to the disciples; and the reply of Peter to the question of the penitent Israelites, spoken after that promise had been fulfilled to the apostles and their brethren, announces the conditions upon which the same blessing might be enjoyed by the world. I take it that the gift of the Holy Spirit, as promised by Peter, includes the whole work of the Holy Spirit in and for the Christian. It includes the various supernatural gifts spoken of by the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. xii., but does not stop here. It includes also the ordinary strengthening and comforting influences enjoyed by all Christians, and remaining to the church when all supernatural gifts and powers have passed away. The gift of the Holy Spirit is, therefore, the Holy Spirit himself given. This I do not consider it now worth while to argue.

The Lord Jesus expresses the relation of the Spirit to the disciples in two distinct forms of speech, embodying two distinct conceptions of the subject: "He dwelleth *with* you, and shall be *in* you." Our erudite Bro. Christopher, who is an independent thinker and bold writer, affirms that in this and all similar passages the Greek particle

en should be translated among. "When this preposition *en* describes the relation that exists between persons, it must be translated among, and not in," says the Doctor. Grounding his view on the personality of the Holy Spirit, and assuming that such expressions as the above are necessarily to be interpreted literally, he makes quite a vigorous defense of his position.

If the position were a tenable one, certainly the Doctor has shown himself capable of defending it. A single fact, to which the attention of the public has already been called by an able writer in the *Quarterly*, is fatal to this translation. Whenever *en* is followed by a noun in the singular number it is obliged to be translated in. "Ye are not in the flesh, but *in* the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you." Now here we have the relation between the Holy Spirit and Christians expressed in two distinct modes of thought. Christians are said to be in the Spirit, and the Spirit is said to dwell in them. To say among the Spirit would be "nonsense," and Bro. Christopher, of course, would not be guilty of that. But by what law would he translate so as to read "in the Spirit" and "among you," when the preposition is the same in both cases, and when in both cases the relation described is between persons, not things? Does he understand the first expression as figurative, and the last as literal? If so, why? Surely there can be no sufficient reason for so deciding. Why not both figurative? Clearly both are literal, or they are both figurative. To adopt any other view is wholly arbitrary, and contrary to every sound rule of interpretation. But of this, more hereafter. But I desire to make a few remarks upon the passage quoted from John. The Lord's language is: "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Bro. Christopher would say "among you." Now, upon this hypothesis, why should the Savior have used the two distinct forms of expression contained in the text? The relation of persons "exteriorly" is fully expressed by with. If we translate *en* among them, we have two forms of expression indeed, but only a single idea. But the Lord employs two forms of expression, because there were in his mind two distinct conceptions of the subject. If this had not been so, a single expression would have fully answered his purpose. What thought or shade of thought, let me ask, have we in the adjunct "among you," additional to that contained in the expression "with you?" Clearly these are two forms of expression for only a single thought. To say that the Spirit is with Christians is in sense precisely the same as to say that he is among them. It is certain, therefore, that among is not, in this instance, a correct translation of *en*. I conclude, therefore, that in some proper scriptural sense the "Spirit is in Christians."

To this agrees the language of the Lord Jesus in other places. To the woman of Samaria he says: "Whoever drinks 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." And again: "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, 'out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive."

These expressions are, of course, figurative; but then they are manifestly grounded on the idea that the dwelling-place of the Spirit is not simply among Christians, but in them. Bro. Christopher's mistake consists in this, that he concedes to the advocates of a literal indwelling the correctness of their gratuitous assumption, that all those passages which describe the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christians must be understood literally. Believing himself, however, that the reasons against the idea of a literal presence of the literal personal Spirit of God in Christians are absolutely overwhelming, he is driven to this incorrect and altogether indefensible translation, as the only means of defending his position, and recovering the ground which he has lost by his too hasty and altogether improper concession. He is right, clearly right, in denying the literal personal indwelling; but wrong in his mode of defending himself against its advocates.

This brings me to the first point, which I desire to determine in this piece, namely, whether those passages which speak of the presence of the Spirit in Christians are to be understood as literal or figurative? Does the Holy Spirit dwell literally and substantively in the bodies of Christians, or are such expressions to be understood metonymically; the Holy Spirit, as the cause, being put for his effects in the heart? The latter is my position. It is my honest conviction, and I am not ashamed to avow and defend it. Any one, who chooses to do so, may cry "Rationalism," if he likes; I only say: "Strike, but hear me."

The idea of a literal inhabitation is grounded upon such expressions as the following: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. viii., 11.) "Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii., 16.) These passages are samples of the New Testament style on this subject. Others might be quoted, but it is unnecessary. Everything turns upon the sense which we give to the three words, "dwelleth in you." If these words are to be understood as literal, I am wrong; otherwise, I am right. Thus the issue is fairly made, and I intend that it shall be as fairly met.

The question now raised is simply one of interpretation, and it becomes necessary to have some rule by which it shall be decided. If we do not work by the same rule, we shall not obtain the same results. The Bible is consistent with itself. Any rule of interpretation

which makes it a bundle of contradictions is therefore to be rejected. God is consistent with himself in nature and in revelation. No two facts are in antagonism to each other. Reason and revelation agree perfectly. We may not, nay, unless we would trifle with our own souls, we dare not, set up our weak and erring reason against the Bible; but, in strictest propriety, we may call reason to our aid in interpreting the Bible. The facts of science have spoiled many interpretations that it was once considered, not simply as indicating a rationalistic tendency, but as downright infidelity, to call in question.

I am aware that this principle has been greatly abused; but, then, this is no argument against its proper use. Of two interpretations, supported by equal weight of argument drawn from the Scriptures, who would hesitate to adopt that which is clearly in accordance with reason, and to reject that which is contrary to it? I do not make this remark because of any special applicability to the present investigation, but simply by way of laying down a principle that may be of possible use to us in our efforts to understand the Word of God. I should be very far from admitting that the advocates of a literal indwelling have equal weight of scriptural argument on their side; on the contrary, I hope to make it appear, before I close this investigation, that the scale preponderates largely the other way. What I mean to say is, that it is not "Rationalism," to call reason to our aid in the work of interpretation. The meaning yielded by any passage, when subjected to just and proper principles of interpretation, is to be received without question. Anything else is sheer infidelity. That a doctrine is above reason is no valid objection. His creed is a very short one who only believes what he can comprehend. In determining the point now before us I propose to adopt a rule which, as I understand it, conforms fully to the principle here laid down; a rule stated by the editor of the *Quarterly*, in his own words (vol. i., p. 374), as follows: "A word must be taken in its literal or current acceptance, unless the nature of the case or a qualifying epithet forbids it." The principle here so clearly enunciated is undoubtedly sound; and if its proper application to the passages now to be investigated turns them against my position, why, then, I frankly acknowledge that position to be wrong. I proceed to reassert my conviction, that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Christian is not literal; that the passages which indicate his presence are not to be understood literally, but figuratively. I am not unaware of the magnitude of the task before me, and undertake it with great diffidence in myself, but strong in the belief that my position is the truth. In support of it, I offer the following reasons, and invite a candid, unbiased, truth-seeking examination. I care not how rigid the scrutiny to which they are subjected, provided the controlling motive is love for the truth.

]. The Holy Spirit is omnipresent, and therefore can not be con-

ceived to dwell in the individual Christian in any other than a figurative sense. David says: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Thus it will be seen that, as regards his personal presence, God's Spirit is everywhere.

He pervades the entire universe. His physical power is felt to its utmost extent. The hackneyed lines of Pope may be applied to him in their fullest breadth of signification. In literal truth, he

"Warms in the sun; refreshes in the breeze;
Glowes in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;
Lives through all life) extends through all extent;
Spreads undivided; operates unspent."

Now the question is simply, whether it is consistent with this scriptural idea of the Spirit's omnipresence to say that he dwells in his personal entirety in every Christian?

Surely there can be but one way of looking at this matter. "The nature of the case" clearly forbids the idea of any such indwelling. But if this is not what the advocates of literal inhabitation mean, what is their meaning?

Ah, indeed, that might puzzle them to tell. Since, then, the divine Spirit is personally present everywhere, it is manifest that in this sense he is no more present with the Christian than he is with the sinner. The presence in Christians for which we are looking is something peculiar to Christians; something that exists in the hearts of Christians alone. But since, in his personal presence, the Holy Spirit pervades all space, fills the entire universe, I conclude that when he is said to dwell in Christians "the nature of the case" requires that the expression shall not be understood literally. If there be no other reason to the contrary than the force of our rule, it appears to me quite clear that we must interpret the indwelling figuratively. *The nature of the case requires it.*

2. The Holy Spirit is a person; not a mere influence or emanation. He exists, not in the imagination, but substantively, really. It is impossible to conceive the idea of a being without substance. The Holy Spirit is therefore a positive, substantive, personal being. To say that the Holy Spirit dwells anywhere literally is the same as to say that he dwells there personally; for as the Spirit is a literal person, of course, if he is present literally, he is present in person. Now, if the Holy Spirit, as a substantive, personal being, is assumed to be present in his personal entirety in any single Christian heart, then it is manifest that he can not be present, at the same time and in the same sense, in the hearts of all Christians. The spirit of a man dwells lit-

erally in his body. But it is not possible for the spirit to be in the body and absent from the body at the same time.

Neither can we conceive it possible for one human spirit to inhabit two distinct bodies at the same time. We read in the New Testament of several wicked spirits—in one case a legion of them—taking possession of one body, and dwelling in it; but we nowhere read of one spirit taking possession of two separate distinct bodies, and dwelling in them, at the same time. The annals of demonology furnish no such case. But it may be said that this applies only to finite spirits; and that while it may be considered quite clear that a finite spirit can not dwell in two separate bodies at the same time, yet it by no means follows that the same may be predicated of the Spirit of God, one of whose attributes is admitted to be omnipresence. But I answer that the doctrine in question ignores the omnipresence of the divine Spirit, by assuming it possible for him to dwell personally in the body of a man just as the man's own spirit does; and that, admitting this to be true, it is certainly clear that he can not be present, in the same sense and at the same time, in two different places. This argument is based, of course, on the idea that the notion I am combating assumes the presence of the Spirit in his personal entirety in the heart of each Christian. This, I affirm, can not be true; for if he is thus present in one Christian, he can not be present, in the same sense, in more than one. But it may be said that our brethren are not contending for any such notion as the one here opposed. Then, I ask, what are they contending for? If this is not literal indwelling, what is it? Nay, is anything short of this literal indwelling? You can not, without getting all your ideas of personality utterly confounded, attempt to form a conception even of the Holy Spirit as present in his entirety in the hearts of each of the hundreds of thousands of Christians that make up the great family of God. It may be said, and I readily grant it, that we know very little of abstract spirit, or its capacities; but it will be admitted that there are necessary truths, whose application is universal; and reasoning from the data now before us, I do not think it presumptuous to say that this idea of a personal inhabitation involves a physical impossibility:

3. The notion of a literal indwelling is, to all intents and purposes, the same thing as an actual incarnation. The divine Logos did indeed become incarnate. He dwelt personally and in incomprehensible union with the human spirit in the body of the man, Christ Jesus. Just as this literal presence of the personal Logos in Jesus of Nazareth was an incarnation, so the literal presence of the personal spirit in any Christian man is an incarnation of the Spirit. I do not see how this can be denied. The Logos took upon him our nature, clothed himself in human flesh, and dwelt among men. We can at least conceive of the possibility of such an incarnation, though we may not be able to

comprehend it; but the idea of the Holy Spirit as a personal being enshrined in the hearts of each one of all the saints on earth is actually inconceivable. Surely no one is prepared to receive a doctrine so utterly preposterous.

4. The demoniacal possessions of the New Testament are instances of literal indwelling. The wicked spirit took up its abode in the body of the unfortunate victim, and remained there. But in such cases, the individual possessed seems to have lost all power of voluntary action. The hands, legs, tongue, everything, were under the control of the possessing demon. The will of the man was overpowered; and he walked, talked, acted, in all things, just as the wicked spirit willed. Now, in what does the notion herein opposed differ from this, save in the fact that in one case the inhabiting spirit is a wicked demon, and in the other the Spirit of God? But are we prepared for anything like this? Are we ready to adopt a theory that makes the Christian man a machine, controlled and worked by mere mechanical impulse? I think not. But if the notion of literal inhabitation is not analogous to the fact of demoniacal possession, I hope our brethren will point out in what the difference consists, other than in the single point above mentioned.

5. We now invite the reader's attention to an argument less metaphysical in its character. The Holy Spirit, in the sense in which he is given to Christians, is said to be "poured out" and "shed forth." "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh." (Joel ii., 28.) "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath *shed forth* this, which you now see and hear." Clearly this language is not to be taken literally. Does any one think that the literal Spirit of God is capable of being literally poured out? Certainly not. But if the expressions "poured out" and "shed forth" are not figurative, such is the doctrine of both Testaments.

But while these expressions are absurd enough when understood to relate to the Spirit as a person, they become very expressive when applied to his influences. As the clouds pour out water upon the parched and sterile earth, causing the solitary place to be glad, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose; so the Lord sheds the genial influences of his Spirit upon his people, to cheer their drooping hearts and to fill their souls with peace, and hope, and joy. As, therefore, the "pouring out" and "shedding forth" of the Spirit are clearly figurative, I conclude that we do no violence whatever to God's word, when we understand the indwelling in the same way. Nay, how else can we understand it? The Spirit, as given to Christians, is poured out. If, therefore, the pouring out is not literal, neither can the indwelling be literal.

6. The Holy Spirit, as possessed by Christians, is spoken of as ca-

pable of being divided into parts and portions. The prophet Joel, as quoted by Peter on the day of Pentecost, says: "In those days I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Now this form of expression is clearly partative. The meaning is just the same as if he had said: "I will pour out a *portion* of my Spirit."

To the Lord Jesus the Spirit is said to be given not by "measure." This implies that to others he was given by measure, or in allotted portions. To the Philippians, Paul says: "I know this shall turn to my salvation, through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." Here we have in the word "supply" the same idea. Now we can not conceive of the personal Spirit as distributed into "portions," "measures," or "supplies." These expressions must be understood as relating to his influences. Indeed they make nonsense if we try to apply them in any other way.

7. The Spirit, as present in Christians, can be quenched. To the Thessalonians, the apostle's words are: "Quench not the Holy Spirit." This, of course, is figurative. It relates not to the Holy Spirit literally, that is, as a person, but to the glowing, burning aspirations kindled by him in the hearts of the saints. All these forms of expression, to which we have now called the reader's attention, go to show conclusively that the presence of the Spirit in the saints is not literal. The only wonder is that intelligent readers of the Bible, uncommitted to a theory and pledged only to the truth, should ever have thought of anything else.

Having now seen that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the Lord's people is not a literal presence, we proceed next to ascertain, as definitely as possible, the meaning of those passages of Scripture in which this presence is spoken of:

1. In the Scriptures, God is said to dwell in the saints; Christ is said to dwell in them; the Holy Spirit is said to dwell in them. I propose to examine each one of these ideas separately. In this way only, as it seems to me, can we obtain a conception of the whole subject, which shall be exact, definite, and scriptural. I call attention to the following passage: "Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." What now is the exact idea embodied in the words, "God dwelleth in him?" It will not do to say that the infinite, eternal God dwells literally in the body of a Christian man. The nature of the case utterly forbids any such thought. Neither will it do to say that the matter is fully explained, when it is said, "God dwells in him by his Spirit." This does not meet the case. The expression "God dwells in him" means something. The question is: What does it mean? We are not inquiring whether this indwelling is effected representatively, or otherwise. The inquiry regards the nature of the presence itself. In what does it consist? I understand it to consist in the spiritual likeness of the saint to God,

as his Father. Every Christian has in him something that assimilates him to God. When the love of sin is killed in his heart, and the love of holiness implanted; when the lusts of the flesh cease to govern him, and the felt power of the Spirit of God becomes a permanent presence in his soul; in a word, when he becomes like God, then God is said to dwell in him. This God-likeness is the precise idea in the expression whose meaning we are trying to ascertain. Whoever loses sight of this will fail to understand truly what is meant by God's dwelling in his people. God is in the Christian by the resemblance which the latter bears to him. That this similitude exists is owing to the Holy Spirit, by whose agency the new life has been originated; and, therefore, he is said to dwell in us by his spirit. But it should never be forgotten that the presence itself is simply the presence of the divine similitude.

2. But Christ also dwells in Christians. "My little children," says Paul to the Galatians (iv., 19), "of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you." On behalf of the Ephesians, the same apostle prayed that "they might be strengthened by God's Spirit in the inner man; that Christ might dwell in their hearts by faith." The question now is: What is meant by Christ dwelling in the heart? Of course, he does not dwell in any heart literally. Literally, Christ is in heaven.

The idea of a literal indwelling is, therefore, out of the question here. It may be said, that the meaning of the expression is made plain by the adjunct "by faith," which follows it. But this does not reach the case. Christ is in the hearts of his people, and he gets into them by faith. This is perfectly clear. But the question is: In what sense is he there? The answer is, precisely in the same sense in which God is there. God's children all bear his lineaments; Christ's people are all like him. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." "Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying: Abba, Father." This spirit of adoption is not the personal Holy Spirit, but the spirit of Christ, the likeness of Christ formed in the heart. "Know you not," says Paul to the Corinthians, "that Jesus Christ is in you, except you be reprobates?" Christ, then, is said to dwell in Christians, because they have his spirit, because they are like him.

All this seems perfectly clear. It does look as if the uniform New Testament style ought to open the eyes of those who advocate the notion of the Spirit's literal indwelling, to see that they are not only flying in the face of reason, but that they are in danger of dashing themselves to pieces against the very Word of God itself.

3. We come now to consider what is meant by the Spirit's indwell-

ing in us. The expression is evidently very closely allied in meaning to those which we have just examined. And since we have very clearly ascertained what is meant by God's dwelling in us, and Christ's dwelling in us, it would seem that the subject of our further inquiry can present no real difficulty.

As already remarked, the whole controversy turns upon the three words, "dwelleth in you." If these are to be understood literally, I am wrong; if not, I am right. In seeking for the meaning of these words as applied to the Holy Spirit, I shall be content with no forced or far-fetched interpretation. I must have a meaning which would at least as readily as any other be suggested to the understanding of the common reader by the words in question; especially I must be satisfied that it harmonizes fully with all Bible truth, and does no violence to any sound principle of biblical interpretation. In general terms, my position is already before the reader. I consider the expression a metonymy. The Holy Spirit is the cause of certain effects in the heart; such as love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, self-control; therefore, by this very common figure of speech, the Spirit is said to dwell in the heart, and the meaning, literally stated, is, that his effects are there. Or, again, the Christian is said to be begotten by the Spirit; what does this mean? Let us quote once more: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." The Spirit is the begetter, but the truth that Jesus is the Christ is the incorruptible seed; faith is the beginning point, the germ, of the new life in the soul. It is through this truth, understood and believed, that the power of God, the power of the Spirit, is felt in the heart. "We," says Paul, "preach Christ crucified; to the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but to the called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." The Spirit is said to dwell in the Christian, then, because he is the author of the new life in him; he is said to dwell in him, because through the felt power of the truth that Jesus is the Christ the influences of the Spirit become a permanent presence in his soul. Who can not see the propriety of speaking of the Spirit as present wherever his influences are habitually realized, wherever his power is constantly felt. God is said to dwell in us, then, because there is in us a similitude to him; Christ is said to dwell in us, because the Christ-likeness is in our hearts; and the Spirit is said to dwell in us, because we are indebted to him for every Christian impulse, for every holy desire, for every heaven-begotten hope, that exalts, strengthens, and purifies the soul. In this interpretation there is nothing far-fetched, nothing fanciful, nothing strained or unnatural. I am persuaded on the contrary that it is the view which the words we are considering would most readily suggest to the mind of any uncommitted man, sufficiently familiar with the New Testament to be

able to give a definite shape to his conceptions of the subject. Here, then, we rest with confidence. Our position is the only one which reason acknowledges; but better, far better, it is fully sustained by the Word of God.

I come now to offer some thoughts on the second point proposed, namely, the nature of the influence exerted by the Holy Spirit in the Christian. This, after all, is the important issue in this controversy. The notion of a literal indwelling, if I am not much mistaken, is made the basis, by those brethren who adopt it, of a view of divine influence as relates to the Christian, which, in my humble judgment, is no better than the sectarian notions which our people have so long and so earnestly opposed. If it were not for this feature in the discussion now going on I should take no part in it. If it does any brother any good to believe the doctrine of the literal presence of the Spirit in the Christian, without at the same time believing that he operates by direct impact, and puts forth a power distinct in kind from any known to us, I can not say that I have any great objection to his doing so. Thus held, the notion would be powerless for either good or evil. But so do not its really intelligent advocates hold it. They admit that the Spirit operates upon the sinner only through the truth; but believe that, in the Christian, he comes into direct contact with the Christian man's own spirit, and so strengthens him and helps his infirmities.

It will be admitted, I presume, that, in strengthening the Christian, as in converting the sinner, power of some sort is certainly necessary. It is also clear that this power must be exerted either directly or mediately; either with or without means. When I say with or without means, I do not mean with or without some written or spoken word; for it is admitted that spirits may operate without such means as these; what is meant is simply that the power is, or is not, put forth by the divine Spirit upon the human spirit by direct contact or touch, as a man takes hold of a crank and turns the machinery to which it is attached. If this notion, or something very closely allied to it, is not entertained by the brethren whose teaching is herein opposed, then I am much mistaken. They evidently believe that the Spirit assists the Christian otherwise than through any intervening truth, thought, motive, or means of any kind. If I am mistaken in this I shall be happy to know it. I am very sure, however, that such is not the case. For myself, I believe no such doctrine. I believe that in the saint, as upon the sinner, the Spirit operates through the truth. I do not say through written or spoken words, but through the truth.

In order that an action be virtuous or vicious it must be voluntary. God will not overpower a man's will to save him; neither will he permit the Devil to do it to lead him to perdition. God works in the

Christian "to will and to do," but in such a way as to leave him free. To do this the man's will must always be consulted. A power exerted upon a man, or in him, by direct spiritual contact, is necessarily exerted otherwise than through his will. If a man's will has anything to do with any spiritual influence of which he is the subject, that influence must come to him through some thought or idea which the mind takes hold of voluntarily and then voluntarily considers.

What I mean is simply this, that moral power, the power that moves mind, is exerted only through ideas. This principle is true alike of saints and sinners. It is true of Satanic influence as well as divine influence. It is true in the very nature of things, and therefore true universally. Whoever felt any inclination to do wrong, without the presence in his mind of some motive that led him so to incline? Whoever felt himself inclined to obey God, to walk in the ways of holiness, without some intelligent, present perception of his relations to God and the motives to a godly life? No one ever was tempted to do wrong without some idea present in the mind, by means of which the Tempter's power was felt; so no one ever was moved from above, unless there was present in the mind some idea, some thought, some truth, by means of which the holy impulse was awakened in his soul. In either case the power is in the idea. In either case there is no power exerted beyond that contained in the idea. The human mind is influenced only through ideas.

I appeal to universal consciousness. Whoever was tempted with evil, or moved to do right, in the absence of any idea or motive? The history of all human hearts will fail to furnish an example. It is a law of our being, of which we are as distinctly conscious as we are of our own existence, that moral power is only felt as there is present in the mind some thought or idea which contains such power. The ideas by means of which the Devil tempts men to do wrong are derived from the material objects around them; the spiritual ideas, through which the divine Spirit woos us to Christ, and then sustains, strengthens, and comforts us after we have come to him, are all found in the Word of God. Now the power of a truth or an idea, whether true or false, is only felt as the idea is present in the mind, as the mind takes cognizance of its presence and considers it. True, we may be under the influence of an idea partially latent in the mind, provided it is still the subject of consciousness; but there must be a conscious presence of any idea in the mind in order that its power may be felt. We go into the Lord's house on the Lord's day; we engage in the services; we sing the praises of God; engage in prayer; hear the word; our minds are brought into present contact with the great truths that God's word unfolds to us, and we feel our whole being strengthened and exalted into a better and holier mood.

We go out into the world; the precious truths to which we have

listened fade from our memories; the world crowds itself into our hearts, and our spirits droop and languish. What is the philosophy of this change? Simply that an idea must be consciously present in the mind in order that its power may be felt. It was this law that led David to say: "I have hidden thy word in my heart, that I may not sin against the Lord."

Now I do not limit the work of the Holy Spirit to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, a work long since accomplished, and deny to him any present agency whatever; on the contrary, I admit such agency. I only insist that he works according to the laws of mind; that his moral power is only felt through ideas. True, I do not suppose he inspires any new ideas, but that his agency consists in bringing before the mind, and keeping before it the great spiritual ideas already known to it by the Word of God, so as to give these ideas a present power in the heart. I attempt no speculation as to how this is accomplished. I only know that the Spirit operates according to the laws of mind; that he exerts no influence in the absence of any idea or truth as the means. To do this, the notion of a literal inhabitation is not at all necessary. God is a "present help" to his people; he assists them powerfully in their struggle for eternal life, but always according to the laws which he himself has impressed upon their intellectual and moral organization.

Why should any one think differently from this? Does not the Devil exert an influence in the hearts of wicked men without a literal inhabitation? Does any one suppose that Satan enters bodily into the hearts of sinners, and dwells in them? That the demons or spirits of wicked dead men in New Testament times did indeed dwell in the bodies of the possessed literally there can be no doubt; but such an indwelling is never affirmed of the prince of the demons, the real Diabolus himself. Moreover, such possession precludes the idea of any responsibility other than that which attaches to the wicked heart and life by which the entrance of the demon was invited; for after the fact of possession the conduct of the possessed ceased to be voluntary. No; Satan does not dwell literally in his children. He is in them only by the devilish disposition he has begotten in their hearts.* And yet, that he "works in them" is expressly declared. It can not be that he works by a physical or psychical impulse, for such a notion destroys alike man's freedom and his responsibility. How, then, does he work? Why, according to the universal law herein laid down; the law that moral power is never felt in the absence of some idea as the means. In what way the Devil brings before the minds of men, and keeps before them, such ideas or images as may answer the pur-

* "The Devil is never said to enter into any one unless in some figurative way, as in the case of Judas."—*A. Campbell's Lecture on Demonology.*

pose of temptation I do not attempt to decide. Upon this question I care not to speculate. I am sure, however, that he does not work in any one without an idea; that he exerts no power, save that contained in the thoughts presented by him to the mind. Upon this point I am very decided. Of the existence of this law I have no doubt. The experience of all human hearts, I undertake to say, is in perfect accordance with it. No man is conscious of ever having felt a good emotion or an evil impulse, unless through some idea as the means.

I would be more than glad to hear from our brethren on this point. Are they prepared to ignore the existence of this law, as it relates to the Christian? Are they prepared to concede the truth of the doctrine, nay, to maintain it so far as concerns the child of God, that the naked Spirit of God works by direct impact upon the naked spirit of man? By all means let them speak out boldly here. If this point is conceded to the sects, I for one propose, so far as the question of divine influence is concerned, to retire from the field of contest—in good order, if I can—but certainly to retire. He that has a dream, will have my permission to tell it; I shall not feel at liberty to despise his vision or laugh at his fanaticism. But I do not believe that our brethren generally mean to make any such concession. I certainly think they will agree with me that the fathers of this reformation were right, and boldly continue the war until truth triumphs, and error hides its head in silence, if not in shame. L.

L.'s ARTICLE.—The foregoing article is from a brother of great excellence and moral worth. His piety is above suspicion, and his devotion to Christ complete. Of him we have pleasure in speaking in terms of high praise. We wish his article were such as to justify us in saying the same of it; but it is not. As an article simply, it is fair; but when this is said, its merit is exhausted. As an argument, it is unsound; as a criticism, lawless; and in its conclusions, wholly untrue. We insert it without indorsing one feature in it. We shall not here comment on it in detail. This will be done in the next number. In the mean time, we ask for it a careful reading, for the sake of its excellent author, and a universal repudiation for the sake of Christ and the truth of the Bible. It is published, I must say, with many a doubt, whether the furnace, and not the pages of a religious paper, is not the proper place for all such products. Their sole tendency is to evil; and when they emanate from a good man, the pain they give is great and real.

A NEW TRANSLATION,

BASED ON REVISED TEXTS.

THE following modest pages lay no claim to merit. They are designed to be merely an humble sample of what John conceives a translation for the common people should be. They affect nothing. As for learning and originality, they make no pretensions to them. John is distrustful and diffident in laying them before the public. He hopes no one will accept them as more than a mere approximation to correctness. The object in them is to be true, as far as John could be, to the sense of the sacred text, especially to express that sense as simply and purely as he could. He feels that the necessity is great to give the *common people* a translation of Christ's holy truth in their own strong, simple dialect. Scholars need no translations. They can make them for themselves. Yet translations are generally made for scholars. They do not look to the anxious, untaught heart as much as they should. They must be elegant and classic things. They hence miss the humble poor. Against these translations John has nothing to say; only he thinks the great commonalty need something not so high.

John loves to read the words of the great Master; and when reading these he sometimes jots down his mean conceptions in the tongue his mamma taught him. The following pages are some of these jottings. If they shall do no more than indicate to some fond friend of the Savior how simply that Savior could talk, and how simply his book can talk, then John will feel doubly paid for his vanity in giving them to the readers of the *Quarterly*. John wishes he belonged to that much-envied class of men who in the delicate work of translation are infallible; but he does not. He has often detected himself blundering even in these pages. Hence he has frequently altered them. Nor would it cause him the semblance of a blush to have an error pointed out, even by a child. He would simply smile at his own weakness, and alter again.

John has, as the reader will readily see, paid little regard to what the world in its vanity calls the *sacred style*. He thinks others would do well to imitate him in this. He does not know how King James more than other kings could create a sacred style. John is still in doubt here. How "thou hast" can be pronounced sacred, while "you have" is to be set down as a vulgar thing, he affects not to be able to see. That it *is* so, of course, he will show himself too well bred to deny. Only he can not see why it is so. John likes mixtures; but

then he does not see why we should mix the style of 1600 with that of the year of grace 1866 in the Bible, but in no other book. He would make the Bible either all one or all the other. But, then, John is so often wrong.

Moreover, it will be seen that John has no peculiar fondness for long and learned words where easy plain ones will do as well. John always stood foot in words of five syllables. He only likes long words when they are clearer than shorter ones. Hence John likes tax-gatherer, not publican. A milk-maid can understand that, only a Roman this. Again: John likes plain, blunt talk. He says adultery, not lewdness. This is a tidy word, he knows; and, then, there is no gross sin in it. It is a fancy word. But John has no more fancy than a plowman.

Whether he will continue to send his poor labors to the *Quarterly* must depend on many contingencies. He will make no pledges; then he will have the pleasure of knowing that he has broken no promises.

THE BOOK OF MATTHEW.

I.

A record of the descent of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham.

Abraham begot Isaac; and Isaac begot Jacob; and Jacob begot Juda and his brothers; and Juda begot Phares and Zara by Thamar; and Phares begot Esrom; and Esrom begot Aram; and Aram begot Aminadab; and Aminadab begot Naasson; and Naasson begot Salmon; and Salmon begot Boos by Rachab; and Boos begot Jobed by Ruth; and Jobed begot Jesse; and Jesse begot David the king.

And David begot Solomon by the wife of Urias; and Solomon begot Roboam; and Roboam begot Abia; and Abia begot Asa; and Asa begot Josaphat; and Josaphat begot Joram; and Joram begot Ozias; and Ozias begot Joatham; and Joatham begot Achaz: and Achaz begot Ezekia; and Ezekia begot Manasse; and Manasse begot Amos; and Amos begot Josia; and Josia begot Jechonia and his brothers, about the time of the removal to Babylon.

And after the removal to Babylon, Jechonia begot Salathiel; and Salathiel begot Zorobabel; and Zorobabel begot Abiud; and Abiud begot Eliakim; and Eliakim begot Azor; and Azor begot Sadok; and Sadok begot Achim; and Achim begot Eliud; and Eliud begot Eleazor; and Eleazor begot Matthan; and Matthan begot Jacob; and Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

So all the races from Abraham to David were fourteen races; and from David to the removal to Babylon, fourteen races; and from the removal to Babylon to Christ, fourteen races.

Now the birth of Jesus was thus: his mother Mary was engaged to Joseph; but before they came together she was found with child from the Holy Spirit. And Joseph, her husband, being just, and not willing to expose her, decided to put her away privately. But while thinking of these things, lo, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying: Joseph, son of David, fear not to receive Mary, your wife; for that which is begotten in her is from the Holy Spirit. And she shall give birth to a son, and you shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins.

And all this took place to fulfill the things spoken by the Lord, through the prophet, saying: Lo, a virgin shall be with child, and shall give birth to a son; and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, when explained, is God with us.

And Joseph, rising from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord commanded him; and received his wife, and knew her not till she had given birth to a son. And he called his name Jesus.

II.

Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, lo, wise men from the east came into Jerusalem, saying: Where is he who is born King of the Jews? for we saw his star in the east, and have come to pay him honor. And on hearing this, King Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And bringing together all the high-priests and scribes of the people, he asked of them: Where is the Christ to be born? They said to him: In Bethlehem of Judea; for so it is written by the prophet: And you, Bethlehem, land of Juda, are not least in the leaders of Juda; for out of you shall come a leader, who shall be the shepherd of my people Israel.

Then Herod, secretly calling the wise men, learned from them the true time of the star's appearing. And sending them to Bethlehem, he said: Go, search well for the babe, and when you find him let me know, that I too may go and pay him honor. And on hearing the king, they set out; and, lo, the star which they had seen in the east went before them, till it came and stood over where the babe was. And when they saw the star they rejoiced with very great joy. And on going into the house, they saw the babe with Mary, his mother; and falling down they paid him honor. And opening their treasures they gave him gifts,—gold, incense, and myrrh. And being directed in a dream not to return to Herod, they set out for their country by another way. And when they had gone, lo, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying: Rise, take the babe and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and there be till I tell you; for Herod is going to seek the babe to destroy him. And, rising, he took the babe and his mother, and left by night for Egypt, and was there

till the death of Herod, to fulfill the things spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying: Out of Egypt I have called my Son.

Then Herod, seeing that he was deceived by the wise men, became very angry; and sent out and killed all the male children in Bethlehem, and in all its borders, from two years old and under, according to the time he had learned from the wise men. Then was fulfilled the thing spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying: A voice was heard in Rama, weeping and much lamenting; Rachel wept for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

But when Herod was dead, lo, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph, in Egypt, saying: Rise, take the babe and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for they are dead who sought the babe's life. And, rising, he took the babe and his mother, and came into the land of Israel. But on hearing that Archelaus was king in Judea, in place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go there. And being directed in a dream, he went off into the parts of Galilee, and came and lived in a town called Nazareth, to fulfill the thing spoken by the prophet: He shall be called a Nazarene.

III.

In those days came John the immerser preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is the person spoken of by Isaia the prophet, saying: The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. And this John had his dress of camel's hair, and a leather belt round his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey.

Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the country round the Jordan, and were immersed by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins.

But on seeing many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his immersion, he said to them: Race of vipers, who has taught you to flee from the coming wrath? Bear, now, fruit worthy of repentance; and think not to say in yourselves, we have Abraham for a father; for I tell you that God is able, out of these stones, to raise up children to Abraham. And already the axe is lying at the root of the trees; so every tree which bears not good fruit is to be cut down and cast into the fire. I immerse you in water into repentance; but he who comes after me, whose sandals I am not fit to carry, he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing shovel is in his hand, and he will clean up his threshing floor. The grain he will gather into the granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire.

Then came Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan to John to be immersed by him. But John checked him, saying: I have need to be

immersed by you, and you come to me? But Jesus answering, said to him: Permit it, now; for thus it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he permitted him. And on being immersed, Jesus went up at once from the water. And, lo, heaven was opened to him; and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon him. And, lo, a voice out of heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son in whom I delight.

IV.

Then was Jesus led out by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the Devil. And having fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward hungry. And the Tempter coming, said to him: If you are the Son of God, speak that these stones become bread. But he answering, said: It is written, man shall not live on bread alone, but by every word which goes out through the mouth of God.

Then the Devil took him away into the holy city, and placed him on a high point of the temple, and said to him: If you are the son of God, cast yourself down; for it is written, he will give his angels charge concerning you, and on their hands they shall carry you, lest you strike your foot against a stone. Jesus said to him: Again it is written, you shall not test the Lord your God.

Again the Devil took him away into a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and their glory, and said to him: All these I will give you, if, falling down, you will worship me. Then Jesus said to him: Away, Satan; for it is written, the Lord your God shall you worship, and him only shall you serve. Then the Devil left him; and, lo, angels came and served him.

But on hearing that John was given up, he went off into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth he came and lived in Capernaum by the lake, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim, to fulfill the thing spoken by Isaia the prophet, saying: Land of Zabulon and land of Nephthalim, by way of the lake, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations: the people who sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them who eat in the land and shadow of death, to them light arose.

From that time Jesus began to preach and to say: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

And while walking by the lake of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the lake, for they were fishers. And he said to them: Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they at once, leaving their nets, followed him. And going on from that place, he saw other two brothers, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they at once, leaving the boat and their father, followed him.

And he went round over all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease, and every sickness in the people. And his fame went out into all Syria; and they brought to him all who were ill, afflicted with various diseases and pains, had demons, and lunatic, and paralytic, and he healed them. And great crowds followed him from Galilee, and Decapolis, and Jerusalem, and beyond the Jordan.

V.

And seeing the crowds, he went up upon a mountain; and on sitting down his disciples came to him. And opening his mouth he taught them, saying: Blest are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blest are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blest are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blest are they who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blest are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy. Blest are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blest are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. Blest are they who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blest are you when they shall revile and persecute you, and say every evil thing against you on my account; rejoice and be glad, for thus they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt become tasteless, how is its saltness to be restored? It is no longer fit for anything, but to be cast out, and trampled on by men. You are the light of the world. A town set on a hill can not be hid; nor do they light a lamp, and set it under a cover, but on a stand, and it gives light to all in the house. Thus let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets. I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. I tell you truly, till heaven and earth pass away, one letter or one point shall not pass from the law till everything is done. Hence he who breaks one of the least of these commandments, and shall so teach men, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But he who does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you, unless your righteousness shall excel that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

You have heard that it was said to them of old: You shall not kill; and he who kills shall be liable to condemnation. But I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to condemnation. And he who says to his brother: Empty thing! shall be liable to the sanhedrim; while he who says: Fool! shall be liable to the fire of hell. If, then, you bring your gift to the altar, and there remem-

ber that your brother has anything against you, leave there your gift before the altar, and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift. Be of good will to your opponent quickly while with him in the way, lest your opponent give you up to the judge, and the judge give you up to the officer, and you be cast into prison. I tell you, you will not come out thence till you have paid the last cent.

You have heard that it was said: You shall not commit adultery. But I tell you that he who looks on a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her in his heart. And if your right eye cause you to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from you; for it is better for you that one of your members should be lost, and not your whole body be cast into hell. And if your right hand cause you to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from you; for it is better for you that one of your members should be lost, and not your whole body go into hell.

And it has been said: Let him who would put away his wife give her a divorce. But I tell you that he who puts away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, makes her commit adultery; and he who marries the woman put away commits adultery.

Again you have heard that it was said to them of old: You shall not swear falsely, but shall pay to the Lord your oaths. But I tell you not to swear at all,—neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; neither by earth, for it is the footstool of his feet; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King; nor must you swear by your head, for you can not make one hair white or black. But your word shall be, Yes, yes, No, no; for anything more than these is out of evil.

You have heard that it was said: Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth. But I tell you not to resist the evil-doer; but whoever 6laps you on the right cheek, to him turn the other also. And to him who would sue you and take away your coat, to him give your cloak also. And whoever shall press you for one mile, go with him two. Give to him who asks you; and from him who would borrow of you turn not away.

You have heard that it was said: You shall love your neighbor, and hate your enemy. But I tell you love your enemies, and pray for them who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on bad and good, and sends rain on just and unjust. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax-gatherers thus? And if you greet your brethren only, what more do you / Do not even the heathen the same? Be you, then, perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect.

JOHN.

THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD TO CHRIST.

WHEN Jehovah promised Abraham that in him and his seed all families of the earth should be blessed, there was planted the germ of that faith which has constituted the chief element in the life of his posterity, both natural and spiritual, from that day to this. Very early in the history of his descendants the impression began to unfold itself that it was the purpose of God that they should in the end become the rulers of the world.

In the time of David this conviction had taken root in the national mind, and was already strong enough to express itself with great distinctness. It constitutes the subject of some of the sweetest songs of the shepherd king. Especially is it the fountain of the inspiration of that splendid vision of his illustrious son, in which he beholds upon the throne of Israel a monarch, to whom "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the king of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts; yea, all things shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." "His name shall endure forever; his name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed." The spirit of this prophecy was the faith of the nation—a faith which was so deeply rooted in the hearts of all faithful Israelites, that no change could possibly remove it. About three hundred years after. David had established his throne in Jerusalem, and had blended his spirit with Hebrew literature; and, with the deep faith of his own heart, inspired the songs of the people, came the prophet Isaiah. But not until the fortunes and future prospects of Israel were darkly changed. The kingdom was rent, and both parts of it were in ruins. The royal seed of David, the priesthood, and the people had apostatized, until not a trace of the glory of the reigns' of David and Solomon remained. Assyria, Babylon, and Persia were successively spoiling Samaria and Jerusalem. Even Edom, Moab, and Tyre scorned and insulted the degenerate children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Yet, from the depths of such hopeless ruin, the son of Amoz, with exulting eloquence, proclaims the hope of Israel: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. In that day there shall come a root out of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious." "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law." "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold I will lift up my hand

to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders, and kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers. They shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth and lick up the dust of thy feet." "Arise, shine, for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee, and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." A hundred and fifty years after one of the seraphim had touched with a live coal from off the altar the lips of Isaiah, and long after the heavens were opened to Ezekiel, among the captives of Israel by the river Chebar, and the eye of Jeremiah had trickled down without ceasing because he saw the city sit solitary that had been full of people, appeared the prophet Daniel, the counselor of Nebuchadnezzar, and the ruler of the province of Babylon. The Assyrians had made the mountain of Ephraim a wilderness, and "Judah had gone into captivity because of affliction and because of great servitude." "The Lord had covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel." Her enemies had passed by and clapped their hands at her. They had hissed and wagged their heads at the daughter of Jerusalem, saying: "Is this the city that men call the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth?" Her princes, her priests, and her people had "sat down by the rivers of Babylon; yea, they had wept when they remembered Zion. They had hanged their harps upon the willows in the midst thereof," and mourned in songless silence over the buried hopes of their wasted nation. Thus when the Hebrew nation was destroyed, when, according to the calculations of human sagacity, even the hope of its reorganization and of its future triumphs had utterly perished; and when the monarch of the world's empire, who had carried them into captivity and dispersed them through the provinces of Babylon, that their name as a people might be forgotten, was lying in his palace and dreaming of his future greatness, his spirit was troubled by the appearance of a great image, whose brightness was excellent and the form thereof was terrible. And when all the wise men of his kingdom failed to show him his dream or the interpretation thereof, then there was found a man of the captives of Judah who showed the dream, described the great image, and revealed the interpretation. The interpretation of the king's dream was a sublime procession of the great empires that were to fill the then inhabited earth. As these vast monarchies, with their subjects, provinces, and captive nations, passed in stately succession across the field of the prophet's vision, what could a captive Hebrew, whose nation as such had been swept away by their power, hope for the future of his peo-

ple? Yet, while Daniel was still beholding the last and greatest of them all, devouring, breaking in pieces, and bruising all the nations of the earth, the deathless faith given by promise to Abraham, sung by David and proclaimed by Isaiah, came out of his heart in these remarkable words: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms; it shall stand forever."

This great man seems to have been intentionally placed by Providence in the position most favorable for observing the movements of the kingdoms and empires of the earth, that from these he might educe his prophecies concerning the future history and destiny of all nations in all coming ages, by a sort of divine sequence. Standing at the right hand of the throne of the greatest power on the earth, he lived to see the rise and fall of some of those mighty kingdoms whose fortunes he had beheld in his wonderful visions. In the first year of the reign of Belshazzar, King of Babylon, there was given him another vision of the four great empires, at the close of which is expressed, still more clearly and strongly, the faith and the hope of Israel: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

These predictions, and a multitude of others like them, formed the ground on which rested the expectation of the Messiah. It is true that, by construing the prophecies literally, the Jews misconceived the nature of the kingdom promised them, and then of necessity the character of the king who was to fulfill these sublime predictions. But it can **not** "be said that the faith which filled the Hebrew heart, from which, as from a never-failing fountain, has flowed all Hebrew life, which gave form and color to all their literature, and which time and its revolutions have found to be indestructible, was wholly false. The final dominion of Israel over all the inhabitants of this globe is as clearly predicted as the coming of Christ, and belief in the fulfillment of the one involves belief in the final fulfillment of the other.

The actual coming of the Christ has not changed the fact of such a faith in the hearts of men, but only the form of it. From the day that Jesus called to him, from their boats on the waters of the Galilee, the sons of James and Zebedee, there has been in the hearts of his disciples a deep and ever-increasing conviction that the human race would in some way or other be brought under his dominion.

Listening daily to his words and witnessing his mighty works while he was with them on earth, the confidence that it was he who was the blessing of Abraham, the Son of David, the King foretold by Daniel, was growing stronger and deeper. The disappointment ex-

pressed in those touching words of some of the disciples, "We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel," shows the strength which their faith had attained; and after his resurrection was known by them, and they had collected again about him, the question, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" reveals that same faith still looking to the supremacy of Israel over the nations of the earth, but expecting it now through him.

Precisely in harmony with the prophecies to which we have referred was the commission received by the apostles from him who was now come to fulfill them. Sanctioned by all authority in heaven and upon the earth. It read: "Go ye, therefore, disciple all the nations." They waited in Jerusalem until they were indued with power from on high, and then in the fullness of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with the higher interpretation of the Hebrew prophets, and with the whole life of Christ brought afresh to their remembrance, with every act and word with all its mighty import to them and to the world lying forever open before the eye of the soul, they went forth armed to the conquest of all the nations. And when they saw the whole creation travailing and groaning together in pain under the weight of its inward evils and its outward griefs, and felt that the grand purpose of their mission was to make known the life, the death, the resurrection, and the coronation of him who had come to bring glad news to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to open the prisons of them that were bound, and to set at liberty them that were bruised, it is not wonderful that they should have thought that such a message, before such a world, would draw air men after their Redeemer and King.

Can the language of the Hebrew prophets, illuminated and extended to its true signification by the Dayspring from on high, and the vast meaning and purpose of the life Christ expressed in the words of the commission of the twelve apostles, fail to establish in the hearts of all who receive the Old and New Testament Scriptures as true the belief that it is the clearly expressed purpose of Jehovah to give the empire of the world to the saints? Such, we have already seen, has been their faith and their hope in the ages past, and such it must ever be until the trumpet of the seventh angel shall sound, and there will be great voices in heaven saying: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." If it be said that the kingdom of Christ is spiritual, and therefore has nothing to do with the kingdoms of this world as such, it will be enough to reply, that to the extent to which the reign of Christ over the spirits of men shall become universal, to that extent will it become outward in its manifestations. This thought is so well expressed by Trench, that I am induced to avail myself of his language. Alluding to the examination of the Savior by Pilate, he says: "The practical Roman saw as much as the natural man could see of

this in a moment, that the question at issue between Christ and the world was not a question of one nation and another, but of one kingdom and another; and seeing this, he came at once to the point: 'Art thou a king then V And that empire which tolerated all other religions would have tolerated the Christian, instead of engaging in a death-struggle with it to strangle it or be strangled by it, but that it instinctively felt that this, however its first seat and home might seem to be in the hearts of men, yet could not remain there, but would demand outward expression for itself, must go forth into the world and conquer a dominion of its own, a dominion which would leave no room in the world for another fabric of force and fraud!'

With the word of prophecy made more sure by voices from the excellent glory, and with a commission bearing with it the authority of Him whose power they had so often witnessed, and whom, after he had led captivity captive, they had seen ascending to the right hand of the Majesty on high, giving them, as he arose, a pledge of his presence and co-operation to the end of the world; let it not surprise us if, with these transcendent facts immediately before them in the freshness and power of their faith, and the strength and splendor of their first hopes, they contemplated the conquest of the world as near.

This lengthened introduction will prepare us for some questions which will constitute the real subject of this article. Have the prophecies, that shone in starry beauty over the darkness of those long-passed ages, ever found their fulfillment? Or, have the hopes which put forth their blossoms in the dawning light of the rising Sun of Righteousness ever found their realization? Christianity has been in the world now nearly 1,900 years; how far have the results of the labors of all those long centuries corresponded with the promises made at the beginning? Has the world ever been converted to Christ I The thoughtful reader of the history of Christianity is compelled to answer: No. Notwithstanding the nature of the message contained in the glorious gospel of the blessed God, the preaching of the apostles, the sufferings of martyrs, and the toil and sacrifices of the disciples in succeeding ages, but a comparatively small fraction of the human race has ever acknowledged the power and authority of him who was declared to be both Lord and Christ.

Still another question meets us; one which, most of all, commands our interest, namely, Does the present condition of the religious world point to the fulfillment of our hopes? The religious powers now at work on the globe, do they give us any assurance that they can convert any large proportion of mankind to Christ? A serious examination of the available data necessary to render a candid answer to this question turns our heart into sadness. Truth compels the statement, however solemn and painful to Christian philanthropy, that the world, considered as to its whole population according to the best calcula-

tion that human wisdom can make, is not even in the process of being converted to Christ. Does this startle you, Christian reader? If so, wait and hear me. If true, it ought to startle and alarm all Christendom. Look with me at a few facts, and then think.

The State in which this article is written contained at the last census (1860) nearly 1,200,000 inhabitants. This population is one which, in many respects, will render an estimate as favorable to the results of religious labor performed in it as any other. A large part of it consists of emigrants from the older States. In a statistical report these are credited to work done here, and which will much more than balance the number that has been converted in the State, and gone elsewhere. Besides, in a country comparatively new the minds of the people are more accessible than in the older and more stereotyped forms of society. The work of converting this people was begun with the first settlements; but we may safely assume that for a period of fifty years all the religious bodies, with perhaps an exception or two who are now engaged in the work here, have exerted their whole strength. For the greatest part of the time none of these parties have been wanting in the means of accomplishing all that was in the power of each to do. The Roman Catholics, who as it were pre-empted the ground, with their characteristic unremitting industry, their ceaseless vigilance and never-failing faithfulness to their cause. The Episcopalians, with all the prestige which the highest claims of aristocracy and money can give a people. The Presbyterians, with their changeless adherence to the forms of piety and an educated ministry, whose tenacity for the articles of their creed is like the predestination which they preach—eternal. The Methodists, with an energy as unbounded as their zeal. And the Baptists, with Jewish obstinacy for their own faith, and Jewish hate to all who may differ from them; all have been engaged in the work of converting the people, and we must believe earnestly and sincerely.

And after all the successes of all the pulpits, the fruits of the Sunday schools, the results of the circulation of religious papers and tracts, and what has been effected by denominational schools of all grades, the influence direct and indirect of religious character upon society, together with the prayers of all the truly pious, all added together, and the total membership of all religious organizations in the State did not exceed 300,000, even before its population was broken by civil war, leaving 900,000 who have not been reached at all. It must also be remembered that this estimate includes every man, woman, and child claimed as belonging to all religious parties. But in every church there is a percentum of unconverted. The proportion is variously set down at from one-third to a half of the aggregate membership of all denominations. The latter is, perhaps, not too high, if those only are counted of whom it could be said, they are in a saved

condition. This would give us 150,000 as about the true present exponent of all the Christian effort with this population in half a century. Leaving more than 1,000,000 of people to die unsaved. Now, if we consider the fact that this population at the time when the calculation begins was only a few thousands, and that, under the influence of all the religious effort that has been made to Christianize it, it has grown to its present number, it must be seen that the part of it outside of all churches has grown many times faster than that which is in them. The gain, therefore, of the world on all the churches is thus shown to be immense.

Perhaps it will be said that the case described is an exception. We think not. It is possible that in a few communities in America the religious element may be larger; but it is equally true that in a far greater number it is much smaller, so that the regular and rapid gain of the unconverted multitudes of our own continent would not, in an aggregate calculation be changed.

The same thing is true in what are called the Christian nations of Europe, as shown by the religious statistics of the globe. In the April number of the *Millennial Harbinger* for 1863 is published the latest statistical report that has come under the observation of the writer. The facts published in that paper purport to have been taken from a table prepared by Prof. Schem, editor of the *National Almanac*. In that report the total population of the globe is estimated at about one billion, 300,000,000 of which, the total Christian population, counting in all the sects laying claim to the name, is about 357,000,000, leaving the earth's unconverted masses about 943,000,000. Now in all the estimates made in the early part of this century from the best data that could be furnished from all sources, the latter number was set down at 800,000,000, so that if such estimates can be taken as even approximately true, the unchristianized population of the globe has gained on all the churches in the world, nearly 150,000,000 in a little more than half a century. But if we take what is here called the Christian population of the globe, and subtract from it the unconverted, the result is more painfully discouraging. For if we should say that but a small proportion of the Greek Church, the Roman Catholic, and some of the other national establishments of the Old World, into which children are born and grow up as they did in the Jewish Commonwealth, are converted, facts would sustain the statement; but, if we subtract one half, we have only 118,500,000 out of the entire population of the globe converted, and who will say that there is even that number? Leaving 1,000,121,500,000 of the earth's inhabitants, of whom it can be said every moment, so far as Christianity is concerned, they are dying unsaved. These are a few of the facts that have forced the melancholy and startling statement already made, namely, that the world, looked at in relation to its whole population and the

religious potencies now operating upon it, is not even in the process being saved. Preachers and other religious partisans, who hasten every year to report the numbers they have gained in particular communities, and to publish the rate of increase in their respective little parties, fail to tell how much the great world outside of the churches has grown in the same time. It is certain that the most favorable estimate in behalf of the churches of Christendom will show that the world is gaining on them every year.

What then? Have the promises to Abraham, by which he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God, proved, after all, vain illusion? Shall the sweet strains of the Hebrew minstrel, which have charmed the evil spirit of discord and gloom from the hearts of so many thousands of the human race, charm no more? Are the enraptured visions of Isaiah, by which his soul was borne away from the evil days of Ahaz to behold with exultant joy the coming of the Wonderful, the Counselor, the Father of the everlasting age, and the Prince of Peace, to be regarded as the fantasies of a wild imagination? And those most marvelous dreams of the prophet Daniel, by which the tears of the exile were dried, and Jerusalem still remembered above his chief joy, are they to be considered as nothing but dreams? Have all those holy men who walked by the light of these promises, seeing them afar off, being persuaded of them and enduring as seeing Him who is invisible, lived and died in a vain faith? And is it in vain that the Redeemer has come to Zion travailing in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save? Has he borne our griefs and carried our sorrows—was he wounded for our transgression and bruised for our iniquities, and yet not to see the travail of his soul and be satisfied? Have the everlasting doors been opened wide to receive the King of Glory, and yet is the dominion under the whole heaven not to be given to him? To all these questions we say: No! They do not form the conclusion to the premises stated above. But there is an answer to the question, What then? which is so palpable and overwhelming that it is forcing its way into the minds of the best thinkers of the age.

It is this: the present religious organizations of Christendom have no power in them to save any large proportion of mankind. It is not that Christianity is a failure. The gospel is adapted to all the wants of human nature. It is the power of God for salvation, and it can and will save all men who believe. But the religious powers on the globe, after having ample time to make a full trial of what they can do to save the human race, have demonstrated clearly the fearful fact that they are wholly inadequate to its accomplishment. To a thoughtful mind this conclusion is solemn beyond expression, and it forces from the heart the painful inquiry: Why is this? Is it a revealed purpose of God that any large part of mankind is to be converted to Christ,

or are we to be driven to the dreadful alternative that nearly all of our race are to be excluded from the great redemption? Who is prepared for this conclusion? If so, what means the Old Testament by all those promises, to some of which we have referred? What means the commission of the apostles? Have the inspired men of both Testaments, and the great and good who have believed their teachings in all ages, indulged a faith which is groundless; and cherished hopes which are to have no realization? If it is not so, whose fault is it that so few comparatively are being saved?

This seems to us the most ponderous question which can engage the minds of this generation; to its investigation, therefore, we now propose to direct the attention of the reader. The apostles themselves, in the course of their ministry, encountered this gloomy difficulty. And, perhaps, if we attentively examine the reasons assigned by them why all were not converted to whom they preached, we shall obtain some assistance in finding the right solution.

The apostle Paul has left on record the inspired account, which he rendered to himself and the world, of the rejection of the gospel by the two classes of men to whom he preached it. We can not think that such a record was made without a special design, or that it was intended only for the age in which it was written. In the first letter which he wrote to the church at Corinth he makes the following statement: "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness." These are the causes which prevented the Jews and the Greeks from receiving the preaching of the cross. The devotion of the Greek to the pursuits of philosophy, and his proud confidence in those systems which the surpassing intellect of the great thinkers of his nation had produced, was that which made the promise of life through a crucified Messiah seem to him foolishness. The Jewish scribe also had his eye fixed upon a system of life derived from the study of the law and the traditions of the elders, and in it his confidence was so great that he demanded both from the Savior and his apostles a sign from heaven before he would consent to hear them, and when the cross of the Crucified was placed in the pathway of his self-righteousness he stumbled and fell. It is not without special significance that the spirit of inspiration has pointed out these two great divisions of mankind, and fixed the attention of the reader of the New Testament upon the central point in the life of each as the reason of their rejection of Christianity.

Nations do not come into being by accident, nor is the part performed by each one in placing its link in the chain of universal history a mere fortuity. There is a divine plot in the great drama of the world's national life. Each nation has its part to perform, some great principle to illustrate before the eyes of humanity, which is necessary

to make up and bring out the final *denouement*. Now here are two nations that have performed their parts and have passed away. The curtain has fallen behind them ages ago. What were they here for? In the great plan of God's providence, what principles have they illustrated and given to the world?

To understand this question, let us first place before our minds the two great departments of human nature, namely, the intellectual and moral; then let us glance the eye along the line of human history, and behold humanity struggling to comprehend itself, and to work out its destiny at one time on the ground of its intellectual strength, and at another on that of the force of its moral integrity. Then let us look at the two great divisions of the human race mentioned by the apostle Paul, each representing its side of human nature, and throwing its light on the solution of the vast problem of humanity.

In reference, then, to what the civilization and national life of Greece meant for the world, while the politician seeks his solution in her forms of society, in the annals of her struggles and her failures, her triumphs and her defeats, in the examples of her statesmen, in the genius and heroism of her generals, and in the eloquence and patriotism of her orators,—while the philosopher finds his in the achievements of her transcendent intellects, the teachings of Socrates, the dreams of Plato, the reasonings of Aristotle, Zeno, Pythagoras, and their successors,—and while the poet and the artist has each his department in the matchless beauty of her literature and ruins of her imperishable art,—let us, as Christian philosophers, while conceding that the remains of that marvelous people have been precious to the world in all these respects, maintain the higher stand-point given by the apostle to the nations. Instead of regarding either of these departments as a life within itself, let us contemplate the meaning of the whole problem of Greek life in its relation to the redemption and destiny of man as developed in the book of revelation.

Man has ever been saying, especially among cultivated nations, that he can rely upon the achievements of reason to discover the truth which he needs, to find a remedy for his evils and sorrows, and the source whence to supply all the wants of the soul.

Knowing that this perverted confidence is so deeply imbedded in his nature that nothing but experience can detach him from it, the Author of his being, in wisdom and kindness, has permitted him to make the experiment. For that purpose he gave the Greek mind, invested it with powers such as he has bestowed upon no other people, and these he touched with a perfection of finish never equaled since that nation perished. With such intellects, in the midst of circumstances most favorable for their full development and free exercise for a period of more than 500 years, or, if we estimate the whole time which measures the history of Grecian literature as necessary to the

culmination of their intellectual perfection, more than 1,000 years, was the experiment being made. When the apostle was at Athens and Corinth it was complete. The immovable superstition which he found in the former, and the moral corruption in the latter, proclaim the result. The conclusion is palpable. No intellectual endowments, no effort of human reason, however stupendous and far-reaching it may be, has any power to lift the burden of guilt and sorrow from the heart of man, or, in the summary of the apostle, the "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" needed by him is utterly and forever unattainable by any system of human philosophy. But if man has become vain in his reasonings, his foolish heart, by its proud confidence in the strength of its virtue, has been darkened; hence, as a warning against this universal danger, another people, with a different cast of mind and another form of civilization, has left him its history and the lesson which it teaches. If in Greek civilization the intellect always and everywhere predominates, in the Jewish the moral nature is developed to an extent never found in the history of any other people. In Greek literature, the order, symmetry, and beauty which intellect creates reigns supreme in poetry, history, philosophy, and the arts. In Hebrew we have the instincts of the heart, the longings of the soul for the unseen and the infinite, the movements of which are too sublime for the regular processes of logic. Hence, if in Hebrew we look in vain for the unity and harmony of Sophocles, the philosophical order and graceful arrangement of Thucydides and Xenophon, the always studied conciseness, grace, and energy of Demosthenes, and the perfect logic of Aristotle, still less shall we find in Greek the deep natural pathos of Job, the simple unapproachable sublimity of Moses, the heart-gushing lyrics of David, or the spontaneous and never-wearied flight of Isaiah. The natural orbit of the soul described by the movement of such spirits as have given us our Hebrew Bible may be irregular, yet it is inconceivably above that of Greek intellect.

With a people thus constituted and exactly adapted to it, was the experiment made for the moral nature of man. That it might be perfect, they were transferred to a country isolated from all others by its natural boundaries; the mountains of Lebanon on the north, the Desert of Arabia on the east and south, and the Mediterranean Sea on the west. To make the isolation more perfect, the rite of circumcision was given them, which separated each individual from all other peoples. Then, to test the moral strength of human nature, there was given them a law, holy, just, and good, which they were exhorted to keep, by the promise of every material and moral good, and against the breaking of which were threatened the severest penalties. They were commanded to teach it to their children on all occasions. It was illustrated daily in the Temple worship, and afterward read in their syna-

gogues every Sabbath day. They were allowed fifteen centuries to make the necessary trial, and when Christ, "the end of the law," was in Jerusalem, her moral condition was almost, if not quite, as sad as that of Athens and Corinth. The highest classes of her people, Scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers, he likens to whited sepulchres. The Temple itself was made a den of thieves. The testimony of Josephus, their own historian, in innumerable passages reveals the melancholy fact that the nation was a moral wreck without the hope of recovery. The conclusion becomes inevitable, that man has as little power in his moral nature to save himself as was shown to be in his intellectual.

When this great argument of God with man, one of whose premises was fifteen hundred years being formed, and the other more than a thousand, was complete, these civilizations began to pass away. There was nothing more that they could do for the human race. They had taught all that they were sent to teach. The national life of the Greek and of the Jew was done forever. They had revealed the utter helplessness of man on both sides of his nature, and made known the mournful fact, that there was no remedy either in the one or the other that could reach his condition. It was time for Peter to appear in Jerusalem, and Paul at Athens, preaching Christ and him crucified; though to the Jew a stumbling-block, and to the Greek foolishness, yet, to them that believed, the power of God and the wisdom of God.

By the light of this great demonstration, we may now return to the question: Why are so few of the earth's unsaved millions being converted to Christ? We are now prepared to affirm that the greatest of all reasons—that which has stood in the way of the world's conversion for ages, is the fact, that the warning of these departing nations has been unheeded. The apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them, by preaching' the cross of Christ proved, by the successes which attended their efforts, that the gospel has life and power enough in it to save the world. But a little more than two centuries after the last of the apostles was dead, the church began to try to improve on the apostolic method. It was determined to put Christianity into what is now termed a scientific form—to convert it into a system of doctrines, which could be stated in logical propositions. Each of these was made an article of faith. The seat of Christianity was removed from the heart to the head. These systems, and the intellectual conflicts which forever spring from them as inevitably as leaves and blossoms from buds, took the place of the simple, living, loving trust of the soul in the person of Christ. The old Greek life, which had engulfed in moral ruin, not only themselves, but all nations which derived their civilization from them, began to be repeated in principle, and then began that tremendous apostasy which culminated in the dark ages, and left the world Romanism as the final result.

This failure, more appalling in the moral depravity which it produced than both the others, was the result of an experiment made from the union of Greek philosophy and Jewish legalism.

When human nature was so deeply outraged by the dreadful corruptions, cruelties, and abominations into which it had been dragged by this perverted system, that it could no longer tolerate it in silence, began those indignant protests, called reformations, from which have grown up the Protestant denominations of Christendom. Each one of these in its turn, noble in its origin, and great in its first progress, promised to realize the hopes of that kingdom of truth and love which the hearts of men have cherished in spite of all failures, which the deepest abysses of darkness and woe into which they have fallen could never entirely wrest from them. But so deeply rooted in our fallen nature is the old vanity of the intellect and the pride of the heart that every sect in the world has fallen into the same fatal error, is repeating the same sad experiment, and is promising to mankind the same mournful failure.

Without regard to chronological order, we select one of these systems, which, in respect to the point to be proved, represents all. The history of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith is as well known as that of any denomination. It was produced by a body of men possessed of as much ability, piety, and learning as could at the time it was made have been collected on the globe. It is the result of deliberations and discussions of more than a hundred ministers, besides distinguished laymen, continued, without intermission, for a period of five years—from 1643 to 1648. It is not necessary to our purpose to discuss the truth or falsity of its doctrines; so far as the argument is concerned, we might assume them all to be true. The simple fact that we wish to use is this: that it consists of a set of abstract propositions, supposed to contain, in a scientific form, the teaching of Christ and the apostles.

Now suppose we grant that these propositions were formed by men of the greatest minds and the most profound learning then on the globe; of course, the greater the mind and the deeper the learning, the more abstruse will be the propositions in which they affirm their conclusions. It is notoriously so in this case. It requires more study and time to master the Assembly's confession and catechisms than to become well acquainted with the life of Christ. But the argument is especially concerned with the nature of the process. When you put the Confession of Faith into the hands of a child, you have given him a set of abstract propositions to study which it required men of mature minds, some of them of immense learning, years of profound thought to produce. Now the faculties which he exercises in obtaining a knowledge of those propositions are the same that he would employ in solving a problem in algebra or geometry, and the

process is precisely that by which the mind acquires a knowledge of the abstractions of Plato or Pythagoras. It is simply the exercise of the intellectual powers.

The same thing can be truthfully affirmed of every Protestant sect. The Episcopalians have thirty-nine of these abstract propositions; the Methodists, Baptists, Unitarians, etc., many. Every sect has its view of Christianity made into a scientific form, logically stated, in propositions, which, taken together, make up its denominational system. Each system has for its object to convince the intellect that it is true and all others false; and in this conviction there is no religious element whatever.

The result is as patent as it is mournful. Among the thousands claimed to be under the influence of these systems, a large proportion have intellects thoroughly convinced—are intense partisans of some religious philosophy, while their hearts have no living faith in the living Christ, and they do not even profess to be Christians.

But it will be said that a certain proportion of the adherents of these theories do confide in Christ crucified. This is freely admitted; we are thankful for all the faith that any human heart reposes in the Messiah; and pray that it may abound more and more; but this does not change the historical fact that there is even among those who so believe an element in that very belief which has for its object the intellectual system which each has embraced, and to this element is attached the thief importance.

If this is doubted, let the experiment be tried. Let a man who has been converted to Christ, and not to any of these philosophies of Christianity—in other words, who is a Christian simply—make application for admission to the fellowship of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist Church. Will he be received? Not at all. He will be told: We are Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, or Baptists, as the case may be, and you are only a Christian. Accept our system and we will receive you. The fact that every Protestant sect makes the system which it has adopted the bond of its fellowship, is no less than an official proclamation to the world that it holds faith in Christ subordinate to faith in its system; the conversion of the intellect to the propositions which make its creed above the conversion of the heart to Christ. In harmony with this, is the fact that the chief labor in denominational theological seminaries is bestowed in the preparation of young men for making proselytes to these theories, and, as a necessary consequence, a large amount of the talent, the learning, and labor of the whole Protestant pulpit is expended for the same purpose. Hence out of the whole number converted to these systems only a few comparatively are converted to Christ. Here, then, we find the answer to the question: Whose fault is it that so few of our race are being saved?

Jewish legalism tried for fifteen centuries on the side of man's moral nature to accomplish the salvation of the race, and ended, as we have seen, in a mournful failure. Human reason for more than 500 years held the brilliant torch of Greek philosophy over the pathway of humanity, and then threw it down in grief and despair. Romanism, combining both of these, with some of the elements of Christianity, tried for a period of 1,200 years to save the human race, and plunged both the intellect and the heart into an abyss of darkness.

Protestantism has had nearly 400 years to test its power in the conversion of the world, and its failure is becoming painfully intelligible to the best minds both in the Old World and the New. The world has already obtained from it what good there was in it. There is but little more that it can do. And yet those prophecies that have planted in the human heart a deathless faith in the universal dominion of Christ seem as far from fulfillment as ever.

If, now, from this position we turn our eyes toward the future, and inquire what must be the next great movement that may affect the destiny of our earth's population, there seems to be, from the whole premises now before us, but three things possible: the mind of humanity may return along one of the two great routes over which it has traveled to its present position, or it must find some other way than those in which to move forward; that is to say, the human race may return to Romanism, which has absorbed into itself the experiment of Jewish legalism; or it may fall back into rationalistic infidelity, which is only a new version of Greek philosophy; or it must move forward, walking by faith in Christ. The moral condition of the human race at the time when Christianity was first introduced reveals the possibility that under the perversion of false systems a large proportion of mankind may become infidel. The condition of Christendom before the birth of Protestantism proves that a large part of the human race may become Roman Catholic; and the condition of the civilized world before Christianity was corrupted, by being converted into a mixture of false philosophy, religion, and superstition, shows that the world may become largely Christian. Leaving out the question which is the most probable, these three things alone seem possible; for with the history of Protestantism before us, and its present condition, to believe that any greater proportion of the human race will ever become Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist is now simply impossible. Intelligent men in these denominations may hope that their churches may increase in numbers in some particular localities as the population of the earth grows; but that any intelligent man can seriously imagine that Protestantism can ever gain on that population we can not believe for one moment.

Another consideration already hinted at may be mentioned confirmatory of this position. If there is to be any further progress of

the human race at all, it must be along some line not described by the movement of either Romanism or Protestantism. From created fountains the streams all flow down, never up; so of all systems created or arranged by the human mind; the forms of life which have flowed from them have ever tended downward. Even Judaism produced its best fruits soon after its establishment; after that it degenerated to its close, as a civilization. Greek philosophy exhibited some splendid examples of manhood at its beginning, and then sank lower and lower to the end. So of Romanism; we must go back more than 1,000 years, to find those men who are termed the fathers of the church. Lutheranism too; think of the characters it produced in the sixteenth century, and then of what it is doing now. Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, and Methodism have all done their best work long since. In the fruits which they may continue to produce they can never ascend. It belongs to uncreated, infinite, and eternal truth to move in lines ascending forever. If, then, there is ever to be any coming, in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, it must be in a way marked out by something else than these systems.

If, then, the present religious organizations of Christendom are to continue, the conversion of the world is an absurdity, and the millennium a dream; no conclusion, it seems to us, can rest on a more solid foundation than this. But the Scriptures tell us that "the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdom of our Lord and his anointed." Now the only power which Christ has, in this dispensation, of winning for himself the empire promised him is by gaining the faith and love of the human heart. It is only through these that he can exercise dominion over the souls of men. It was in view of this fact, and the great failures of human nature to which he alludes, that the apostle Paul so earnestly affirmed that the only thing left for man was "to preach Christ and him crucified; to plant the faith of mankind, not in wisdom of men, but in the power of God." He knew that the diseases of human nature were too deeply seated to be removed by any system of philosophy or of law-keeping morality. They require a person, a living being; hence he brought no persuasive words of human wisdom, but the Healer of the woes of the human heart,—Jesus the Christ. The world had said to him, when he came to bind up the broken-hearted: "Physician, heal yourself;" and having shown them that he was a man of sorrows like themselves, suffering before them even unto death, he came back from the grave the Great Physician healed, able now to help all who are tempted. It is no abstract proposition, no doctrine, no process of logic, that men need; but the Almighty hand of this living and ever-present Helper, and this hand is laid hold of by faith, not in a system, but in him.

When the soul is alarmed by its guilt and torn by remorse, its

agony is too awfully real to be reached by any proposition stated in human speech. It never calls for a creed at such a time, but for an almighty living friend who can take that guilt away. When we feel the ties that bind us to life giving way, and see the grave opening beneath us with no power on earth that can keep us from sinking into its darkness, it is not a theory bound up in a creed that we want, but one who has been in the grave and come out of it again; the hand that has burst the bars of death, that it might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Whoever heard a dying man ask for a doctrine or system? Again: when we follow to the grave a father or mother, a husband, wife, or child, and see the body let down into its vault, and the earth begin to close over it, to whom does the whole heart turn in that awful moment? Can imagination conceive a more hollow and heartless mockery, than to speak to it then of "the doctrines of our church?" If the soul's deepest longing at such a time could express itself in words, it would contain the question: Who will give me back my dead? And who can answer this tremendous question, daily and hourly crushed out of the heart of humanity? Neither Moses nor Plato ever mentioned it. Belief in systems of doctrine has nothing to do with it. But there does come One, not a creed, but a living person, in that dreadful hour, holding in his hands the keys of the unseen world and of death, and laying his right hand upon us, he says: "Fear not, I am the first and the last. I am he that liveth and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore." "All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." You shall have your dead again. Neither the law nor philosophy could say this. Of all that have lived on this globe, Jesus alone could speak thus to a broken heart. God has literally shut up the soul of man to faith in Christ, and obedience to him as its last and only hope.

Men only call for a creed when they wish to wrangle with and hate their fellow-men. To be indoctrinated into the abstractions of any system of church doctrine is to shut up the heart and embitter it against all who, by their training or mental constitution, are compelled to think differently. It is impossible to think of a kingdom of Christ in which there shall dwell a universal brotherhood, heirs of a common inheritance, without for the time losing sight of these systems, and falling back on the broad ground of simple faith in Christ and conformity to his will.

One feels tempted to exclaim: How long have these vain systems, born of the pride of reason and of the heart, yet to trifle with and to mock the great wants and woes of the world? How long shall the souls of the dying millions of our race cry out against those who, with these obsolete systems, stand in the way of the world's redemption?

The premises before us are now wide enough to indicate the highest duty of the true men of this generation. It is to call men from these dumb idols to serve the living God; to work and pray for the annihilation of every system which stands in the way of the world's conversion to Christ. The position which we have taken as a people, involves nothing less than this. Our antagonism is not to men, but to systems as such. With these there can be no compromise. If there is a man among us who thinks of the possibility of such a thing, he understands neither the principles which he represents nor the people with whom he is identified. If God has given us as a people any mission into the world, it is to turn men from systems—which can not convert any large part of mankind, but which only make religious partisans—to Jesus the Christ, who can and will save to the uttermost all who come to God by him. It therefore behooves every true-hearted man to gird himself for the work, to put on the whole armor of God, and enter the contest as if the salvation of the world depended upon his personal success.

P.

CHRISTIANITY A PACT AND NOT A PHILOSOPHY.—Were this truth apprehended by the whole brotherhood as fully as it is by the writer of the foregoing article, what a glorious day would dawn upon the church and upon the world! How hard it is to *realize* that Christ is the way, the truth, and the life! How hard to imitate his example, to visit the sick, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to speak kind and encouraging words to the erring, to be forgiving, to be tender-hearted, to be loving, to be pure in heart, to be going about *always doing good*. On the other hand, how easy it is to profess faith, to contend earnestly for favorite speculations, to be zealous in the defense of human creeds or philosophies, which have no foundation in the Word of God, and have nothing to recommend them except their antiquity, present popularity, or because such a course secures the life that now is, regardless of the life that is to come, and all this in the name of Christ and of Christianity. May the good Lord have mercy on the leaders and teachers of the people, and cause them to sit together at the feet of the Master, that they may learn of him who was meek and condescending, that they may find rest to their souls. Never will the world become what the world should be, till it learns this great truth: that to believe what Christ says, and to do what he enjoins, constitute the whole duty of man.

H.

SCRIPTURE TYPES.

From the Christian Teacher.

THERE is no subject connected with our religion that requires more care in its interpretation than that of types; and few that yield more instruction and pleasure, when handled with due regard for the Word of God. Few Bible readers will question that we have a system of types in the Old Testament, but there has been so reckless a method of interpretation applied to it, and so absurd conclusions drawn from it, that many have turned away from this delightful theme, and many more persist in a refusal to investigate it at all.

We propose a few short essays on the subject, rather suggestive than exhaustive, in the hope that our readers will examine for themselves the law and the gospel; the tabernacle "made with hands," and that which "God pitched, and not man," in the relation of type and antitype, shadow and substance, letter and spirit, which form such an important and instructive contrast in the writings of the apostles, especially in the epistles of the teacher of the Gentiles, the disciple of Gamaliel, the man so well qualified by nature, education, and the inspiration of God, to give the church an authoritative exposition of those wonderful prefigurations found everywhere in the Patriarchal and Jewish Scriptures. We maintain that a full-orbed view of the Sun of Righteousness, such a one as shall bring healing in his rays, can only be had by him who sees that sun rising from the shadows of the east, while the starlight, moonlight, and twilight of the patriarchs, Moses, and the Baptist, insensibly disappear in the richer effulgence of that "true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

We acquire much of our knowledge in nature, art, and religion by comparison, showing resemblances and contrasts. Were we to take away from literature the allegories, parables, and analogies with which it abounds, we would be amazed at the poverty of what was left; and surely we need not be told what would be the effect of such a course with the writings we hold most dear—the memoirs of Christ, and the epistles of Paul. Who can read the letters of this distinguished apostle to either the Galatians or the Romans, and not be struck with the constant reference to the Jewish polity and ritual, its economy and worship, abounding everywhere with type and symbol, pattern and outline, analagon and similitude? And who can study the Epistle to the Hebrews, with profit and pleasure, without an intimate knowledge of the great fonts of types set up and stereotyped by Moses?

The epistles of Paul, if we had no other, are enough to encourage us in an attempt to examine this most extensive and instructive subject; with him as our guide, we may enter "the tabernacle of witness," and reverentially listen while he shows the nature and explains the

meaning of courts and furniture, sacrifices and ablutions, propitiations and benedictions, that all were "a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things."

If we carefully note our feelings while reading the Scriptures, or any book of a typical or emblematical character, we shall discover that the Author of our being has established an intimate correspondence between typical systems and our intelligence. The child delights in his illustrated primer, and must have the picture for the eye, as well as the word for the ear, before he can master with facility the *prima elementa* of human knowledge. The youth seeks the aid of diagrams and figures, in demonstrating the theories of abstruse science, and can make but little advance without these adjuvants to the mind in scaling the alpine heights of pure abstraction. The mechanician and the architect draw from nature the models after which they form the machines and erect the structures that serve the necessities and contribute to the comforts of social life. We all take great pleasure in tracing the resemblances and discovering the meaning of those rites and ceremonies of preceding and adumbrative dispensations that prepared the world for "the bringing in of a better hope, by the which we draw nigh unto God." Often a single word spoken by Christ, or leaping from the pen of an apostle, will, to a mind instructed in the forms of the Jewish worship, send conviction to the heart, or image forth a world of beauty, that, without this instruction, would be lost.

We contend, that, beside the pleasure arising from a familiar acquaintance with the typical system of the Old Testament, no one can for a moment, call into question the divine origin of Christianity, when it is studied in the light of that system. As the student of nature reads the silent, but none the less convincing prophecies of the approaching and better epoch in the fossil, flora, and fauna of the preceding cycle, and is convinced that an intelligence, all wise and good, planned the order of the cosmos, controlled the mighty forces necessary to bring beauty out of chaos, and directed all things to a grand consummation; so, also, the student of God's system of grace and mercy is assured of an omniscient God, who saw the end from the beginning, and who, by type and symbol, has stamped on the sacred page, prefigurations of Christ's kingdom, that shall forever speak the same language, while the ever-changing forms of human speech are falling into desuetude.

And herein we find another and important advantage of types and symbols, in communicating to men the mind and will of God. Words are ever changing, just as change the customs and costumes of succeeding generations. We need revisions of the Scriptures, in process of time, to bring the thoughts of God into the phrases of living men; but to the eye of humanity, of every tribe, and age, and clime, the pictures which patriarchs, prophets, and apostles have drawn on the walls of "the temple made with hands," will signify the same, will

always convey the same ideas concerning the service and worship of God, and his dealings with men and nations in the government of the world. A bleeding lamb, smoking altar, brazen laver, golden lamp, and a table with bread thereon, will never cease to teach men unmistakably the essence of revealed religion, under every dispensation. We can not become well acquainted with the manner in which blood, water, and oil were used in the tabernacle service, without learning much about the atonement, purification, and sanctification brought to us by Christ, and the way in which we are to obtain these inestimable benefits.

But while we contemplate the great advantage resulting from this study, and the pleasure to be derived from such an employment of our rational powers, let us not be unmindful of the dangers of the proposed voyage, and the peculiar qualifications needed in the pilot who is to give us a safe passage over shoals, where many have been shipwrecked. Let us take warning from the mistakes and failures of others. So many have become intoxicated, and have staggered out of the way here, that not a few think the whole subject noxious, and that the spirit of such studies turns the head, and disqualifies for sober thought. Because Jewish cabalists sought to extend the boundaries of the typical, so as to embrace the most puerile fancies and extravagant analogies, and Origen among the early Christians, and Swedenborg in latter times, have careered over the fields of the allegorical and symbolical without check, interpreters not wanting in the elements of vigorous thought, analytical power, and just discrimination, have been frightened from the investigation of the principles that should guide us in this most interesting department of Biblical literature.

We are not at liberty to regard as typical, whatever resemblances, far-fetched and often imaginary, we may fancy to exist between the details of Jewish and Christian worship. As there have been expositors who held that in any given passage of God's revelation, every word has as many meanings as can be brought out of it. So another class, like them in many respects, have made the types to signify a thousand things unknown to the Scriptures, and often in direct contradiction of them. Witness the long and seemingly endless controversy about baptism coming in the room of circumcision, which language, if it have any meaning at all, simply imports that circumcision is a type of baptism, in direct opposition to the apostle who says, in effect, that it is a type of the spiritual circumcision of the heart; "the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Now this is effected by immersing the penitent believer in water, and has no more to do with sprinkling a few drops of water on the face of an innocent and unconscious babe than with any other pagan or papal rite.

While we thus enter our protest against the wild and licentious

method of many expositors in their treatment of Scripture types, we can not subscribe to the statement of another class, who will not allow anything to be a type in the preceding economies but what is affirmed in the New Testament. We regard this latter opinion as the necessary recoil from the extreme of the former class. Both are wide of the mark; both are extremes, and therefore to be avoided.

"*In media via tutissimus ibis.*"

There can be no canons of criticism and Bible-interpretation given that will supersede the necessity of good sense, caution, and reverence in handling "the things of the Spirit." Religion, like any other of God's works, will reveal its wonders only to the diligent, the prudent, and the devout. She loves to meet in her temple gates those who come in spirit and truth to worship at her altars and learn her mysteries; and these alone will be able to understand the meaning of those strange devices that meet them in every niche and recess, and look down on them from every pane and panel in God's glorious cathedral.

Next to a mind free from party bias, we need a sound judgment in order to a correct interpretation of Old Testament types. There is so much to dazzle the imagination and allure the fancy, so much to delight the mind and draw it aside into forbidden paths, that we need sound and discriminating judgment, and a firm resolution to disregard fine-spun theories to secure us against the vagaries and extravagances of mystics.

Along with reverence for the Scriptures and a sound judgment, we must have correct and well-established principles of interpretation, if we hope to come to rational conclusions in this important field of inquiry. Nothing must be left to caprice. There are rules in this department framed by men of learning and pious industry, from broad inductions and deep study which will guide us aright in what, without them, would be a labyrinth without a thread.

We invite particular attention to the fact that in these essays we shall speak of *Scripture* types, rather than *theological*. The difference is simply this: theological types, as this phrase is used by divines, include only prefigurations of Christ. They would restrict all types to him, and look only at the prefigurative character of such types. They lose sight of the fact that there is more in the word type than prefiguration, and that many types refer to the things of his religion as well as to Christ himself. We wish to treat of types as defined by Paul where he says: "Now all these things happened unto them for *en-samples* (types), and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world (ages) have come." (1 Cor. x., 11.) In thus treating them we shall find that Christ and his religion, God's government over nations, and his method of saving the penitent and punishing the rebellious, as well as the grand consummation of all in the downfall of anti-typical Babylon, the mother of harlots, are all foreshadowed in the Old Testament.

RENAN'S LIFE OF JESUS.

"OUR age," says Kant, "is the age of criticism, to which everything must be subjected. The sacredness of religion and the authority of legislation are by many regarded as grounds of exemption from the examination of this tribunal. But if they are exempted they become the subjects of just suspicion, and can not lay claim to sincere respect, which reason accords only to that which has stood the test of a free and public examination." Whether or not the sacredness of religious truth and the authority of divine legation should shield them from "the test of a free and public examination," it is very certain that they have not done so. And if "reason accords the claim to sincere respect" to every document which has stood this test, it can not be withheld from the writings esteemed sacred by all Christian people. Criticism sharp and severe has been applied without stint to every portion of divine truth. Reason, undeterred by suggestions of modesty, and in the exercise of the highest degree of freedom, has made herself familiar with the sublime and awful declarations of divine revelation. No book, indeed, has passed the same ordeal through which the Bible has been made to go, and if in its integrity it still survives it is simply because "the word of the Lord endureth forever."

Here it may be well to adjust the relative claims of reason and revelation, and to determine, if possible, the true province of the former in relation to the latter. As well observed by Dr. Campbell, it is solely in consequence of the possession of reason that man is susceptible of either religion or law. It is not faith, but superstition, that interdicts the use of reason in religious affairs. "He that believes," says Locke, "without having any reason for believing, may be in love with his own fancies; but neither seeks truth as he ought, nor pays the obedience due to his Maker, who would have him use those discerning faculties he has given him to keep him out of error and mistake." The Scriptures themselves confirm this declaration, since they lay the injunction on all believers that they be ever ready to furnish an answer to every one demanding a reason for the hope that is in them. The extravagant paradox of Tertullian—that "a thing is true because it is impossible, and is to be believed because it is absurd"—if it has any meaning at all, is equally void of scriptural and rational justification. Nor can we go even as far as Lord Bacon, and assert that "the more absurd and incredible any divine mystery is the greater honor we do God in believing it, and so much the more noble the victory of faith." He does not, indeed, like the choleric Tertullian,

make a merit of absurdity as a ground of belief; but only as a test of its excellence and worth, and he affirms on this ground that "as we are obliged to obey the divine law, though our will murmur against it, so are we obliged to believe the Word of God, though our reason be shocked at it." Now no authority whatever, however imposing, can propose any absurdity as a legitimate object of faith. Nor can any amount of evidence establish its credibility. "Because this," as Locke justly observes, "would be to subvert the principles and foundation of all knowledge, evidence, and assent whatsoever; and there would be left no difference between truth and falsehood, and no measures of credible and incredible in the world."

But though this position is certainly tenable, it does not involve the conclusion at which some have arrived, that the provinces of reason and faith are coextensive. The old distinction between things above reason and things contrary to reason we believe to be just. The former contain no elements inconsistent with the legitimate exercise of faith in its highest degree of perfection. The latter we have shown to be wholly irreconcilable with the possibility of even its very existence. Reason and faith, then, are never opposed; but the objects of the latter may immeasurably transcend the limited range and extent of the former. All efforts to establish a philosophy of the absolute, eternal, and infinite have proved abortive, as ever they must. But these are matters of revelation and faith. Criticism is useful and its aid should be invoked; but let it not aspire to deal with the high and difficult themes which lie beyond its sphere. Moreover, in matters which come within its reach, its procedure should be governed by the rules of an enlightened and judicious method. No one is as liable to err as the intemperate critic. He speaks with the authority of philosophy and learning, and honestly believes that his maxims should be received as self-evidently true and intuitively clear. He never suspects that the method of his procedure is wholly arbitrary, or that the rules by which he works are not those which a profound philosophy and enlightened system of criticism would dictate.

We are truly gratified that the author of the work now before us has set forth in a long and elaborate introduction "the rules which have been followed in the composition of this life." We propose, first of all, to examine the authority of these principles, and to test the validity of their application to the extraordinary phenomena composing the history of "the incomparable being to whom the universal conscience has decreed the title of Son of God." We should endeavor to ascend to the most general conception of this treatise that thence, as from an eminence, we may take in the whole at one view, and **may** thus be enabled to form a just estimate of the character of the work. As to the spirit which pervades it we could wish that it entered more largely into many other productions that are vastly superior to this

in other respects. Its tone is lofty and dignified, while the evidences of sincere respect and profound admiration for the subject of the narrative are found on almost every page. But it is equally perceptible that these two affections—admiration and respect—exhaust the feelings of the writer in regard to the great personage whose character and deeds he undertakes to describe. Jesus is only a man after all, and his actions are such as superior genius, combined with uncommon energy, could produce. This is the cardinal idea pervading the whole treatise, and so thoroughly is it impressed upon all its details that the reader can never for a moment lose sight of it. Every element of the supernatural in the life of the Son of God is thus made to disappear, and the phenomena are supposed to be explained without its presence. The merits of this explanation will be examined hereafter. We now take up the general principle of criticism which lies at its foundation, and from which is derived its specific character. It is expressed by the author as follows: "Till we have new light, we shall maintain this principle of historical criticism, that a supernatural relation can not be accepted as such; that it always implies credulity or imposture; that the duty of the historian is to interpret it, and to seek what portion of truth and what portion of error it may contain."

Now, as this fundamental maxim is the generic source of the author's whole critical procedure, we shall attempt an analysis of the grounds on which it reposes, that we may thus be enabled to test the validity of its claim to the rank of an authoritative canon of historical criticism. Nor has the author himself left us in doubt as to what he considers a just foundation for this claim. "It is not," he proclaims, "in the name of this or that philosophy, but in the name of constant experience, that we banish miracle from history. We do not say 'miracle is impossible;' we say there has been hitherto no miracle proved." Our critic is not understood to affirm in this paragraph, that miracles are unauthenticated by the testimony of "constant experience" in the sense that they have never been witnessed by any class of men in any age of the world, for this would be a manifest *petitio principii*. It was to establish this very position that his "principle of historical criticism" was invoked, and to resolve this canon into the proposition intended to be sustained by its authority is an illogical feat of which the author is held to be guiltless. He is well aware that miracles plead in their favor the testimony of numerous witnesses of various classes, and he assumes not the contrary in the fundamental principle on which he relies. He means by "experience," not the general observation of the many, but the scientific observation of the few. To make this apparent we transcribe the following passage: "None of the miracles with which ancient histories are filled, occurred under scientific conditions. Observation, never once contradicted, teaches us that miracles occur only in periods and

countries in which they are believed in, and before persons disposed to believe in them. No miracle was ever performed before an assembly of men capable of establishing the miraculous character of an act. Neither men of the people nor men of the world are competent for that. Great precautions and a long habit of scientific research are requisite." As if to remove all possibility of misunderstanding, our critic enumerates the "scientific conditions" deemed essential to the establishment of a miraculous event—say the resurrection from the dead. To this end, "a commission composed of physiologists, physicians, chemists, and persons experienced in historical criticism, should be appointed. This commission should choose the corpse, make certain that death was real, designate the hall in which the experiment should be made, and regulate the whole system of precautions necessary to leave no room for doubt." And even if the act is performed under all these conditions, a probability only, though "a probability almost equal to certainty would be attained." The experiment behooves to be repeated "under other circumstances, upon other bodies, in another medium." In case the miracle succeeds each time, he acknowledges at last the establishment of two things: "First, that supernatural acts do come to pass in the world; second, that the power to perform them belongs, or is delegated to, certain persons." Such, in our critic's conception, are the elements of a scientific history of miraculous events. Since, however, these conditions have never been fulfilled in the history of any supernatural occurrence, the conclusion is drawn by the authority of "constant experience," in the sense thus defined, that "there has been hitherto no miracle proved."

This, then, is the first element eliminated by our analysis of the fundamental conceptions underlying the author's general "principle of historical criticism." We believe that we have not done it any injustice, and after examining its critical merits we will notice another feature which our analysis will disclose. First, then, the given conditions of legitimate testimony touching the credibility of miraculous events exceed the demands of the case. He whose organs of sense are in a healthy condition, and whose mind is regulated by the laws of ordinary intelligence, is not under the necessity of consulting a board of "physicians, physiologists, and chemists," in order to know when a friend or a neighbor is dead. And if he sees that friend or that neighbor coming forth into life once again, he is as capable of discerning the true nature of the act as the greatest adept in the science of "historical criticism." We see, then, no solid foundation for the positive assertion, that "no miracle was ever performed before an assembly of men capable of establishing the miraculous character of an act." Common sense, to preclude deception on the part of the witness while acting as judge, and common honesty while acting as a witness to prevent the deception of others, are the sole requisites

for establishing the credibility of such an occurrence. Had the author duly considered the nature and origin of the conviction touching the existence of supernatural events, he could not have supposed "a long habit of scientific research" to be essential to its production. It springs in fact from the spontaneous action of intuitive principles operating upon suitable data and under appropriate circumstances. A new fact or phenomenon is presented to the mind through the organs of sense. This phenomenon is immediately referred by the mind to a cause that is capable of bringing it into existence. This reference is made because the mind is unable to do otherwise. It is true, that Hume, with some others, refused to acknowledge the necessity implied in this reference; but they only did so on a given hypothesis, which being thoroughly exploded by greater researches in the science of mind, leaves no room for debate on this point. That every event has an adequate cause is therefore simply an intuition. Now suppose that our senses testify to the existence of a certain event, say the resurrection of some one to life, which we are absolutely certain that no agent in nature could produce, what judgment is the mind now driven to form under the imperative rule of the immutable principle presented above? Simply and solely that the event now before us is the product of some agent acting above and superior to nature. Such an occurrence is what we call a miraculous event.

A conviction of the supernatural is thus seen to flow from the action of a native and fundamental law of human intelligence, and the supposition that it "always implies credulity or imposture" is shown to be false and absurd. Nor do facts sustain the author in his strange declaration that "miracles occur only before persons disposed to believe in them." Hear the decision of the Jewish sanhedrim, touching the miracle performed by Peter and John at the "Beautiful gate of the Temple:" "What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all that dwell in Jerusalem, and we can not deny it." What a pity that no one "experienced in historical criticism" could be found in that learned assembly to solve the difficult problem before them and relieve their minds from perplexity, by suggesting the appointment of "a commission of physicians, physiologists, and chemists, "to ascertain whether or not a miracle had really been performed in their presence!

There is another principle underlying the author's general law of historical criticism to which we must pay some attention before we make an application of these principles to the phenomena presented in the life of the Savior. This is called by the author: "the principle of positive science," "the basis of all philosophy," and consists, as he explains, in "the inflexibility of the general *regime* of nature." This, he pronounces "the negation of miracle," which is "the idea that everything is produced in the world by laws, in which the personal

intervention of superior beings has no share" whatever. This is the old argument against the possibility of miraculous events, and it is truly astonishing that it should be repeated at this late day in so enlightened a country as France, when it is well known that the scientific history of the earth is a history of successive divine interventions which no law of nature can explain. What can be more preposterous than the conception or rather conceit of production by law? To say that "everything in the world is produced by laws," is to use unintelligible language. Law implies action, while action supposes some agent, and agents alone can produce or create. Law only defines the mode of production. Natural laws regulate the action of the forces and agencies established in nature; but he who gave birth to those laws and subjected those powers to their restraint and control, is superior to both whatever may be thought of their "inflexibility." The suspension, counteraction, or abrogation of those laws is impossible only upon the supposition that Nature is God, and besides it there is none else. An atheist, on these grounds, might logically argue against the doctrine of miracles, but no one can do so who acknowledges the existence of a living, intelligent, personal God. Now if Jesus was really divine, his power over nature is not only conceivable, but what we must, of necessity, suppose to flow from his nature. On the other hand, if this power was exhibited in his person and life, his divinity is thereby established. Thus he reasons of himself: "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me."

"Two means of proof only," says the author: "miracles and the fulfillment of prophecies could, in the opinion of the cotemporaries of Jesus, establish a supernatural mission." Are we to infer from this statement, that anything less than miracles and prophecy could establish a mission of this kind in the opinion of modern philosophers and critics? He who understands the meaning of his words when he talks of a supernatural mission, must ever deny its existence when unaccompanied by these two elements of proof. The cotemporaries of Jesus were not peculiar in this respect, and if they received not in truth that testimony which they justly demanded, they were right in rejecting the claims of Messiah. Our critic continues: "Jesus, and especially his disciples, employed these two methods of demonstration with perfect good faith." Let us not be deceived by this declaration which possesses the form of reality and truth while it has not the shadow of their power. The following quotations will explain the author's conception of the manner in which these two methods of proof were employed: "Time has changed into something very grievous to us that which was the power of the great Founder; and if ever the worship of Jesus grows feeble in the heart of humanity, it will be because of those very acts which made men believe on him!" "With

the multitude, faith in the special action of God led to a silly credulity and to the deception of charlatans. To him it gave a deep idea of the familiar relations of man with God and an exaggerated faith in the might of man; admirable errors which were the principle of his power; for if they were one day to put him to fault in the eyes of the physicist and the chemist, they gave him a power over his time which no individual ever wielded before or since." Thus the employment of miracles by Jesus as a proof of his mission signifies merely, in this author's view, that he innocently imposed on himself and his cotemporaries, by ascribing to himself powers which he did not in reality possess! This, indeed, measured by the rules of our criticism, is a hundred-fold more marvelous than any miracle that Jesus was ever said to perform. How credulous, indeed, the incredulous critic? That Jesus possessed power of some kind the author admits and all history attests. But it is "something very grievous to us," says our critic, and has "put him to fault in the eyes of the physicist and chemist." How marvelous is that power which "makes men believe on him" in one age, and yet causes "his worship to grow feeble in the heart of humanity" in another age of the world!

"Almost all the miracles," says our author, "which Jesus thought he performed, appear to have been miracles of healing." Criticism on the hypothesis before us denies only a miraculous cure while awarding to Jesus good faith and sincerity, who, living "in a state of poetic ignorance," imagined himself to be the subject of miraculous powers. We wish it distinctly remembered that the author, in the passages quoted above, places the ground of the Savior's miraculous action in a sincere faith in himself, and finds in this faith the secret of his power and success. This is contradicted in the paragraphs quoted below: "Many circumstances, moreover, seem to indicate that Jesus was a thaumaturgist only at a late period and against his will. Oftentimes he performed his miracles, not until after solicitation, with a manifest disinclination, and while reproaching those who ask them for the grossness of their understanding." * * * "One would say, at times, that the part of the thaumaturgist is disagreeable to him, and that he seeks to give as little publicity as possible to the marvels which grow, as it were, under his feet. When his enemies ask of him a miracle, especially a celestial miracle, he obstinately refuses. We are, then, permitted to believe that his reputation as a miracle-worker was imposed upon him, that he did not resist it very much, but that he did nothing to aid it, and that at all events he felt the emptiness of public opinion in this regard."

How wayward the movements of historical critics! It seems that the ground of the conduct of Jesus in regard to miraculous events, consists no longer in a deep and "poetic" faith in himself; but his miracles are performed in deference to the popular faith, "with a

manifest disinclination" on his part, and with a full knowledge of "the emptiness of public opinion in this regard." That he employed the evidence of miracles as proof of his mission "in perfect good faith" is not to be inferred from the passage last quoted, and his sincerity, if not directly assailed, is made to appear in a singular light. But if this element of the character of Jesus is obscured in these passages, what becomes of the following paragraph? "Jesus owed these numerous conquests to the infinite charm of his person and speech. A penetrating remark, a look falling upon a simple conscience, which needed only to be awakened, made for him an ardent disciple. Sometimes Jesus made use of an innocent artifice, which Joan of Arc also employed. He would aver that he knew something intimately concerning him whom he wished to win, or he would recall to him some circumstance dear to his heart. It is thus that he touched Nathanael, Peter, and the Samaritan woman. Dissembling the true cause of his power, I mean his superiority over those around him, he suffered them to believe, in order to satisfy the ideas of the times, ideas, which were, moreover, entirely his own, that a revelation from on high discovered to him their secrets and opened to him their hearts." The power which gave to Jesus "his superiority over those around him" is now sagely decided to consist in "the infinite charm of his person and speech," and he is represented as taking advantage of this to make them believe that he could do what in reality he was unable to do! Is this employing miracles "in perfect good faith" to establish the truth of his mission? But to vindicate to his criticism the merit of consistency, the author has elsewhere propounded a theory of Oriental sincerity. "To us," he says, "races profoundly serious, conviction means sincerity with ourselves. But sincerity with ourselves has not much meaning among the Eastern nations, who are little accustomed to the delicacy of the critical mind. Good faith and imposture are words which, in our rigid conscience, are opposed like two irreconcilable terms. In the East, between the two there are a thousand subterfuges, a thousand evasions." Ah yes! the difficulty now vanishes, and the thing is explained. Jesus, whose conscience was of the Oriental type, must not be judged by the standard of "our rigid conscience," but in his pretensions to miraculous powers must be regarded as acting with that degree of "sincerity" and "good faith" which admits of a "thousand subterfuges" and "a thousand evasions!!" And this, forsooth, is seriously set forth as a philosophic explanation of the series of wonderful phenomena which have constituted the Son of God "the corner-stone of humanity so entirely that to tear his name from this world would be to rend it to its foundations." And yet the author tells us that "criticism experiences no embarrassment before these historical phenomena." Certainly not; for the rationalist of every school is doubly more credulous than the

simple-minded Christian, who accepts, indeed, the only rational explanation of the phenomena before us.

What happier illustration need we of the truth of this last observation than that which the following passage affords? "Scientific medicine, founded five centuries before by Greece, was in the time of Jesus unknown to the Jews of Palestine. In such a condition of knowledge the presence of a superior man treating the sick with gentleness, and giving him by some sensible signs the assurance of his recovery, is often a decisive remedy. Who dare say that, in many cases and apart from injuries of a decided character, the contact of an exquisite person is not worth all the resources of pharmacy? The pleasure of seeing him heals. He gives what he can—a smile, a hope, and that is not unavailing." What admirable faith in the medical virtue of beauty! Those who had wasted their fortunes in seeking relief from the tortures of an inveterate malady which had baffled the medical skill of the age, cured at last by "a smile, a hope," and "the pleasure of seeing an exquisite person!" This is certainly a discovery in the science of therapeutics which is worth more than "all the resources of pharmacy." Nor is this all. It seems that the very demons were so overpowered by the "infinite charm of his person and his speech" that they, too, would "down at his bidding." It was thus that "by his pure and gentle beauty he calmed the troubled organization of Mary Magdalene." The author's reflections upon this class of afflictions are refreshing indeed. "At the present day, in Syria, those are regarded as lunatics, or possessed of a demon, who are only somewhat singular. A gentle word often sufficed in this case to drive away the demon. Such were, doubtless, the means employed by Jesus. Who knows whether his celebrity as an exorcist did not spread about without his knowing it? Persons who reside in the East are sometimes surprised to find themselves, after a little time, in possession of great renown as physician, sorcerer, or discoverer of treasures, without being able to get any satisfactory account of the facts which have given rise to these strange imaginings."

Does the reader suppose that these puerilities exhaust the meaning of the term ridiculous? We beseech him to suspend his judgment until he has time to consider the following exhibition of all the essential elements of a solemn farce into which are resolved the scenes and incidents connected with the resurrection of Lazarus. "The family of Bethany may have been led, almost without suspecting it, to the important act which was desired. Jesus was there adored. It seems that Lazarus was sick, and that it was indeed in consequence of a message from his alarmed sisters that Jesus left Perea. The joy of his coming might recall Lazarus to life. Perhaps, also, the ardent desire to close the mouths of those who furiously denied the divine mission of their friend may have carried these enthusiastic persona

beyond all bounds. Perhaps Lazarus, still pale from his sickness, caused himself to be swathed in grave-clothes, as one dead, and shut up in his family tomb. Martha and Mary came out to meet Jesus, and without permitting him to enter Bethany conducted him to the sepulchre. Jesus desired to see once more him whom he had loved, and the stone having been removed Lazarus came forth with his grave-clothes and his head bound about with a napkin. This apparition must naturally have been regarded by all as a resurrection. Faith knows no other law than the interest of what it believes to be truth. The end which it pursues being in its view absolutely holy, it makes no scruple about invoking bad arguments in behalf of its proposition when good ones do not succeed. If this evidence is not real, so many others are! If this prodigy is not genuine, so many others have been! Thoroughly persuaded that Jesus was a worker of miracles, Lazarus and his sisters may have aided this performance of one, as so many pious men, convinced of the truth of their religion, have sought to triumph over human obstinacy by means of the weakness of which they were well aware. The state of their conscience was that of the Stigmatisers, the Convulsionists, the Obsessed nuns led on by the influence of the world in which they live, and by their own belief in the pretended acts. As for Jesus, he had no more power than St. Bernard or St. Francis d'Assisi to moderate the avidity of the multitude and of his own disciples for the marvelous. Death, moreover, was in a few days to restore him to his divine liberty, and to snatch him from the fatal necessities of a character which became each day more exacting, more difficult to sustain." Can the author be possibly serious in this amazing exposition of the incident before us? Does he suppose the men of that day to be removed but one degree from a state of absolute idiocy? But even allowing them a susceptibility of being duped by one man poorly playing the dead man, and two women piously aiding the fraudulent deed, can that part of the farcical performance attributed to these be reconciled with common sense? If they were "thoroughly persuaded that Jesus was a worker of miracles," could they have reasoned as here represented? "If this evidence is not real, so many others are. If this prodigy is not genuine, so many others have been!" Would they not have rather challenged the attention of their unbelieving neighbors to the performance of actual miracles, and then have awaited the issue with that perfect confidence which they are here represented as reposing in the power of their Lord? How unnatural to represent them as inventing fictitious miracles, when they believed that the Lord could perform them with much greater ease than they could invent them? But what shall we say of the moral aspect of the case? Ah! the author's theory of Oriental sincerity here comes to his aid. Yes, they were led to this "almost without suspecting it," and only acted as many other "pious

men, believing in the truth of their religion," have done in order to "triumph over human obstinacy." That is, in plain English, they piously acted the part of impostors and hypocrites, and religiously propagated a falsehood! As for Jesus, though inwardly conscious of the imposition, he stands by with "no more power than St. Bernard or St. Francis to moderate the avidity of the multitude and of his disciples for the marvelous," while they compel him in spite of himself to become a magician! One is almost ready to pity him as he sighs for "restoration to his divine liberty" and deliverance from "the fatal necessities of a character which becomes each day more exacting and more difficult to sustain." He did not perform, but rather "suffered the miracles demanded of him by popular faith," and this since "in the impure and oppressive city of Jerusalem his conscience had lost something of its primitive clearness!" Now the perpetration of this shocking and scandalous outrage upon all common sense is called "historical criticism," and the interpretation of facts. It were a thousand times more rational, indeed, to resolve the whole thing, with Strauss, into fables and myths. Let these two theories stand in opposition to each other. Christianity, the only adequate explanation of history, has as lofty a contempt for the one as for the other.

If, then, the position of Jesus is such that "all history," as the author affirms, "is incomprehensible without him," it is also true, as we think we have shown, that he himself is incomprehensible without miracle. He was supernatural in birth, in life, in death—yes, in his glorious resurrection from the grave and ascension in the brightness of glory to the august presence of "the King eternal, immortal, and invisible." If he is not all this, then indeed is he nothing, while religion is a humbug and history an enigma. Closely related to this, the supernatural aspect of his character, are the messiahship and divinity of Jesus, respecting which the author has written with the same inconsistency and much greater obscurity. "The universal belief was that the Messiah would be a son of David, born, like him, at Bethlehem." Hence, in the popular mind, "the immediate consequence of this proposition: Jesus is the Messiah, was this other proposition: Jesus is the Son of David." But says the author: "The first idea of Jesus was not precisely that. * * * Here, as in many other circumstances of his life, Jesus conformed to the ideas which were current in his time, although they were not precisely his own." "He submitted to receive a title, without which he could not hope for success." "Popular opinion on this point did him a species of violence," and he accepted the title "probably without being concerned in the innocent frauds by which it was sought to secure it to him." All this took place, no doubt, by virtue of "Oriental sincerity" which, of course, sanctifies what would otherwise appear in a very different light. But "a grave difficulty presented itself,—his birth at Naza-

reth, which was a matter of public notoriety;" and this, too, coupled with the fact that "the family of David had become, it would seem, long since extinct." "We do not know," says the author, "whether Jesus attempted to answer this objection." We feel happy, then, in being able to give the author some information on this point. A solution of the formidable difficulty was never attempted; and this for the simple reason that it never existed, save in the imagination of this inventive critic. Whence did the author derive the important knowledge which enables him to affirm, with dogmatic assurance, that Nazareth was the birthplace of Jesus; that this was a matter of public notoriety, and that the family of David was extinct at that time? He talks of the inexactitude and the contradictions of the genealogies" when he ought to know that these supposed "contradictions" have all been reconciled. The birth of Jesus at Bethlehem and his descent from David are reported by Matthew and Luke. Take, then, the following admission of the author and estimate accordingly the degree of his consistency: "Upon the whole, I accept the four canonical gospels as authentic. All, in my judgment, date back to the first century, and they are substantially by the authors to whom they are attributed."

It would be difficult, indeed, to reconcile with this admission the author's theory of the compilation of the gospels. The statement and refutation of this theory are not essential to the accomplishment of the specific object of this critique. We have proceeded all along upon the author's admission, whatever liberties he is found to take with the documentary evidence before him. His explanations presuppose a belief in the reality of the phenomena explained, otherwise he might have saved himself the trouble of exposition. Since, however, the theory to which we have just adverted stands remotely connected with the decision of the more important questions before us, we pause a moment to consider its merits. The formation of the gospel history is divided upon this hypothesis into four distinct periods: The first is called "the original documentary state of the first two gospels, Matthew and Mark, in which were recorded only the discourses of Jesus, by Matthew, while Mark contained but a meagre account of both sayings and actions. For the latter conjecture the author gives no authority whatever, while the former is based upon a misunderstood passage quoted by Eusebius from the writings of Papias. The latter, in speaking of the gospel by Matthew, employs the term *logia* (sayings) without mentioning the deeds of our Lord. From this our author infers that Matthew wrote only the discourses of Jesus, while the narrative portions were added by subsequent hands. It so happens, however, that the same term is used by Papias to designate the gospel by Mark, which he represents as containing both narratives and discourses. The term was employed, no doubt, to denote in a

general way the history of Jesus by these two evangelists. In regard to the second period which brought these two gospels into the form in which we now have them the author relies wholly on the richness and fertility of his own imagination. He can see them "lending these little rolls to one another," and "each transcribing on the margin of his copy, the sayings and the parables which he found elsewhere." In this way, the author declares "the finest thing in the world resulted from an obscure and entirely popular elaboration." This will do well enough for a fancy sketch, but "eminent critics have shown, by a great array of arguments, that what distinguishes our synoptical gospels from those which are apocryphal is precisely the seal of individuality, a fixed plan, and a general idea, which refutes the supposition of a sort of legendary and haphazard formation." The third and fourth periods created respectively the gospel of Luke and that of John concerning which the author says nothing of consequence except to quarrel a good deal with the latter on account of the discourses which he has reported. He declares that "if Jesus spoke as Matthew has it, he could not have spoken as John has" it." And yet, as we shall see, in his own account of the teaching of Jesus, at different periods and under different circumstances, he makes him speak as diversely as Matthew and John.

But why this complaint against the oral portions of the gospel by John? Ah! the divinity of Jesus underlies his teachings as reported by this evangelist. When it is affirmed that the Word which was divine in the beginning with God, became incarnate and dwelt among men, the author exclaims that "this can not be accepted as an echo of the thought of Jesus." Well, when Jesus himself proclaims the relationship which he sustains to his Father, the author immediately adds, for our information, that "he is the Son of God; but all men are such, or may become such, in diverse degrees." Accordingly he places him "in the first rank of that grand family of the true sons of God" which embraces such men as "Sakya-Monni, Plato, St. Paul, St. Francis, and St. Augustine," who "felt the divine within themselves" without claiming for themselves any "private relations with God." The "divine filiation" is thus a common heritage, and only manifested itself in Jesus in a higher degree than in any one else. His own idea of this relation is curiously explained as follows: "The transcendent idealism of Jesus never permitted him to have a very clear idea of his own personality. He is his Father; his Father is he. He lives in his disciples; he is everywhere with them. His disciples are one, as he and his Father are one. The idea, to him, is everything; the body, which makes the distinction of persons, is nothing." Thus it seems that the great Founder of "the benign religion of humanity" was so dizzy in the airy heights of transcendent idealism that he confounded himself with everybody else, and had no adequate conception of his own

individuality! "The idea dominated all else to such an extent that the body went for nothing." One would suppose that Jesus was the veritable author of modern German transcendentalism. And yet this author accuses the fourth evangelist of putting discourses into the mouth of Jesus, on the ground that they are filled with "obscure gnosticism and distorted metaphysics!"

The inconsistency here is rendered still more glaring by the author's statements respecting the teaching of Jesus. His ministry is composed, upon this view, of three distinct movements, of which the first is strictly Galilean. "Leave the austere John the Baptist to his desert Judea, to preach repentance, to cry without ceasing, to live on locusts in company with the jackals. Why should the companions of the bridegroom fast while the bridegroom is with them? * * * A Messiah at wedding feasts, the harlot and the good Zaccheus invited to his feasts, the founders of the kingdom of heaven like a cortege of paranymphs; this is what Galilee dared—what she compelled the world to accept." Does this picture correspond with the facts connected with the early ministry of Jesus? Did he leave John the Baptist to preach repentance alone, when he not only proclaimed its necessity himself, but sent forth his disciples upon a similar mission? Did he merely feast with publicans and harlots while divinely bringing them to a deep conviction of their guilt, and meekly sending them away with the gentle injunction: "Go and sin no more?" It is wholly arbitrary to postpone the rigid morality of the Savior's teaching to a subsequent period of his life, while the "sermon on the mount," which the author accepts as the genuine production of Jesus, is sufficient to refute his hypothesis. As a consequence of the denial of the divinity and supernatural power of Jesus, his knowledge is supposed to be progressive. But little originality is attributed to his teaching during the first period. He, it is said, "compressed his doctrine into aphorisms concise and of an expressive form," borrowed in part from the Old Testament, in part from cotemporary sages, only "infusing into these a loftier meaning." The author states the result of these principles to be "a pure worship, a religion without priests and without external practices, reposing entirely upon the feelings of the heart, upon the imitation of God, and upon the immediate communion of the conscience with the Heavenly Father." He would have us believe that external ordinances were foreign to the first thought of Jesus; that these, by "a species of concession" on his part, were accidentally incorporated into his system; that, therefore, "when he descended to the Jordan, his ideas were superior to John" in this regard. But it seems that "he thought himself obliged, in order to win the multitude, to employ the external means which had secured to John such astonishing success." Now the author defines baptism to be "a total immersion," and according to the statement just quoted, the avidity of

the multitude for this was such that both John and Jesus resorted to it as a means of success. Is not this a reversal of all history? If popular feeling necessitated this practice, how has it happened that two-thirds of Christendom now practice a miserable substitute for "a total immersion?" It is obvious that these "historical critics" pay little regard to historical facts.

From the connection of Jesus with John the Baptist the commencement of the second period of his ministry is dated. "So far from the Baptist abdicating before Jesus," says the author, "Jesus, during the whole time that he spent with him, recognized him as his superior," and "desired only to grow beneath his shadow" while he "developed his own genius but timidly." Whence came this remarkable piece of information by which the author would enlighten us as to the relation of Jesus to John? Doubtless from the same source from which he drew his information concerning the origin of Christian baptism. But until he furnishes us satisfactory evidence that he enjoys the privilege, which he denies to all else, of "private relations with God," he will excuse us for preferring the testimony of the Baptist himself. "I baptize with water; but there standeth one among you, whom you know not; he it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe-latchet I am not worthy to unloose." But what was the new direction given to the ministry of Jesus by his association with John the Baptist? It is summed up in the following paragraph: "It seems that his sojourn with John, less by the action of the Baptist than by the natural progress of his own thought, greatly matured his ideas upon the kingdom of heaven. His watchword thenceforth is 'good tidings,' the announcement that the kingdom of God is at hand. Jesus will no longer be a delightful moralist, aspiring to concentrate sublime lessons in a few brief and living aphorisms. He is the transcendent revolutionist, who assays to renew the world from its deepest foundations, and to establish upon earth the ideal which he has conceived."

We confess our inability to discover any reasonable relation between these two periods. Nor does there appear an adequate cause for this sudden transformation of Jesus from a "delightful moralist" to a "transcendent revolutionist, assaying to renew the world from its deepest foundations." It will not do to attribute it to the influence of John, for nothing in his character or circumstances affords a satisfactory solution of the matter. But what is the nature of the revolution which Jesus at this period proposed to himself? The author is here again inconsistent and self-contradictory. "Many times perhaps this supreme question was presented to him: Shall the kingdom of God be realized by force, or by gentleness; by revolt, or by patience?" This picture of mental vacillation between political sedition and spiritual renovation is so thoroughly at variance with the history of Jesus, that the author immediately contradicts himself by stating that "the

revolution which he desired to bring about was always a moral revolution," and "he never dreamed of revolt against the Romans or the tetrarchs." Still he declares that the submission of Jesus to the established powers, though "complete in appearance, was derisive in reality." We, however, consider the apostle of Jesus a much better interpreter of his practice and teaching in relation to civil authorities. "Wherefore you must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake," since "whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." By what authority, then, does the author affirm that "every magistrate appeared to Jesus, the natural enemy of the men of God?" From what part of his divine teaching is the sentiment of the following paragraph deduced? "The Christian will be praised for being a bad son and a bad patriot, if it is for Christ that he resists his father and combats his country. The antique city, the republic, mother of all, the State, the common law of all, are arrayed in hostility to the kingdom of God." A mixture of falsehood and truth not unfrequently causes the former to be accepted and embraced with the latter. We wish that we could do justice to the paragraph just quoted. The relation of civil government to the kingdom of God, and the teachings of Messiah in regard to the former, demand a lengthy essay for their full and complete elucidation. Only a passing notice of them can be afforded here. It is very possible for a State to be "arrayed in hostility to the kingdom of God;" but not, as is implied in the passage above quoted, through any antagonism between their legitimate functions. Civil government is perfected and perpetuated by the influences that are born of Christianity, and it is only when it undertakes to exercise the high office of the kingdom which is not of this world, that a conflict ensues. In such cases the divine principle which makes it the duty of Christians to obey God rather than man, finds legitimate application. In doing this the Christian can act neither the part of "a bad son," nor "a bad patriot," since the authority of a father over his children, and that of a government over its citizens, can never extend to the higher relation which humanity sustains to the God and Father of all.

The teachings of the third imaginary period of the ministry of Jesus remain to be considered. This is, in fact, but a higher potency of the second movement, and dates from "the first attempts of Jesus upon Jerusalem." It was superinduced, it seems, upon the exciting conflicts of Jesus with the irreligious leaders of the people and degenerate doctors of the law in this city of arrogance and pettiness of spirit. "Jesus returned to Galilee, having completely lost his Jewish faith and in full revolutionary ardor. The innocent aphorisms of his first prophetic age, borrowed in part from preceding masters,—the beautiful moral teachings of his second period result in a decided policy. The law is to be abolished; he himself is to abolish it. The

Messiah has come; he himself is the Messiah. The kingdom of God is soon to reveal itself; by him it is to be revealed." From this time onward, till the day of his death, it is represented that the ardor of his temperament and the severity of his exactions became more and more intensified until they exceeded the wholesome limits of human nature. "In these crises of rigor he went to the extent of suppressing the flesh. Something more than human, something strange, was then mingled with his words. It was like a fire devouring life at its root, and reducing everything to a frightful desert. The sad and bitter sentiment of disgust for the world, of utter abnegation, which characterizes Christian perfection had for its Founder, not the delicate and joyous moralist of the earlier days, but the sombre giant whom a sublime presentiment, as it were, was casting farther and farther forth from humanity. One would say, that in these moments of hostility to the most natural necessities of the heart he had forgotten the pleasures of living, of loving, of seeing, and of feeling. How now stands the account between Matthew and John, by which the nervous faith of this critical author is so greatly offended? Do the pictures of Jesus which they have presented differ as widely as "the delicate and joyous moralist" is here seen to differ from "the sombre giant," to whom "family, friendship, and country had no longer any meaning?" The truth is, that Jesus was neither a gay Galilean nor a gloomy ascetic on different occasions, but a character unique from the beginning to the close of his public career. In representing Jesus as the founder of monasticism and a more exalted morality for the few, while requiring a looser morality of the many, the author has been influenced by the gross perversions of Christianity as exhibited in his own country, rather than by anything contained in those documents from which he professes to draw the miserable caricature before us. What precept in the teaching of Jesus affords sanction to the following falsehoods? "Christian societies have two codes of morality, one half-heroic for the common man, the other exalted to excess for the perfect man; and the perfect man will be the monk, subjected to rules which claim to realize the gospel ideal." "The monk is thus in one sense the only true Christian." "The gospel was thus destined to become to Christians a utopia, which very few would trouble themselves to realize!"

This perversion of Christian morality is here combined with a still more serious error. It is not by a mere oversight that the author employs the term "gospel" to denote the moral teachings of Jesus, for in his view, the Savior of the world was only a moral reformer. The new sense in which the term is here used will answer very well the skeptical purpose of turning away the mind from those grand elements of the gospel which sap the foundations of all unbelief, and gloriously attest the diversity and supernatural mission of Him who "died for our own sins, and was buried and rose again the third day

according to the Scriptures." These transcendently glorious facts, which inspire the Christian with undying hopes, are of infinitely more value to him than any mere system of ethical truth, however sublime and enchanting its doctrines may be. In the light of these facts—this only true gospel of Jesus, the Son of the highest,—the moralist and ethical philosopher disappears from our view, while the Redeemer and Savior of men occupies the entire horizon of faith. But what treatment do these grand elements of faith receive at the hand of our author? The death of the Son of God, indeed, calls forth his profoundest admiration. But, then, it is only the death of a martyr to a cause which is good, and not a "propitiation" for sin. This interpretation of the death of the Savior falls as far below the true sublimity of the gospel as the author's explanation of his life fails to present a satisfactory account of his wonderful deeds. Christianity loses its vital principle, and is denuded of all those attributes which impart to it its true excellence and grandeur, and its infinite value ill the eyes of the Christian.

But while the death of Christ, though perverted, is yet acknowledged as a fact, his resurrection, on the contrary, far from obtaining even this factitious honor, is resolved into the hallucination of a superstitious woman. "Divine power of love, sacred moments in which the passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God I" These precious words are the last that we shall quote from this pious production what claims to be a philosophic exposition of the principles and facts which compose "the life of Jesus." We have read many books, and books of many different kinds, but never yet have seen such excess of declamation as floods the curious pages of this singular performance. Solidity in thought, conclusiveness in logic, and consistency in sense are not to be thought of while scanning its contents. Calculated, from the elegance and novelty of its style, to create, indeed, a momentary sensation, it is destitute of every attribute which is necessary to the production of a permanent effect. It is characterized, too, by a form of rationalism which has long since been exploded in the land of its nativity. In Germany, since the days of Strauss, very few have undertaken to explain the birth of Christianity upon the principles adopted by Renan. Thus does one form of infidelity give place to another, while all are alike in external antagonism with the instincts of our nature and the heart of humanity. G.

SECOND VOLUME.—The second volume of the *Quarterly* is now exhausted. Not one more can be supplied. In sending names, therefore, brethren will be kind enough to bear this in mind. Plenty of *first* volume on hand, which will be sent at \$1.50 per volume.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1866.

No. 3.

SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO WAR?

IN the last number of the *Quarterly*, in a brief note near the bottom of page 405, we promised our readers an article on the present question in the next succeeding number of the work. To-day we sit down to the task of redeeming that promise.

The question: Should Christians go to war? is not just now for the first time coming up in our ranks for consideration. Many a time in the pulpit it has been the subject of a few perhaps ill-digested and hasty remarks; seldom the subject of a well-prepared and pertinent speech. We now have reason to mourn its neglect. How it might have been decided, whether at all or not, had it been more thoroughly discussed, of course we have no means of knowing. Still we regret the comparative silence in which it has been allowed to pass. Had we been able to foresee the consequences to which our neglect has led, or to anticipate that indecisive views in regard to the question would at any time lead even to questionable conduct in our brethren, to say nothing of such as is surely wrong, the question would certainly have received the serious attention to which it is entitled. But this power of foresight we did not have, neither the ability to anticipate.

But the question has received more attention from us than these remarks would seem to imply. It has occasionally been the subject of an article in our current literature, and now and then of a tract. Near twenty years ago it was carefully and somewhat fully discussed in an address by our venerable Bro. Campbell. Would that the views then set forth by that large just brain had taken complete sway of every heart among us, and had kept it with tyrannous power to the present instant. But such was not the case; and many a heart since then has felt the pang of the unheeded advice.

That our brethren have generally in large part inclined to the view that a Christian can, in no case, go to war with the approbation of Christ, may, I believe, be truthfully said. Still they have not so strongly so inclined as to control, in all cases, their action. And then not a few have boldly taken the ground, not merely that the Christian may go to war, but that he is bound, even by Christ, in certain cases,

to do so. From this, it at least appears that the question is not with us a settled one. Should it longer remain in doubt? I think not, provided the means is at our command to settle it. Let us have it decided, yes or no; and then let us life-long abide by this decision. Let us teach the decision to our children, train them to it, mold their hearts after it, and so infix it in their young natures that no contingency can ever arise which will lead them to set it aside. If he who says the Christian is permitted by Christ to go to war is right, he who stands in the negative is certainly wrong. Let the issue be fully joined, and the question forever set at rest.

The question I propose to discuss is this: *Does Christ in any case permit his followers to go to war?* This question I unhesitatingly answer, *No*. Let, now, the question be fully understood, and the issue it raises be fairly stated. Moreover, let the relative position of parties to it be well understood; that is to say, let their logical position to it be well understood. Then we shall have no false issues raised, nor any irrelevant disputes introduced.

1. *Of the question.*—I have aimed to so state the question as to involve the precise point in doubt; to involve all that is in doubt, and nothing that is not; in other words, to exclude from the proposition all that is foreign to the issue, and to include only that which is essential. The question, then, is not whether all wars are in themselves wrong, or whether some wars are right; not whether Christ ever sanctions war, or whether he never sanctions it; not what men not under Christ may or may not do; nor what governments may or may not do,—the question raises none of these points. But a state of war actually existing, no matter by whom or what induced; no matter from what cause arising; no matter for what end waged,—does Christ permit his followers to fight therein? This is the question.

2. *The issue.*—Is not what Nimrod did, nor what God sanctioned in his day; not what Israel did in or out of the wilderness; not what Moses commanded, or Joshua did; not what Saul did, nor David did, nor Samuel did. These are not the issue. Neither is it, whether some wars have not resulted well; whether nations have not been blessed by them; whether the wicked have not been justly scourged by them; whether all this may not justify them; and whether, if, on such grounds, they are justified, Christians may not allowably take part in them. Neither are these the issue. But does Christ *permit* a Christian to fight in any war? Not whether he *may* permit it; but whether he *does* permit it. This is the issue.

3. *The logical position.* — Let it be carefully observed that the relation we sustain to the question is strictly negative. We do not affirm that no Christian can with Christ's approval fight in war; we *deny that any can*. We are, consequently, not to prove anything. Our business is to show that others prove nothing; that is, that they prove

nothing who affirm the proposition. This we confidently expect to show. Those, then, who affirm that Christ permits his followers to fight in war, take on them the burden of proof. Our denial stands good against their affirmation till they adduce the evidence on which they rest their conclusion. If we show that that evidence is impertinent or inadequate, or that it is in any other respect so defective as not to necessitate the conclusion it is designed to establish,' then the proposition must be held, as to this evidence, to be false, and a verdict is to be rendered for us. And if, on still further investigation, no evidence necessitating the conclusion is adduced, then the proposition must be held to be absolutely false, and all Christians should eschew it.

Nor must the proof adduced to sustain the proposition in hand be such as to leave it in any sense doubtful. War is a shocking thing. It is abhorrent to the feelings of all humane and tender hearts. Its effects on the morals of a people, its waste of human life, the misery and suffering it entails—these show it to be a horrid thing. Now surely, no doubtful proof can justify the Christian in taking part in it. The case should be both clear and imperative. If even the vestige of a doubt hangs over the case, I hold that the Christian is bound to decide against a step which leads him to shed human blood. If the case is merely doubtful, then to my mind the case is decided, and decided against the proposition. It is not enough that the Bible may merely say nothing against it. To make the step right, the Bible must enjoin it, and that in the clearest terms; or if it enjoin it not thus, at least must it do it in some not less binding form. These principles seem to me so obviously correct that simply to state them is enough; and if correct, it will hardly be denied that they lie heavily against the proposition in hand.

But still further in regard to the form in which the proposition should be stated. I have phrased it thus: Does Christ in any case permit his followers to go to war? But I much doubt whether this is the true form for the proposition. Is not this rather it? Christ in some cases binds Christians to go to war. It so strikes me. For if they are not bound to go, then it seems to me intuitively clear that they are bound not to go. Such is the nature of war that it can not be a matter of indifference whether we go or not; and if it is not a matter of indifference, then it is a matter of duty one way or the other. It is either a duty to go, or a duty not to go. This I shall take for granted. The proposition, then, let us allow, is this: Christ in some cases binds Christians to go to war.

Now let all my brethren suppose me to have affirmed this proposition, and to be standing before an audience about to attempt its proof. Just at this juncture, let them imagine an angel to appear and to take his stand beside me. Let them now suppose him to say to me: "You shall die before to-morrow morning. If from the word of God you

make good the proposition you have affirmed, you shall be saved; if not, you shall be lost." What would be their sensations on hearing this announcement? The universal feeling would be—lost, forever lost. But why? Because from not one passage in the word of God binding me as a Christian, or in any other sense, from not one incident in the life of the Savior, from not one in the life of any apostle, would it occur to them that I could make good my task. They would at once appeal to their memory of the New Testament to suggest to them the proof; and this their memory could not do, for the proof is not there. But one feeling would pervade every heart, and that one of universal horror. They would believe me to be as certainly doomed, as they believe the Bible to be the word of God. Even he who most confidently affirms it to be the duty of the Christian, in certain contingencies, to go to war, would involuntarily utter: Lost. But this would not be the case if the New Testament, in any form or in any way, supplied the requisite proof. I must hence feel the proposition, in the only form in which it really ought to be stated, to be difficult indeed, if not wholly incapable of proof.

But let me present a similar case. The proposition to be discussed, allow, is this: The New Testament makes it the duty of Christian parents to have their infants sprinkled. Let us suppose the person who affirms this proposition to be a Methodist Episcopal Bishop, venerable for his great age and pure life. He is before an audience to begin its defense. An angel appears, as supposed in the preceding case, and the same startling announcement is made. Instantly my brethren would shriek: Gone. But does not that bishop as firmly hold his proposition to be grounded in the word of God as do you, my brother, who affirm that Christians should sometimes go to war? *Men may be mistaken.* And I am free to say that I see quite as much in the Bible to favor the bishop as I do to favor my brother who stands for war; and that I think their mode of treating the Scriptures much alike.

Let it constantly be borne in mind, that to be either bound or permitted to go to war, is to be either bound or permitted to take the life of human beings. When, then, the question is reduced to its simplest form it amounts to this, that Christ binds or allows his followers to take human life. Are we not shocked at the very announcement of such a thought? That He who came into this world, not to destroy men's lives, but to save them, has yet ordained that in certain cases his disciples shall not save them, but destroy them, is a tough position for the Christian to defend. The mode in which this is done alters not the case. I hold that I have just as good a right to step out into the street and in cold blood shoot my enemy dead, as I have to do it on the battle-field. On the battle-field, every time I shoot I aim to kill a man; in the street I could do no more. But it

.will be replied, that in the street I shoot from malice, but not so on the battle-field. Perhaps so. The only difference I see is, that in the one case the malice is directed against a single individual, in the other against a troop; in the one case I aim to kill only one man, in the other as many as I can. I apprehend that the human heart is capable of no more deadly hate than adverse warriors carry into the melee of the battle-field. Here passion runs as high as passion can run, only it is disciplined; and hatred is as intense as it ever becomes, only the code that regulates it is different. Its mode of action is not the same; itself is not the less real.

Before proceeding to adduce the arguments which are herein to follow, and as much as possible to guard against the influence of prejudice, I wish to say, that the position will not be here taken that the Christian by going to war necessarily unchristianizes himself. If Christ neither binds him nor permits him to go, then by going it is held that he does wrong; unless, as already said, war is in itself a thing so harmless and indifferent, that he may go or not, as he chooses. But the wrong of going to war can be allowed to have no other effect on him than any other wrong act. It is a thing to be forgiven, as is every other wrong; and hence is not necessarily decisive against him. If not forgiven, of course, it is fatal; but this is not because it is an act of going to war, but simply because it is in itself wrong. Any other wrong act, if unforgiven, would have precisely the same effect.

But to this it will be replied, that many Christians go to war who not only do not believe their act to be wrong, but positively believe it to be right; and that in all this they must be allowed to be strictly conscientious. Granting this, which must be true before the Christian can act with his own approbation, and still the nature of the act remains the same. The act has its own absolute character, as right or wrong, independently of the convictions of him who engages in it. To go to war and take men's lives is not a thing made right or wrong merely by the accident of being believed right or wrong. It is right in itself, or wrong in itself; and no human convictions can divest it of this attribute. If wrong, though all men believed it to be right, still it is not right, How far conscientiously believing it to be right, when it is wrong, will go to soften the rigor of Heaven's sentence against it, is a question which I am wholly incompetent to decide. That it will have its effect I am glad I have not the inclination to deny. We have all long since learned how extremely dangerous it is to decide acts to be right simply from the motives which control them. Few acts could be named which could not be shown to be right in some part of the world, if this were to be accepted as the standard. An act may be right in itself, but if controlled by wrong motives it will not be accepted. The wrong motives affect not the act, however; they affect

only the actor. He will be rejected, not because his act is wrong, but because his motives were wrong. To be accepted himself and have his act accepted, two things are necessary: the act itself must be right, and the motives which control it must be right. If the act be right and the motives wrong, the actor is rejected, and the act goes for nothing. But if the act be wrong and the motives right, still the actor can not be accepted; for it was his duty not to act till he knew his act to be right. Had he been at the proper pains to investigate the nature of his act before he performed it, he would have learned that it is wrong. For this neglect his motives can constitute no sufficient excuse, at least they can constitute none so far availing as to render an act wrong in itself right. Acts, in the case of the Christian, have not their character as right or wrong from the convictions of him who performs them, but solely from the will of Christ. They hence have a character which is absolute and positive; and this no motives or convictions of men can change. Though all the men on earth believed the act of sprinkling water on an infant in the name of Christ to be right, and to be baptism, still would it be a crime and deeply offensive to the Savior? So with the act of going to war. If it is right, it is because it is either commanded or in obvious and necessary accordance with the will of Christ; if wrong, it is because it is contrary to his will; and in this case nothing can render it right, but it remains a sin forever. Hence what remains is to determine the character, under Christ, of the act of going to war. Is it right? Is it wrong? Or is it indifferent?

But what do we mean when we talk of an act of going to war? The language is vague and general. It strikes me that a sharper and more specific view of its import and implication is necessary before we can either test it by rules or apply to it arguments; and this we must certainly do before we can pronounce on it a very reliable judgment.

By an act of going to war, then, we mean, not to speak more particularly, an act of going out to subdue *by force* an enemy. Now the very first question which here arises is this: Is the Christian in any case allowed, to say nothing of his being bound, to use *force* against a human being? This is a hard question, lying on the very threshold of our subject. If the Christian may not use force at all, then the question is settled. He can not go to war. May he, then, use force? Of course, the advocate of war must affirm it. Can he prove it? I ask the candid reader if he has here no doubt? Does he feel sure that the advocate of war can make good his case? I must say my doubts are large with heavy point. Indeed, I feel satisfied that he can never invest his case with even a high degree of probability, far less can he make it good. On what ground, let me ask, may he use force, if on any? Let it be constantly borne in mind that the

Christian man is not his own; that he has been redeemed by Christ, and consequently belongs to him. Christ's will, then, and not his own, is the rule of his conduct. He has no rights of his own, and may do nothing save by sufferance of Christ. Has, then, Christ given him the right to use force against a fellow-creature?—especially has he given him the right to use it against him to the extent of taking away his life? Every precept of the New Testament, having the slightest bearing on the case, negatives the question. This is not the place to argue the question save on general grounds, yet even these appear enough. Suppose it to be admitted that the Christian may use force against his fellows, whom of them may he use it against? When the advocate of war says against the enemies of the State, this is an arbitrary discrimination. Why not equally against his personal enemies? Of course, the answer is: He is forbidden to use it against these, but not against the enemies of the State. But this is not satisfactory. For, in the first place, it is an assumption of the point in debate; and, in the second place, it implies a false ground of action. The Christian may not do things merely where they are not inhibited, especially where even this is doubtful. Mere non-inhibition can never justify an act such as that of going to war. It must rest on a far more solid and authoritative basis than this. The right to use force is hence far from being apparent.

But the act of going to war is more than the mere act of going out to subdue an enemy by force. It is the act of going out to take his life. Further than this, it is the act of going out to take many lives. When the Christian enters the ranks as a soldier, he enters expecting and willing to be led into battle. And when led into battle, he intends to kill to the full extent of his power. Hence, every time he has a chance to shoot, he shoots; and every time he shoots he aims to kill a man. Suppose now he has a chance to shoot twenty times in a day, and this is a very moderate estimate, twenty times in a day, then, he aims to take the life of a human being who was created in the image of God. These human beings are generally unprepared to die. They are hence hurried into eternity in the midst of passion, while their souls are thirsting for blood, and curses are on their lips. Yet twenty times in the day the Christian deliberately intends thus to hurry one off. Is it possible now that he can be acting with the approbation of Christ, and that his soul is pure in the sight of God? Whether he kills or not every time he shoots affects not the case I am making. He *intends* to kill. This intent is the thing which I wish to have shown to be right. If this can not be done, again I repeat, the question is settled. The Christian can not innocently go to war.

Hence, when maintaining the right of the Christian to go to war, what he who maintains it has to do is, to maintain the Christian's right to intend and actually to kill a human being, called his enemy, every

time he gets a chance on the battle-field. I know not what proposition the New Testament may not be made to sustain, if it can be shown to sustain this.

The subject in discussion being now pretty fully stated, and the proposition to be opposed being fairly before the mind, I may, I believe, next proceed to adduce my arguments. The proposition to be opposed, let it be borne in mind, is this: *Christ in some cases binds Christians to go to war.*

1. My first argument in refutation of this proposition is drawn from the source whence wars spring. The argument is, that; war can not be right when its cause is wrong. What now is its cause? The following from the New Testament supplies the answer: "Whence are wars, and whence battles among you? Are they not hence, from your lusts that war in your members *1*" (James iv., 1. Green's Translation.)

Here lust is, in the word of Christ, set down as the cause of wars and battles; not as the cause of some wars and some battles, but as the cause of all wars and all battles. And I hesitate not to believe that, were we capable of tracing every war to the secret motive from which it originates, we should find the apostle's remark to be in every case, and in the severest sense, true. Lust of territory, lust of power, lust of fame, lust of wealth—few will be found to deny that these are the great mainsprings of war. Extinguish all trace of these in the human breast, and unless Satan could muster some other passion into service, wars would universally cease. Now that lust is positively forbidden in the word of God, as a thing wrong in itself, no one will deny. Hence all acts which are strictly performed to carry it out and gratify it must be wrong. This includes war—all war. Hence all war must be wrong. But is it the object of the apostle in the passage to show merely whence wars come, and that they are wrong because lust is wrong? Is it not rather to show that lust is wrong, because it leads to war? Does he not take for granted that war is wrong; and then, as war is the effect of lust, reason from the effect to the cause to show that the cause is wrong? Clearly, to my mind, his object is to condemn lust because it leads to war. But how can he condemn lust because it leads to war, if war itself be right? The answer is obvious. Hence from every view we can take of the passage the same conclusion results—war is wrong.

But in reply to this it will be said that the wars and battles of the passage are not war in the sense in which the word occurs in the question, Should Christians go to war? but that they denote merely the little feuds and contentions which from time to time spring up among the children of God. How, I ask, is this known? Or from what laws of language results such a narrowing of the terms? This view is clearly arbitrary, and taken for a special purpose. If the

words "wars and battles" have not here their accustomed signification, it would be difficult, it seems to me, to show that they have it anywhere else in the Bible. I can certainly take them in no other than their usual sense; and must deny to others the right to do so, till they make good that they have that right.

But even granting that the wars and battles of the passage refer only to the little feuds and strifes which occasionally arise among Christians, and does a better conclusion result? If Christians may not take part even in the small strife, which is free from the guilt of human blood, may they yet take part in the great battle where thousands are slaughtered? Is it the magnitude of a war which makes it right? Or is it right only when human blood runs, and wrong only when it does not? If an argument from the less to the greater is ever sound, then must that be sound which from the wrong of the bloodless feud infers the wrong of the bloody battle. How Christians can be wrong when merely quarreling with their brethren, and yet right when shooting human beings down in battle, is something which I confess my utter inability to see.

2. My second argument will be based on the following: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." (John xviii., 36.)

The expression, "My kingdom is not of this world," is to the Christian one of peculiar value. It is one of those great general sayings of the Savior which regulate not a single act, but a life. By it the Christian is taken completely out of the world. His citizenship is changed; for he is transferred into a new kingdom; his relations are new; his modes of life are new; and all the principles which govern it are new. He is himself a new creature; old things have passed away; and he is no longer, as though still living in the world, to be regulated in his conduct by purely worldly ways and laws. His subjection to the will of Christ is now absolute. It is the supreme regulating law of his life. It controls, not one act, but all. Every thought, and word, and deed is to be referred to this and determined by it. All this is implied in the fact that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, and that the Christian is in it. Now, that war is not permitted within this kingdom, among its inhabitants, is simply indisputable. Wars take place in the world and belong to it. They are not of the kingdom of Christ. Hence, if the Christian go to Avar, he must, to that extent, go out of the kingdom and back into the world. Now the question arises, can any thing, law, or necessity, which is not of this kingdom, so far take the Christian out of the kingdom, and place him back in the world, as to enable him innocently to engage in war? I feel profoundly satisfied it can not. If war were permitted in the kingdom, then might the Christian engage in it out

of the kingdom; or if it harmonized with any rule of action of the kingdom, or with its spirit, or with the renewed character of its citizens, in that case might the Christian go to war. But it is not permitted, neither does it so harmonize. On what ground, then, I ask, is the Christian to be justified in an act of going to war? Simply none.

But we must not omit to notice the Savior's own mode of treating the case. His language is: "If my kingdom were of this world, *then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.*" Now allow that the word "fight" is not to be here so taken as to include fighting for any purpose; still it must be admitted that it denotes fighting in any way. "Then would my servants fight, *that I should not be delivered to the Jews.*" The object is clearly specific; the mode of effecting it clearly is not; that is, it is not except within certain general limits. It is specific within the limits within which fighting can be done, but no farther. The Savior clearly means, then would my servants fight, fight in any way, fight with anything, fight in battle, fight as soldiers—fight in whatever mode might be necessary to prevent the end named. This clearly includes fighting in the sense of an act of war. Now, that delivering up the Savior to the Jews, and their putting him to death, were wrong, are points which, in the light of the New Testament, need not be argued. The Savior himself decides the former point, in what he says of Judas; Peter decides the latter, in what he says of the Jews. Indeed, I set down the act of murdering Christ as the most outrageous and flagrant deed of earth. Of all the crimes that heaven ever frowned upon, this, in point of turpitude; exceeds them all. To take a being, who was without spot or stain, the purest and truest friend of man, and with malice of the pit put him to "death, rises in blackness and deep criminality infinitely over every other sin of human kind. Nor is it the slightest mitigation of this sin that God intended his Son thus to die. This he did; but he never intended the wickedness which caused it. To intend that his Son should thus die, knowing that there would then be men who, of their own accord, would be wicked enough to do the deed, is one thing; and to intend that wickedness, a very different thing. That God did; not this. Hence the Jews were in God's sight, and in the sight of every law forbidding wrong and every one commanding right, as guilty as though his Father had decreed that Christ should live forever and never die. Now if, because his kingdom is not of this world, he would not let his servants fight to prevent this crime, what crime may they yet fight to prevent, or what to avenge? The crime, it seems to me, can not be named by human cunning which can justify fighting if this did not. But further: let it be noted that this would not have been a fight to acquire territory, power, or gain, or to gratify lust in any of its forms, but solely to prevent the shedding of innocent blood.

Yet to fight even for this object, and in the absence of all the motives and feelings which usually lead to war, was not permitted. Can, then, the servants of Christ fight at all? To me it seems impossible.

But we shall be told, that, had Christ allowed his servants to fight, and to prevent his being delivered to the Jews, thereby the purposes of God would have been defeated as to the mode in which his Son should die. Granting this, as to this particular mode, still, had it been right to fight to prevent it, would not the heavenly Father have fixed on some other mode which fighting could not defeat? Surely he was not necessarily limited to a single mode. As an objection, then, this amounts to nothing.

But still further: we shall be told that it would have been wrong for Christ's servants to fight to prevent an event which was necessary to the founding of his kingdom, and, without which, it could not be founded; but that this does not imply that they may not fight for other purposes. True, it may not imply this; but it expressly teaches that fighting is in some cases not allowable. Now, granting that in others it may be, then comes the difficult question, which are the allowable, and which the disallowed cases. In the absence of divine direction, are Christians competent to decide the question? I feel sure they are not. Are they not rather bound to decide that all wars are wrong, seeing they are so very horrible in themselves, and hence to decline to take part in them till some divine warrant therefor is produced? This seems to me to be their true and only safe rule of conduct. At least, they must not act till they know which wars are right, if any are, and which are wrong; for in a doubtful case the Christian must either not act at all, or he must act on the side which is least doubtful; and that this is the side of not going to war I shall not argue.

3. My third argument will be based on the prayer which the Christian is taught by his Savior to make to the heavenly Father; namely, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

According to this, the profound and the expressed wish and desire of every Christian's heart is to be, that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven. This, moreover, is to be, not his occasional, but his constant prayer. Of course, then, while making it, he must do nothing inconsistent with it, or in any way calculated to defeat it. If now the will of God were to-day as perfectly done on earth as it is in heaven, does there live a Christian who believes that we should ever have another war? Surely not. But why? Because it is the instinctive feeling of every pious heart that the will of God is not only against war, but that were it done on earth as it is in heaven all war would cease, and peace would reign universally. In proof of the correctness of this feeling, we know that a time comes when the will of God will be done on earth as perfectly as it is in heaven; and that then there will be no war, but universal and per-

petual peace. And this state of peace will be the immediate effect of the complete prevalence of the will of God. The inference, then, is just, that the will of God is wholly against war, and inducive only of peace. This will the Christian is to do as far as in him lies; and no power or other will can legitimately interpose to interfere with his act, prevent it, or prescribe another. He is wholly and supremely bound to the will of God, and nothing, save that will itself, can release him from it, that he may do other acts than those prescribed in it. Certainly, then, he can not be released to do acts contrary to it. Now, unless God has so far released the Christian from his will that he may go to war, which is an act contrary to his will, then is the Christian bound to refrain, and not to go to war. Has God, then, so far released him? I solemnly deny it; and from him who affirms it demand the most indubitable proof. God has certainly not in so many words released him. If, then, he has released him at all, it is by necessary implication. Is there a passage containing it? If so, we shall leave with the advocate of war the task of producing it. Our denial stands firm.

But to this it may be replied, that it was once, as in the days of Saul, the will of God that men should go to war, and that he actually commanded it; and further, that, since he is unchanging, it must still be his will. Here I must again remind the reader of the question at issue. It is not what may be the will of God respecting men of the world—men who are not Christians. With this question I have nothing to do. It may, for aught I know, be God's will, not that war should exist, but that, since nations will grow corrupt and go to war, one nation should thus become the scourge of another. He may avail himself of war to chasten; but this does not prove war right. It only proves that God will sometimes use human wrong as a rod of human correction. But the question is, not what God permitted or commanded in the days of Saul, but what he commands or permits now under the reign of his Son. And as to his not changing, this is granted; but it does not therefore follow that he never changes the laws which men are to obey, or the principles by which they are to be governed. This he does. Hence, from the fact that it was once his will that Saul and others should go to war, it does not result that Christians may go to war.

4. My fourth argument is drawn from the two following passages:

"Then said Jesus to him: Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." (Matt. xxvi., 52.) Again: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed by the sword." (Rev. xiii., 10.)

If these two passages do not settle the question, then must I despair of ever seeing it settled, at least by holy writ. I can not

imagine how a passage, unless it ran in the words, "you shall not go to war," could be more decisive than these are. To my mind they are final.

But let me analyze the passages. And, first, we have the broad general assertion: "all that take the sword shall perish by the sword." This language is without limitation, and must hence be taken in its most comprehensive sense. It does not apply merely to men who take the sword for this purpose, but not to men who take it for that. It applies to all men who take the sword, whether in the kingdom of Christ or out of it, of to-day or to-morrow. No matter what they are, or when they live; if they take the sword, the decree is gone forth, they must die by it. This is absolutely indisputable. Why, now, has Christ decreed that all who take the sword shall die by it? The sole reason is, *because it is wrong to take the sword*. If it were right to take the sword, then it would be wrong to decree that he who takes it shall die by it. To die by the sword is appointed to be the penalty of taking it; it is the punishment due him who uses it. But this it could not be, if using the sword were right. It is hence wrong, universally wrong. No Christian, then, may use it. *Consequently no Christian can go to war*. This conclusion seems to me wholly invulnerable. It is incapable of refutation.

Next, the specific direction: "Put up again your sword into its place." But why put it up? Because, says the defendant of war, it was not allowable to use it in furtherance of Christ's kingdom. Granted. But this is not the reason assigned by the Savior for putting up the sword. That reason is, "for all that take the sword shall die by it." Clearly the train of thought which yields the specific direction is this: All who take the sword shall die by it, because it is wrong ever to take it. Then, Peter, you must not use it. Therefore put it up.

Now how antagonistic to this the position of the advocate of war. He does not say to the Christian, who stands in the battle rank, with drawn sword, ready to strike his fellow down: Put up your sword. Not at all. He says rather to that Christian: Draw your sword and strike. Why? Because he who takes the sword shall not die by it; for it is right to take it. It is idle to say more here.

To the same effect is the language cited from Revelation: "He who leads into captivity shall go into captivity." Now it can hardly be held to be right to go to war, but wrong to lead a captured warrior into captivity. This is certainly deemed, by such as defend war, to be one of its most legitimate consequences. Yet the passage settles that "he who leads into captivity shall himself go into captivity;" and his going into captivity is clearly determined against him as a retribution or punishment in kind for his deed. But how can he who leads into captivity be punished in kind, unless leading into captivity is itself

wrong? The answer is clear. To go into captivity is a just punishment for leading into captivity. Hence leading into captivity is wrong. But leading into captivity can not be wrong, and war, out of which it grows, be right. Hence war itself is wrong; and, therefore, the Christian can not take part in it.

But the remainder of John's language is still more decisive than this: "He that kills with the sword shall be killed by the sword." How, in the teeth of this, the Christian man can persuade himself that he can innocently go to war, is a mystery I never expect to be able to show. There is but one way, it seems to me, in which he can possibly approve his deed to himself, or make it appear to be right. If he can show that to be killed by the sword is no punishment, but is in itself right and approved by Christ, then it may be he can show that the killing of others, from which it springs, is right also. There is no other way.

The only possible reply to this, which I can think of, is, that the killing which leads to being killed is the killing, not of a public, but of a private personal enemy. Should any one take this position, I have simply to say, that for him I am not writing. I am writing for fair men and reasonable; no others.

5. The following supplies my fifth argument: "But I say to you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you, and persecute you." (Matt. v., 44.)

Let any Christian man study the sentiment herein expressed, study the spirit, drink it in till his soul is full of it; till, in other words, he is thoroughly imbued with it; and then let him in candor say whether in his heart he feels no antagonism between this spirit and that which would lead him to war, lead him to take human life. I set it down as a thing simply indisputable, that no man, be he saint or sinner, can with the sentiment and spirit herein named ever go to war. The spirit of the passage and the spirit of war are hopelessly irreconcilable. They can never be made to agree.

But let us inspect the passage a little closer. In what sense, then, are we to take the word enemy? Of course, if we take it not to express all enemies of whatever kind or name, at least must we take it to express a personal enemy. More than this it may mean, and most probably does; less than this it can not mean. A personal enemy, then, we dare not hate; we must love him. But if we dare not hate a personal enemy, then must we hate none. And if we must love the personal enemy, I conclude we must love all. These positions will not be dissented from by the Christian. If, now, the Christian is solemnly bound to love his enemy, obviously he is equally bound to do nothing to him inconsistent with this love. Can he, then, at the instant while loving him and praying for him, and in harmony therewith, take

deliberate aim at him on the battle-field, and shoot him dead? The thing is impossible. Human nature is incapable of the deed. No more can the Christian shoot on the battle-field a man whom he loves, and for whom he is praying, than he can the mother that bore him. The feeling of love must be wholly extinguished in his bosom and all his prayers hushed before he is capable of the deed. But this with the Christian must never be the case. He can hence never go to war. To love an enemy and to want to kill him at one and the same time are feelings grossly opposed. No two can be more so. Yet such must be the state of the Christian's heart before he can go into a battle; unless he may cease to love, which, of course, he can never do.

In estimating the bearing on war of such a passage as that now in hand, we must remember to look at war and warriors just as they are, and not in the deceptive light with which the glowing pen of the defendant of war sometimes invests them. To die for one's country is a glorious thing, we are told. So it may be; but it must be a small affair to him that dies. If a glory indeed, it is so for him who lives, and not to him who dies. To follow the drum and fife in martial line, and shout: "On to victory, boys, on 1" is very chivalric to be sure; but when a soldier lies mangled on the field, his last blood spouting from his heart, and murmurs with life's closing sob: "Oh, my wife and little ones I"—this is a note in a different tune. To report to His Excellency the number of troops engaged, the magnificent handling of forces on the field, the noble bearing of Gen. A., the strategic skill of Col. C, the dashing charge of Capt. B., the tug of battle, the wavering of lines, the repulse, the rout, the victory, the pieces of artillery taken, the flags captured,—all this reads well. But what is it all to him whose cold and pulseless body lies stiff on the sod through the frosty night, while his desolate wife screams in her distant home, and weeping, dependent children cry: "Father is gone; oh, gone, forever gone I" The poetry is now not quite so exquisite. But to draw the picture of a battle is not my object. I wish merely to call attention to the evidently very loving spirit in which this work of death is certainly done, to the many prayers which are breathed for enemies while it is going on,—and to the strict accordance of both with the spirit and tenor of the passage in hand. This is all.

6. My sixth argument is suggested by the following: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." (Matt. vii., 12.)

Fortunately for us, in commenting on this passage, we shall not be met by objections based on supposed or real limitations in its meaning. Here, at least, no reference is made to nations as such, individuals as such, public enemies as such, or private enemies as such. The reference is to men universally, whether enemies or not, Neither nation, rank, condition, age, class, nor individual is excluded. All

men are included, with all their relations, whether to heaven or earth, state or church, family or individual. All whose acts can affect us, or whom our acts can affect, are included; hence none are excluded. How, now, are we to act toward all these? This the Savior does not absolutely answer in the case of each act; conditionally he does. He answers, it is true; but his answer is contingent, depending on our own previous determination or wish in the particular case. Whenever in a given case we decide what we would have a human being do to us, then he decides what we must do. Would we now, in any case conceivable or possible, have an individual to take our life? The answer is overwhelming—we would not. If an enemy saw us on the battle-field, we would not have him shoot at us; and if he shot, we would not have him hit us. This we know to be true at the bar of our own conscience. We would not even have him aim to hit us; for this would imply a willingness on our part to be hit, which is a thing we are incapable of. If our enemy saw us, we would have him to be, in some way, unable to kill us. We would have him out of ammunition, or his gun out of order, the distance too great, or his skill defective; in no case would we have him kill us. Even if we knew our enemy to be in the right, and ourselves to be in the wrong, or that by the laws, either of nations or of the State, we deserved death, still the same result follows—we would not be killed; we would live as long as nature would let us. If an enemy saw us exposed, we would have him pity a poor fellow-mortal and not shoot; or if he had the advantage of us, we would have him too magnanimous to use it; all this we know in ourselves to be true. If, now, such is the would or the wish of our own hearts, and such we know to be their would or wish, then we know what our conduct is to be, in every case, toward our enemy—we must not kill him. Not only so, we must kill no one, whether enemy or not. Then, if we must not kill, we must not go to war; for when we go to war, this is what we go for. This conclusion seems to me unanswerable, and decisive of the question in issue.

But, now, what exceptions does the Savior's language admit of, or what means have we of escape from its meaning? I confess I know of none; nor do I see how any can be imagined. The passage seems to me to bring the controversy to an end. And, if so, the question: Can a Christian go to war *is settled. He can not go.*

T. A seventh argument will be deduced from the following: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law." (Gal. v., 22, 23.)

On reading the fruits of the Spirit, as here enumerated, it seems to me impossible for the Christian not to feel that there is the most palpable repugnance between the spirit and acts which these fruits

imply and the spirit and acts of war. Opposition can not well be conceived which would be greater. Suppose the passage read thus: The fruit of the Spirit is love, hatred, joy, grief, peace, war, and so on,—would we not be shocked with its incongruities? We should feel that it was a tissue of contradictions; and the feeling no one could pronounce unjust. Yet, how could we so feel, or why should we so feel, if war be right? If war be right, there can be no antagonism between the spirit which induces it and the Spirit which yields the preceding fruits. Nor does the fact that the passage reads not as supposed in the least change its value in the case in hand. The opposition between the contents of the passage and the spirit of war still as palpably exists; only it exists not in the terms of the passage. It exists in the facts of the case, but it is none the less real on that account. All Christians have the Spirit; and he who has not the Spirit is not a Christian. This we hold to be irrefutable. One of the named fruits of this Spirit is peace. The opposite of peace is war. Now how can a man who is under the influence of the Spirit which induces peace, yet at the same time engage in war by the sanction of that Spirit? I hold it to be an insult to the Spirit of God to so affirm. Yet short of this affirmation the advocate of war can not stop. I shall leave him, then, to reconcile the points of opposition; for I can not.

Again: another fruit of the Spirit is gentleness. This is a lovely trait in the character of the Christian. Now can any two conceivable things be more opposed than this gentleness and the violence of war? In not a single feature do they agree. War is the very climax of violence. It is violent in spirit, violent in action, violent in every way. Yet, if it be right for the Christian to go to war, then, in some way, must the violence of war be shown to be consistent with the gentleness of the Spirit. But this can never be done. The conclusion is obvious—Christians can not go to war; for they can not become men of violence.

Here, now, are seven consecutive arguments against the position that the Christian is, in any case, bound to go to war. These arguments might easily be increased to twice this number. Any one of them, if countervailed by no conclusive offsetting argument, would, I hold, be decisive against the question in hand. When taken together, as a refutation, I feel them to be nothing short of final. How, in the teeth of their conjoint force, any sane man can stand up, and still say the Christian should, in certain cases, go to war, is something I claim not to be able to understand. Of course, the right of others to a different opinion is not herein called in question, nor their sincerity in the event of holding it in any sense doubted. If, now, there is nothing in the word of God to set aside or annul these arguments, they will, I believe, be generally accepted as decisive. Is there, then, any scripture to annul them? Of course the advocate of war must hold

that there is. I shall consequently adduce the passage on which alone he relies, or, if not on this alone, on this and others like it; hence one will suffice.

" Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resists the power, resists the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." (Rom. xiii., 1-3.)

The argument based on this passage is concisely the following: All legitimate war is an act of the State, and not of the individual. The passage in hand binds every Christian to be obedient to the State. Hence, if the State command the Christian to engage in war, he is bound to obey.

Now, for the sake of avoiding collateral issues, and waiving all immaterial questionable points, I will grant that all legitimate war is an act of the State, and not of the individual. Hence, whether there is any such thing as legitimate war, is, as the reader will perceive, not here made a question. Thus, then, we dispose at once of the first premise of the argument.

The passage in hand binds every Christian to be obedient to the State. This proposition is both true and false. Properly qualified, it is true; without qualification, it is false. It is not true that the passage binds Christians unconditionally to be obedient to the State. Certainly the passage binds Christians to be obedient to the State *in all matters not in collision with Christianity*; and in all such matters the Christian has no discretion,—he is bound to obey. The law of the State, in the case, may, in his judgment, be unwise, it may be inexpedient, it may be oppressive; it may be in many other respects objectionable; it may even be offensive and odious; still, if on comparing it with the word of God it is not found to be in conflict therewith, he is bound to obey it—to obey it, too, as a matter of conscience. All this I hold to be a matter of solemn duty with the Christian.

But the moment the State commands the Christian to do anything contrary to Christianity, no matter what it may be, or how great the necessity for it, he is bound to disobey. Of course, in all such cases there is a conflict between the will of Christ and the will of the State; and in every instance of such conflict, the will of Christ, and not the will of the State, determines the Christian's act. This no Christian will deny.

If, for example, the king of a realm commanded all Christians within the bounds of his jurisdiction to set up in their respective houses of worship a statue of himself *in simple token of their loyalty to him*, no Christian man could refuse obedience to the command; for clearly there is no collision between it and any duty we owe to Christ. But if at the same time the king commanded divine honor to be paid to

such statue, Christians would be compelled to disobey. Here, then, clearly the right of the State to command its Christian subjects is shown to be a limited, and not an unlimited, right. Of the truth of all this the well-known case of Daniel is a pertinent illustration.

Again: if the United States by special statute command all male citizens born within its limits to be circumcised, in order to distinguish them from citizens of foreign birth, however arbitrary and tyrannical such statute might be, I do not see how Christian men could refuse obedience to it. Indeed, on scriptural grounds they could not. But if the United States at the same time commanded such citizens to be circumcised as a religious duty, and as in obedience to the law of Moses, then every Christian man would be compelled to disobey, even at the peril of his life. For while so far forth as circumcision can be viewed as an indifferent act, the right of the United States to enjoin it may be held to be complete, and this whether the reasons for it be adequate or not; still the United States has no right to prescribe to its Christian citizens the observance of any act as *a religious act*. Hence all attempts to do so would have to be resisted, only, however, to the extent of disobedience, even if the disobedience led to the suffering of death.

In all cases, therefore, where the act is in itself right, or is simply indifferent, that is, is made right or wrong solely by the command of the State, the right of the State to command its Christian citizens, and their duty to obey, must be held as perfect and indisputable. But in all cases where the act is not clearly right in itself, or not clearly indifferent, then the State has no authority to command its Christian citizens, and every such command is in itself null and void.

Now since the act of going to war is shown by the preceding Scriptures to be wholly inconsistent with the teachings of the New Testament, it is therefore shown to be, at least in the case of the Christian, a wrong act. Hence, since it is not an indifferent act, nor an act right simply in itself, but, on the contrary, is a wrong act, at least for the Christian, it thence follows that the State has no right to command the Christian to engage in it, and that where the State does so command, every such command is a nullity in the sight of Christ, and is to be absolutely and unconditionally disobeyed by the Christian. Such is the conclusion which results legitimately from the premises now before us. Hence on this conclusion we hold that every Christian man is bound to act; and that he has no discretion in the case. Consequently, if the State command him to go to war, let him mildly and gently, but firmly and unalterably, decline. If the State arrest him and punish him, be it so; if the State even shoot him. be it so; *never let him go to war*.

Much more, certainly, might be said On the question, but I shall **now** bring this paper to a close. My aim has been, not to make an elab-

orate argument, but a conclusive one. For this purpose I have thought it best to confine myself strictly to the Scriptures. Hence I have not turned aside to discuss the statistics of war, nor any other feature connected with it, except such as is involved in the question: Is it right? This question settled, I deem all others of secondary importance.

Again: it will be perceived that I have discussed the question with no reference to the unhappy war through which our country has just passed. My object has been to make a calm, temperate argument, which should be offensive to brethren on neither side of the recent strife. I have wished to profit all, and offend none. With what success the task has been executed, the considerate reader is left to decide.

SOUTHERN KENTUCKY AND NORTHERN TENNESSEE.—Recently I made a visit to Clarksville, Tenn., and spent some two weeks with the faithful little flock meeting in that place. The congregation is not large, but a truer one I do not remember to have met with. Bro. J. E. Myles ministers to it in the things of the Spirit; and under his discreet care it is gradually coming into public favor, and acquiring power for good.

While in Clarksville I met with several brethren from neighboring districts, from whom I learned much respecting the state of the churches and of the cause in the region above named. The cause is still suffering from the temporary eclipse of the war; and many of the churches have not yet recovered from the prostration occasioned by the last five years. Both greatly need the countenance and aid of sound and true men. Here opens up a wide field for evangelists. Indeed, in the region of which I am speaking at least twenty could find constant employment. At present the results of labor might not be large; for the popular mind seems to be sunk far into indifference; but the benefit to churches would be great, very great. And the very first work to be done is to place these on a working spiritual basis. Some of our brethren are talking of going to Australia. They can find the place close at home in the region here alluded to. One thing should be named—the compensation might not be large, for the country is not prospering yet; but the good effected would be incalculable. Here a work could now be done which for generations to come would continue to yield its fruits. Shall the opportunity be lost? Will not some of our preachers, who either have small families or none, turn their thought to this wide field? Many pure hearts would welcome them. Preachers would nobly work with them and help them with their prayers; while private brethren would repay them with their scanty earnings and their blessings. Dear brethren, let us see to it that this fine occasion is not lost.

THE PRESENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIANS.

SUCH is the deceptive title of an article in the preceding number of the *Quarterly*, from the pen of our excellent Brother L., the design of which is to prove, not the presence of the Holy Spirit in Christians, *bid that the Spirit is never present in them*. The contrariety between its heading and the contents of L.'s piece could hardly have escaped his notice; and if not, it is a little singular that he should have headed his piece with an expression calculated to make one impression on the reader, while, in fact, he designed the piece itself to make a very different one. This may all have been very innocent on the part of L., but we fear that there was far more of art than innocence in it. Why did he not head his piece thus: The Holy Spirit *never present in Christians*. This is his faith. Why, then, did he not boldly set it forth in the caption to his piece? Did he wish, by that fascinating title, to engage the attention of the reader till he should succeed in drugging him with his error? Or did he mean to be caught sailing under the enemy's flag, while carrying weapons against his life? Surely L. is too honorable a man for this. The only caption his piece can truthfully wear is: *The total absence of the Spirit from the Christian's heart*. Absence absolute, and not presence, is the true designation of L.'s theory and the true title of his piece. But had he headed it thus, the reader would have been shocked with its daring sentiment, and would have read it with distrust. We shall certainly award to L. some gentle cunning, in conceiving a happy title for a piece which is freighted down to the guard with false views.

L. affects to write his piece under the influence of at least an ordinary measure of conscious modesty. That he thinks he has so written, I am glad to believe. But I must tell him in kindness, that there is not a paragraph in his piece which is not marked by traces of opinionativeness, and by a spirit, I fear, too confident ever to abandon its present holdings. L. thinks he is in quest of truth in his piece; but let him not be deceived, his object is to inoculate the popular mind with his materialistic notions respecting the Holy Spirit. These notions he has set down as truths, and he neither expects to alter them nor to abandon them. Of course, he will tell you that he can not change his views except on sufficient grounds; but, then, sufficient grounds are precisely what he has already decided in his own mind can not be adduced. He does not believe that either man or angel can show them to be false; hence the expectation of a refutation of them, or of the detection of error in them, is not in his remotest dream. L. is not quite so well concealed in his spirit and temper as he thinks.

The air with which he writes, however softened by an occasional epithet, is not to be mistaken. Good a man as I think him to be, he is not proof against the bad effects of his theory on his spirit.

Before proceeding to a more minute review of L.'s article, which is still not intended to be an elaborate review, we must notice a few of its statements; which are designed, no doubt, to be statements of facts, but which we know to be not so.

On pages 162 and 163 of L.'s article is found the following: "On the one side the notion is entertained that the Holy Spirit operates immediately upon the human soul; that there is a direct impact or contact of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man. On the other, it is earnestly maintained that divine influence is not direct, but mediate; that the Spirit operates not by naked impact, but through the truth. Our brethren, as the reader doubtless understands, maintain with great unanimity the latter position. Quite a number, however, limit the application of this view to the sinner, and reject it unhesitatingly as it relates to the Christian. But a large majority, as the writer believes, consider it true in both cases; believing, if it can be shown that the Divine Spirit works by a direct impact in strengthening the Christian, and in helping his infirmities, that it can never be proved that he does not work in the same way in the conversion of sinners."

As an attempt to represent correctly the views of our brethren on the question in hand, the preceding is a failure from beginning to end. There is hardly one true feature in it. I am at a loss to account for it as coming from a brother who stands as high as does its author, and who certainly should have known better.

1. By sectarians it is maintained that the Holy Spirit operates *immediately* on the sinner's spirit in conversion. This is not simply denied with "great unanimity" by our brethren, but universally, or without one dissenting voice as far as known to me. The Spirit operates through the truth only, in conversion; this is the tenet of our brethren.

2. But in the case of the Christian the Holy Spirit dwells immediately, not representatively, in him. Whether it dwells in contact or not in contact with his spirit, neither "the fathers of this reformation" nor their prudent children affect to know; hence they have not had the boldness to say. They accept the fact as here stated, because the Scriptures teach it; but an explanation of the fact they wisely decline to attempt. This is the view of our brethren. Now when L. attempts to make the impression that "a large majority" of them hold a different view, he does them the greatest injustice. To represent Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott as not believing in the immediate indwelling in the Christian of the Holy Spirit is to falsify the clearest teachings of their lives. It is to do injustice to the

memory of the dead and to the faith in which they died. I am mortified at L., when he undertakes to represent "a majority" of our brethren as holding with him. That this may be the case in the region of country where he has taught on the point in hand may be sadly true; but I should be pained to think that even one man in a hundred, taking our whole brotherhood, holds the noxious tenet.

According to L., there are but two views respecting the action and dwelling of the Holy Spirit. He either acts immediately on the human spirit or only through the truth, or he dwells in *contact* with the human spirit, or only through the truth or some other influence. Now, as already said, our brethren have, in the case of the sinner, uniformly denied that he acts immediately on the spirit. But when L. puts into our lips as our tenet that he dwells only in *contact* with the spirit of the Christian, he puts a qualified or an explained tenet in our lips which we have never held. We respectfully deny to him the right to qualify our tenet so as to render it indefensible by the word of God and offensive to us, and then to charge on us that we hold it without warrant of Scripture, and to proceed to file objections against it as against us. We say simply, that is, our brethren, with not one exception in a hundred, *that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian*; and by this we mean that the Spirit itself dwells in him, and not merely that the truth or something else dwells in him in lieu of the Spirit, and as representing it. We do not say that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian in *contact* with his spirit. This, as a statement of our faith, is not true; yet it is L.'s statement of our faith. It is the statement, not of the simple fact which we hold, but rather of the mode of the fact; whereas, as to mode we neither hold anything nor say anything, for the simple reason that we know nothing. We say the Spirit itself dwells in the Christian; but how, since the word of God is silent, we neither claim to know nor venture to say. By stating, not simply a fact, but the mode of a fact, L. has raised a vain speculative issue which we utterly repudiate. I confess I did not expect so gross an injury to his brethren from him.

L. believes that, "if it can be shown that the Divine Spirit works by a direct impact in strengthening the Christian, and in helping his infirmities, that it can never be proved that he does not work in the same way in the conversion of sinners."

I was not prepared for so poor a thing as this from L. The discriminating Christian does not undertake to *prove* that the Holy Spirit *does not* work contactually on any one. The merest smattering of logic would save him from so great a blunder as this. The discriminating Christian, in the absence of divine testimony to that effect, contents himself with simply denying that the Holy Spirit acts contactually on the sinner, and with showing the inconclusiveness of the arguments of him who so affirms. Here, as to this side of the question, he rests

But the non-rationalistic Christian, in the teeth of clear scriptural statement to that effect, feels himself compelled to believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian; and further, since the word of God is silent as to the mode of such dwelling, only speaking of it as of any other real fact, he feels himself in caution bound to say nothing of mode. And still further, the non-rationalistic Christian feels that when he can convert the scriptural expression, "the Spirit dwells with you *and shall be in you,*" together with others like it, into a mere "metonymy," that he could easily, by the use of the same accommodating logic, prove that both the Devil and hell are mere figures of speech, purely mythical things. And further yet, the non-rationalistic Christian feels that in that case he could afford to be very lenient to weak-minded brethren; so that should it do any of them any good to believe in the existence of a real hell or a real Devil, provided they did not believe the Devil a bad being or hell a place of punishment, he can not say that he would have any great objection to the silly creatures so believing. Thus held, the non-rationalistic Christian thinks the notion of a real Devil and a real hell would be powerless for either good or evil. And in all this the non-rationalistic Christian feels that he would not display his vanity.

On page 163, L. again says: "The controversy, in that phase of it peculiar to ourselves as a people, after having been permitted to sleep for several years, has at length been revived in the *Quarterly*. The learned editor himself led the way in an article displaying his usual ability, entitled: "The Influence of the Holy Spirit as it Relates to Christians."

What all this was said for is not quite clear. I do not wish to do it injustice; but I can see but a single motive for it, namely, to make it appear that the editor of the *Quarterly* had incurred some sort of unenviable responsibility in "reviving" the controversy in hand. The editor of the *Quarterly* begs leave to say, that he shrinks from no responsibility incurred by that act. He is quite aware of the fact that the position that the Spirit dwells in the Christian had, *on one side*, long been resting in our ranks. Indeed, on that side the position had never been disturbed, had never been called in question, but had all along been acquiesced in just as it stands in the Bible. But such was not the case on the *other side*. The editor calls to mind that fifteen years ago or more, in a little village in Western Missouri, he and his lamented brother, Allen Wright, had a talk with L. on the subject now in hand. He remembers that L. had then in hand a tract in manuscript, the intent of which was to prove that the Holy Spirit never dwells in the Christian. Bro. Wright and the editor earnestly remonstrated with L. against the publication of said tract. L. agreed to hold the matter in check for the present. The editor remembers that L. subsequently published that tract, against the counsels and earnest

wishes of these his brethren. The editor remembers that said tract was sent to the kingdom of Great Britain, and there reprinted by our brethren. The editor also remembers with regret that this has been all the while a cherished topic with L.; and that he and his pamphlet have been persistently at work to give it currency. Moreover, the editor of the *Quarterly* remembers that about the time he "revived" the controversy, a brother was preparing for the press a work, one chapter of which was to be devoted to the permanent propagation, in book form, of this same shallow rationalistic conceit; and further still, the editor had heard that other excellent brethren were becoming tinctured with the same heresy. He therefore felt that the time had come to restate the views held by "the fathers of this reformation," and by more than ninety per cent, of all the rest of our brethren, and to reproduce at some length the grounds on which said views rest. This is the reason for "reviving" the controversy. The editor of the *Quarterly* now expects, before the "controversy" again lulls, that the whereabouts of others who hold with L. will be discovered, and that *some* of these brethren who deny that they have the Spirit of God may, when put to the test, show that they have a spirit from a somewhat different quarter. The editor will not be surprised if he sees teeth soon.

As already intimated, it is not here proposed to enter into a minute review of L.'s article. This would only be to travel over ground already very carefully examined. L.'s article, in fact, introduces no new matter into the controversy. Nor does it contain even so much as a single new argument. It only states the old issue in a partially new form; revamps arguments refuted many a time; and tells us that the expression "the Spirit shall be in you" is a "metonymy." This last feature in L.'s article is certainly new, or rather is newly phrased; and we have the least imaginable desire to rob him of whatever honor there may be in it. I shall only add that I would not be the author of his saying for the wealth of the State in which he lives.

Neither is it necessary, on the other hand, to restate and argue at any great length the views which L. attempts to oppose. These stand on too solid a basis to need anything of the kind. If not accepted, the solution of the fact is easy. Truth has never been a universal favorite; neither can it ever be so stated and defended as to prevent its rejection. I shall consequently content myself with citing a few passages only, and with a few comments on these.

1. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ *which was in them* did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." (1 Peter i., 10, 11.)

In this passage we have a group of facts, plain historic facts, stated

in language as simple and inornate as can be found in the Bible. Among these facts, and as one of them, it is said of the prophets, *the Spirit was in them*. Now, in the name of fact and sober common sense, what impression is this assertion calculated to make on the universal mind of man? Simply that the Spirit, which inspired the prophets with what they said, "*was in them*" at the time when they spoke by it. If this be not the meaning and sense of the passage, tell me not that the Bible is a guide of human thought and a rule of human action. But I shall be told that the question is not whether the Spirit was in the prophets or not, but whether it is in Christians. Certainly, this is the question. But the point I make with the passage, is this: In what sense would Peter's readers understand his language? In whatever sense they would understand his language when applied to the prophets, in that sense they would certainly understand it when applied to themselves. What this sense was I do not allow to be a matter of doubt. Hence, that Christians would infer from like language, when applied to themselves, that the Spirit dwelt in them, is not with me a matter for disputation. Peter says: "*The Spirit was in the prophets.*" L., says, the Spirit was *not* in the prophets; that the language is a "metonymy," that only the Spirit's influence was in them. He may have the glory of his tenet.

2. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. (1 Cor. iii., 16.)

Here the church in Corinth is called a temple of God; and the Spirit of God is said *to have dwelt in them*. As a fact, this is indisputable. But is the fact, as here stated, to be accepted simply as stated, or must we accept a different fact? In order to answer this, I inquire, first, is the language, *the Spirit of God dwells in you*, a correct translation of the original? The question admits but one answer; it is. No man is bold enough to render it differently. In what sense, second, shall we take the language? It certainly says of the saints in Corinth, *the Spirit of God dwells in you*. L. says the Spirit of God did *not* dwell in them, that the language is a "metonymy," that only the truth or some other influence of the Spirit dwelt in them. When, then, Paul said "*the Spirit dwells in you*," he said what he knew, and what L. knows, to be not true. Yet L. asks the world to believe that when Paul speaks, he speaks the truth. As to the shallow pretense that the language is a "metonymy," had it come from a skeptical sectarian, we should have thought nothing of it, but we are pained at such a puerility from a good man in our ranks. We have no respect for any such repudiation of God's word, and hence must decline to write with any. If the language in question were in any sense doubtful, we should feel it to be a matter of duty to bear long and still hope. But such is not the case. That L. means to repudiate any portion of God's word is something I can not for one moment think; yet that his

tenet is a repudiation of certain portions of it is as much my faith as is the fact that he is an honest man. He knows me too well to believe that anything, save the sternest sense of justice to the truth of my Master, could lead me to speak thus of his position. I only beg of him to bear constantly in mind that I speak this of it, *not of him*.

3. "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of the truth, whom the world can not receive, because it sees him not, neither knows him; but you know him, *for he dwells with you, and shall be in you.*" (John xiv., 16, IT.)

One point of doubt may be admitted for the present to exist respecting this passage; namely, whether it should read, he dwells with you and *shall be* in you; or, he dwells with you, and *is* in you. But this point of doubt in no respect affects the value of the passage in settling the question in hand. Its force remains the same, no matter which reading be adopted.

When the Savior says, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter," does he speak literally or figuratively? When he says, "that he may abide with you forever," does he speak literally or figuratively? Let the reader put the same question on every clause in the passage, and the same answer must be given. In what sense, then, in the name of divine speech, must we understand the Savior, when he says of that Spirit, "*he dwells with you and shall be in you?*" I shall not answer. But if the Savior does not say of the Spirit to the disciples, "*he shall be in you,*" or "*he is in you,*" then let no man ever again say of the New Testament, its meaning is one and clear. The Savior says of the Spirit, of the Spirit himself, of the Spirit only, *he is in you*. L. says of the Spirit, he is *not* in you, the language is a "metonymy," only some influence of the Spirit dwells in you. How L. can ever take the Savior's language in his lips is a mystery to me. Did I hold as he holds, I should feel that to cite it or use it was a solemn mockery in the sight of heaven. The New Testament says Christ arose from the dead. The skeptic says Christ arose *not* from the dead. L. thinks the skeptic wrong. The New Testament says baptism is for remission of sins. The sectarian says baptism is *not* for remission of sins. L. thinks the sectarian wrong. The Savior says, the Spirit is in you. L. says the Spirit is *not* in you, yet L. thinks himself right!

But on what ground does L. repudiate the literal and obvious import of the preceding passages. On the ground that *the nature of the case forbids it. This is the weak point in his piece*. What does he know of the nature of the case? Absolutely nothing, save what little the Bible teaches him. What does he know of even the human spirit, and of its modes of existence and dwelling? Very little surely. How much less, then, does he know of the Holy Spirit, and of its modes of

existence and dwelling? Does he claim to know enough to enable him to say that the Spirit is *not* in the disciple, when the Savior says it *is* in him? If so, I shall only add that his vanity is infinite. If the Savior said of one man of a given size that he dwells in another man of the same size, our knowledge of the nature of the case would enable us to say of his language, it is not to be taken literally. But when the Savior says of the Holy Spirit, a being of whom we have the most imperfect knowledge, that it dwells in the disciple, a fact which we can try neither by our reason nor by our senses, then to claim that the nature of the case determines the sense in which his language is to be taken, is not to reason, but to dogmatize to the subversion of the Bible. On the contrary, the plain and obvious meaning of the Savior's language is itself to determine the nature of the case, and not the nature of the case the import of his language, especially where the case is one of which we have no knowledge, which will serve to guide our thoughts. This great and necessary principle of exegesis L. completely sets at naught.

L. is at a loss to see how the Holy Spirit, who is a person, can dwell in another person, a human being. So am I. But because I can not see how the thing occurs, I shall not therefore deny the word of Christ, which asserts it. I have long since learned not to set up my poor reason as the standard by which the mysteries of God are to be tried. L. does this; hence his rejection of one of the plainest lessons in the New Testament. For I set it down that the divinity of Christ and the efficacy of his blood in the remission of sins are points not more clearly taught than is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, And I must add, that I regard the denial of the last of these items as not one whit less offensive in the sight of God than the denial of either of the other two. The denial of any one of them is a rejection so far of the teachings of Christ. Whether this is done intentionally or not, alters not the fact. It is done; and it behooves him who does it to look to his deed.

Other passages of holy writ, to the same effect as those now cited, might here be adduced and commented on. But nothing would thereby be gained. Those now cited are conclusive; hence, more than these are unnecessary.

Should any one deem that there are other important items in L.'s piece not herein noticed, I have simply to say, in reply, that everything has been noticed which is thought on any ground entitled to it. With me it is questionable whether the piece should ever have been permitted to see the light through the pages of the *Quarterly*. If there be a prayerless upstart in our ranks, to him it will be food, indeed, while it will cause the pious and reverential to hang their heads. We shall be more cautious in time to come how we give such crudities currency.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

On the night of the 4th of March, the night of the Lord's day, at a quarter before midnight, this eminent man fell asleep in Christ. He died at home, beneath his own roof, in the bosom of his family, surrounded and watched by his friends. For this event the country was not wholly unprepared. For several years past a rapid decay was known to be going on in his intellectual powers; and recently his body gave obvious proofs of his approaching dissolution. Yet now that his death is announced, it fills us with the deepest grief. It may not be dutiful to wish that he could have stayed with us longer; still how utterly do our hearts refuse not to mourn that he is gone.

Mr. Campbell was born in Ireland, in the county of Antrim, in June, 1786. This is the date of his birth as given by Prof. Pendleton. I confess I question its correctness. Mr. Campbell himself told me, unless my memory is at fault, that there was the difference of a year, as to his age, between the count of his father and that of his mother, and that he himself followed the count of his mother, as being of the two the more likely to be correct. Prof. Pendleton follows the count of his father. This difference in count arose from the fact that the family record was lost by shipwreck on the passage of the family to America, and that the date of the birth of Alexander had to be made out from memory. Whether the count of his mother made him a year older or a year younger than that of his father, I do not now recollect. It is probable, then, that at his death he was either seventy-nine or eighty-one years old, and not eighty, according to the above date.

From the foregoing facts it will be seen that Mr. Campbell was an Irishman, and not a Scotchman, as is so generally supposed in this country. On his father's side his ancestors were Scotch; on his mother's, French. And in his modes of thought and personal appearance, especially the conformation and expression of his face, he exhibited strong traits of his Scottish descent. His nose and other features of his face were strikingly Scotch; his eye, strikingly Irish. Again, the ring of his voice was decidedly Scotch; while his rapid articulation was clearly Irish.

His early education was received in Ireland, and was superintended with scrupulous care by his godly father, whose powerful mind (perhaps not excelled in native strength even by that of his gifted son), deeply pious heart, and accurate learning, eminently fitted him to be the curator of his richly talented boy. His riper education was received at the ancient University of Glasgow, Scotland, of which, through life, Mr. Campbell ever cherished the fondest recollections.

It seems to have been at the latter place, more than anywhere else, that those aspirations awoke in his bosom, and that wonderful impetus was given to his powerful intellect, which formed the guarantees of his future success. His stay at the University was not long, but highly important. Here he came in contact with a few very eminent men, who aided him in forming those habits of promptness and intense thought, which so much distinguished him in after-life.

He immigrated into the United States in 1809, landing in New York in October of the same year. Consequently, if born in 1786, he was twenty-three years old at the time of his landing. From New York he at once went to Washington, Pa., where his father lived, who had preceded the family two years before. Here he lived, and continued to study with his father till his marriage.

In May, 1810, in the twenty-fourth year of his age, and about seven months after landing¹ in this country, he preached his first sermon at a meeting-house called Brush Run, about eight miles southwest from Washington, Pa.

He was married in March, 1811, to Margaret Brown, by whom he had eight children. Beside this intellectual and lovely woman and her eight children he now sleeps, on a little slope, near the home in which he died. By him and his dead, wrapped in the same consecrated dust, sleeps also his venerated father. Seldom has so much of greatness and pious worth hallowed the same spot on earth.

On the 2d of June, 1812, he and wife, also his father, mother, and one sister were all immersed, to use his own language, "into the Christian faith." They were immersed by Elder Matthias Luse. This event at once identified him with the great family of the immersed on earth, with whom he stood connected, and for whom he worked with a fidelity and an energy never surpassed, for fifty-four years of his life.

In 1823 he commenced the publication of *The Christian Baptist*. This work is the masterpiece of his life. In polish and completeness of thought, it can not be pronounced equal to some volumes of his *Harbinger*; but in originality and utility he has written nothing to excel it. But to comment in detail on these works is the business especially of his biographer. We shall not here further anticipate it.

To few men has nature been more kind than to Mr. Campbell. No word but lavish will express her gifts to him; and this must be accepted as true, whether it have reference to the inner or the outer man. Physically, not one man in a thousand was so well endowed as was he. Nature was in a fertile mood when she molded that large sinewy body. Material was abundant and bestowed with no grudging hand. In height, in the day of his prime, he stood, I should say, full six feet, perhaps a little the rise of that. And from the first foot to the sixth, counting upward, was not one defective bone or muscle. Not a pound of flesh too much, not a pound too little. His body was a noble one.

To say that it was formed to manifest the true conception of the symmetrical or the beautiful would be going too far. It was not. Toughness and power were, palpably the two finest traits in it. Grace and beauty are ideas it did not suggest. Not that it was ungainly; for it was not. It was not rude; only it was not exquisite. The lightness and polish of the model Greek it lacked; the force and strength of his own sorrowing Erin were its boast. Nor was a body ever more largely endowed with the true activities of life than his. Even when he slept I should think his muscles often twitched with life. With this his whole frame seemed ever replete. Every motion and emotion of the man evinced its bounding presence. His walk, his talk, his look, and laugh were fervent with it. This, through life, kept him from acquiring the courtly studied manner too often and always unwisely assumed by the great. A slow measured bow was something he could not make. Life rushed on too fast. It left him not the time. He shook your hand in passing you; looked back and made his hasty remark, and then darted on as if some grand inexorable current bore him away. This never-sleeping energy of his nature often exhibited his body at a disadvantage. He had no time to study gestures. His act was as inartificial as that of the untutored child who does not know that the world has a criticism to make, and heeds not the world's criticism when it is made. When he walked he was apt to walk too fast, as if the leading idea were on the wing and he was pressed in the pursuit. When he rode he rocked on his horse, as if to aid his speed; and even in his talk he often articulated one word too hurriedly in hastening to the next. To the eye this gave to him a rather rugged, irregular appearance, but at the same time it served, to show him in the sublime, original light in which nature delights to exhibit her finest samples of handiwork.

With a body formed as his was, any one at all acquainted with human nature would have predicted for him a life of not less than eighty years; and he fell only a little short of that. With less exhausting mental labor than he performed, he might well have reached ninety; to which add a degree of physical repose of which it may be truly said he knew simply nothing, and a hundred years might have fallen to his lot. But for his sake we shall not lament that a merciful Providence spared him the burden of the additional twenty.

But Mr. Campbell's chief greatness lay in his intellect. In resources of mind no word but opulent will describe him. Here he was great, pre-eminently great in the true sense of that fine simple word. No one could gaze on that grand head, or look on that bold unique face, without feeling impressed with this fact. His head was large, very large; his forehead high, with all the breadth necessary to amplitude; while the distance from the point of the ear to the centre of

the frontal bone revealed the capacious home which God had built for his thought. His head I think the finest I ever saw. It was simply faultless. After the first look, you never criticised it; you only admired it. You dwelt on it only to wonder how munificently nature sometimes works. His head never disappointed you. No matter with reference to what you studied it, it always complemented your highest expectations. Was it the abode of a mind of extraordinary strength? Every conformation of it answered, yes. Was it filled with a soul of profound religious devotion? The answer was the same. Did it betoken that its occupant was marred by any dangerous or unlovely eccentricities? Not one. Every point, angle, and curve on it revealed that nice adjustment of faculty to faculty which renders greatness safe, and assigns to it its true position in the lead of earth's great beneficent changes. On once looking on that large finely turned head, you never feared to trust it more. On the contrary, you thenceforward confided in it as the babe does in the mother. You felt sure it would do right.

Mr. Campbell's eye was too small, and sat too far back in his head. This, I grant, gave to it the appearance of great sharpness and penetration; but at the same time it lent to it a look of fierceness from which you a little shrank. Had his eye been larger and more prominent, with a milder expression, it would have comported better with his half Roman face, and relieved it of a look which the word hard, if mildly used, somewhat accurately expresses. But this is said only in the spirit of the critic, and not in that filial affection in which alone I would now recall the lineaments of that noble face. My object is not to dissent from what was so excellent, but to be just to what so well deserved it.

So eminently was Mr. Campbell's mind fitted for most of the great pursuits, that it is difficult to say which one it was best fitted for. Had the law been his calling, that he would have stood the peer of the great masters, as Webster and Marshall, none who knew him, I believe, will deny. Indeed, I doubt whether he would not have excelled them all. He always struck me as possessing peculiar qualifications for the law. His large inborn love of right, his naturalness, especially his capacious and wonderfully well-balanced mind, would certainly have assigned him the first rank in settling those complex and difficult questions of law and equity which are constantly arising in the higher courts. Then at times he evinced a wiry mode of address and a magnetism in speech, which would have enabled him to sway benches and juries as few men have ever swayed them. Still, though we have every confidence that he would have made the first and most brilliant of lawyers, yet how thankful we feel that he was not a lawyer. In that case he might have left us a fine work on Evidence, or a masterpiece on Equity; but, then, we

should never have had his magnificent eulogies on the "great Messiah," his pleadings for the Bible alone, or his manful, heart-warm defenses of the one only true way of salvation to the sinner. What his loss to the world would have been, had he gone to the law, we can only know by comprehending the whole magnitude of his vast achievements under Christ in behalf of primitive Christianity. I repeat, I am thankful that the hand that made him kept him from the law.

In medicine, I think, he would always have stood low. Here he would have been a theorist, and would hence have failed. For a doctor, I think, he had few qualifications. Medicine requires not certainly a greater mind than he possessed, but a finer one. It requires a mind which delights in details, in ultimate atoms and particles. In the discussion of primal cells Mr. Campbell could have taken no pleasure. His active, discursive nature would have disqualified him for it. The comprehensive generalization, the universal affirmative, the far-stretching induction—these were his delight. Mountains, not atoms, were his study; ages, not minutes. To have bent over a magnifying glass of immense power for half a day, for the purpose of defining the shape of a particle of the blood, is something he could never have done. Had he studied medicine he would have abandoned it, and gone to astronomy.

As a statesman and politician, Mr. Campbell would have been transcendent. I believe he would have stood even higher here than in religion. His breadth of intellect, his power of generalization, his ability to cut straight through a huge mass of facts to the one necessary and all-determining one, his genial nature, his brilliant ready talk with the common people—these would have left him without a rival. Indeed he never was a clergyman. Nature had not made him one, and he could never assume the character. It is but just to add that he never tried. His religion was a matter of principle, of conviction. In it was nothing conventional. Hence he never impressed the world as trying to seem clerical. He had neither clerical airs nor clerical gaits. He neither walked like one nor talked like one. And as he never seemed to be one, few people, not knowing him, ever suspected him for one. He had about him an active, sprightly business air; an impatience of confinement, and a love of out-door life, which, combined with his other fine traits, would have made him the gayest and most fascinating of politicians. His large and varied knowledge, his love of all mankind, his inimitable powers of conversation, ever sporting and playing in the most easy and graceful way with subjects from the most abstruse to the simplest—these would have endeared him to the great commonalty, and perpetually have secured him their enthusiastic support. Thus his elevation to the highest place in the gift of the people would have been certain. And

once high in power, the masterly manner in which he would have handled the great questions of State would have made him the idol of his own people and the admiration of all civilized nations. I do not think he could ever have had a superior here.

As a historian, Mr. Campbell would have excelled only in some respects. In collecting facts, in combining propositions remotely connected, and in drawing inferences, he would have been unsurpassed; that is, he would have been a master in the mere logic of history. In other respects he would have failed. That he could have written as splendidly as Gibbon, and as faithfully as McIntosh, I do not hesitate to assert. But he could never have equaled the luminous and dramatic Macaulay. Mr. Campbell stated facts well; but he never vivified them, and made them sparkle with the bright light of genius as they left his hand. He arranged them with skill; but his arrangement had more the stiffness of rule than the grace of life. His combinations lacked ease and ornament. He did not festoon his facts with the drapery which left them gleaming like golden sands in the silvery current of the mountain spring. Hence he would have failed in the finest features of history. Again: Mr. Campbell lacked the rare power of sketching to the life personal character. Without this no man can succeed in history. Here men must live and act as in real life. They must be reproduced with that vividness which makes you hear, after ages gone, the very intonations of voice in which each spoke. This power of reproduction Mr. Campbell did not possess. He would have made you understand his characters, not see them. Thus his histories would have abounded in personal sketches; but they would all have been sketches of bloodless and pulseless bodies. He would have shown you men's faces; but they would have been the expressionless faces of men as seen beneath the coffin lid.

But precisely the intellectual powers which would have placed Mr. Campbell among the first of men in the great departments of literature to which we have alluded, made him the first of uninspired men in the department of religion. For while we intend scrupulously to refrain

do not hesitate to affirm that since the last inspired man bowed his head in death a greater than our lamented brother has not risen. This, of course, we do not expect bigots, and others who did not know him, to admit. We expect this verdict only from his friends who knew him, and who have the magnanimity of soul to grudge him neither his powers nor his rank.

But though we award to Mr. Campbell the possession of the highest and rarest gifts of intellect, yet no one who ever studied him can have failed to observe how completely he was deficient in certain respects. As to the powers necessary in a great metaphysician, he had

positively none. He showed not even a trace of them. Hamilton would have smiled at any pretensions he might have made to a knowledge of metaphysics as at the harmless pretensions of a schoolboy. Of course, we do not mean that Mr. Campbell had not read metaphysics, nor that he could not understand metaphysics—this is not what we mean. We mean, simply, that he had no taste for metaphysics, for the precise reason that he had no talent for metaphysics, and that hence hardly a trace of them can be found in his writings. Had he been left to produce works on metaphysics for a living, we believe he would have died as poor as Goldsmith, and perhaps the subject of as much ridicule.

Again: no one who knew him can have failed to notice how completely he was lacking in those powers of the imagination which insure the success of the poet and the novelist. To say that he was destitute of even the semblance of these would perhaps be extravagant, and yet it is doubtful whether this strong language would do him injustice. Mr. Campbell abounded in the use of adjectives and other epithets, which, to the unpracticed ear, often seemed to invest his efforts, whether written or spoken, with the appearance of the poetic and imaginative. But he has left us hardly a genuine trace of either upon record. To compare him in these respects with Milton or Sir Walter Scott would positively be to offer insult to the good taste of the world. Of poetry he had in his nature just none; of imagination just next thing to none. But when we thus speak we are not to be understood as saying that Mr. Campbell never rose up to the full height of the sublime. Very far from it. This he did, often did. But his sublimity was the sublimity which springs from grandeur of thought, and not from the gorgeous creations of the imagination or the gildings of a poetic fancy. His mind was great, his thoughts great; and what men felt to be great they concluded must be the product of a teeming imagination or the outcrop of a rich poetic vein. But in this the world was wrong. Again: Mr. Campbell's thoughts were replete with a wonderful life and vigor. They bore you on like the fathomless currents of the sea. Beneath every one you felt the throb of a soul which amazed you by its marvelous strength. This bounding life and vigor also men easily mistook for the evidence of imagination and the presence of high poetic inspiration. But what men felt was simple inornate greatness, and neither imagination nor poetic genius.

But now in what light shall we view these deficiencies as affecting Mr. Campbell? Must we regard them in the light of mere deficiencies and as subtracting so much from the power and worth of a great man? If not, in what light shall we view them? I answer, we should view them in the light of special providential appointments, designed pre-eminently to fit Mr. Campbell for the very work which

God called him to do. Had he been a metaphysician, we should to-day have been strangers to the glorious work he has bequeathed us. He would have woven into the fabric of the gospel the subtleties of his intellect, and recast Christianity into recondite scientific molds, and left us a creed, instead of, as he has, the word and light of the divine Master, evoked from the tomb of human folly and human rubbish, pure as in the day when the Spirit gave to this word and this light its completing touch. We feel profoundly thankful that Mr. Campbell was not a metaphysician. In that case he would have struck out some new track of abstruse speculative thought parallel to, or it might have been divergent from, Calvinism, or some other ism equally remote from the primitive truth. This he would have embodied into some book of Institutes, and then have passed away, leaving the world only the darker for having been in it.

If, in addition to this, he had been a man of highly imaginative or poetic powers, he would have compounded the dreams of Plato and the teachings of Christ, and thus have given us some new gnosticism. Or he would have blended the shadowy lights of the Mosaic day with the splendid intellectualism of Greece, and a new system of philosophy, devoid of even one thought from Christ, would have been the result. Side by side with the sturdy facts of the gospel would have stood the nebulous myths of the past; while the traditions of saints and martyrs would have disputed the pre-eminence with the sayings of Paul and James. The frost of antiquity would have gleamed in spicules oil every page of his writings, with scarcely the semblance of truth to sober the delusive picture. Tradition would have occupied the place of divine authority; psychology that of inspiration; and the commandments of Jesus would have fallen into desuetude, as being unsuited to the exemption from law of pure idealism.

While, then, we rejoice in the greatness of Mr. Campbell, we rejoice still more in this, that he was not great in the respects just named. He was pre-eminently a man for naked truth, naked fact, and naked divine authority. He neither wanted these illumined by the coruscations of the imagination, nor improved by the refinings of the metaphysician. He stood for the simplicity which is in Christ, and delighted only in the ultimate elements of the gospel. In these he sternly refused to allow accretion or diminution. He was a warrior in an instant, with a broad, keen blade, ready to strike the moment the truth of Christ was to be marred even in the minutest item. "This," he said, "is perfect, and I fall a martyr ere the profane fingers of mortal shall smut it or change" it." All honor to this great sentinel for his heroism and intrepidity here.

Of Mr. Campbell's scholarship I will not be expected to say much. The proof of what it was and all it was is fully before the world. Perhaps it would better become me to pass it in silence. But I am

so anxious that he shall stand forth in the exact character in which God intended him to work, and in which alone he could have done the work he did, that I am willing, if need be, by speaking of him, to subject myself to the inconsiderate censure of those who can never know how wholly incapable I am of doing him even the semblance of injustice' if thereby I can succeed in setting him forth in that character. Mr. Campbell was a great man. I place him among the very first of the very greatest. He was a *fine* scholar, not a *profound* one. He was great in thought, commanding in learning; but not transcendent. Will my brethren forgive me this boldness? Do I mean herein and hereby to detract from the good name of departed greatness? The very reverse. Hear me then. Mr. Campbell was no graduate of any institution of learning. Still we have just ground for saying that when he left the University of Glasgow for the United States, he was the full equal of any young man of his age who had been in that institution no longer than he had been. He was all he could be up to the time of his leaving. After settling in this country, it is well known that he soon became involved in business, which left him little leisure for more than the mere revision of what he had acquired before quitting his native land and Glasgow. He understood something of Hebrew; was thoroughly conversant with Greek and Latin, and read French well. This was about the extent of his lingual information. Of the sciences, his knowledge was what is termed in the old country liberal. His reading was certainly varied and extensive. More than this we, perhaps, would not be warranted in saying.

But how again shall this circumstance be viewed as bearing on the great work of his life? Favorably, only favorably. Mr. Campbell had all the learning necessary to enable him to discover the whole will of Christ. To the discovery and defense of this will he devoted both his learning and his life. For this purpose he certainly had none too much time. Had he then spent more of his time in rendering his scholarship profounder than it was, or had he devoted more of his years to purely literary pursuits, then clearly must he have left incomplete the very work he did not leave incomplete. Again: it is at least questionable whether a more thorough, especially a more minute scholarship than he possessed, might not have had the bad effect to unfit him for those original natural modes of thought which so peculiarly adapted him to his Master's work. A deeper devotion to human learning might have weakened his perfect confidence in the divine. Most likely, at least, it would have left him less natural, which would certainly have rendered his success less sure.

But the peculiar greatness of Mr. Campbell lay not in his broad intellect, his capacious thought, or his learning. Neither did it lie in the vigor of his soul, or the reach of his view. Nor yet in the activity of his nature, his powerful speech, or mastery over the wills of

men. It lay in none of these. *Mr. Campbell's greatness lay in his power to perceive intuitively the truth.* This power will make a common man great; it makes a great one transcendent; and such was our fallen brother. We say his greatness lay in his power to perceive intuitively the truth. Let us be understood. Mr. Campbell never discovered the truth by induction. Yet he was fond of induction, spoke often of it, and used it well. Still he discovered nothing by it. He admired the great Bacon; but induction was for one purpose in Bacon's hands, for a different one in his. Mr. Campbell saw the truth at once and directly; he only *defended* it by induction. Bacon both discovered and defended by it. Again: Bacon discovered only physical truth by induction; Mr. Campbell, divine truth without it. The difference between them was great.

Hence Mr. Campbell was never enabled to account satisfactorily for his discoveries of the truth amid the darkness which enveloped the first days of his life. The plain truth is, he himself did not know how he had discovered it, or why. As proof of this, whenever asked how he had happened on this or that, or how such and such points had been first suggested to his mind, he uniformly seemed confused and unable to answer. In reply, of course, he always said something; but then you felt that what he said did not fully meet the case. And this was really so. Indeed the truth had flashed upon his mind from time to time by simple intuition; hence he could never give an account of it. Had he discovered it by induction, then could he have retraced the steps by which he reached it, and explained the whole process. But this he had not done, hence his inability to explain.

But when we say that Mr. Campbell discovered the truth by intuition, we may be misconceived. Let me then explain. He made no *original* discoveries. Far from it. The truth which he discovered had already all been revealed, and lay imbedded in the sacred page. This and this only is the truth which he discovered, and this is the only discovery we claim for him. But this truth we say he discovered immediately; that is, by intuition, and not by induction.

But we shall be told that in thus speaking we give to Mr. Campbell no very high merit. We beg to dissent, and to say that we award to him a merit which we award to no other man since the gospel first became corrupted. That truth lay on the sacred page as much for others as for him. Why, then, did others not discover it? Is it no small merit to say that he alone did what none before him had done, and this to the glory of Christ and the happiness of men?

It is here proper to notice the relation of other striking traits of Mr. Campbell to what we deem his great master power—the power of intuition. We notice these traits, not to show how they aided this power, for intuition is never aided by other powers, but to show how they never *interfered* with it.

1. *His Faith.*—No trait of this eminent man shone more conspicuously through his long and eventful life than did his never-flagging faith. It was the noblest mark in his noble life. But in some respects it was peculiar. So strong and simple was it, that at times it assumed the form of the most pliant credulity; indeed to some it would have seemed to reach even the point of superstition. At such times it appeared a positive weakness. No matter what the tale was, if consistent and innocently told, it found an auditor in him. This occasionally rendered him the victim of unprincipled cunning. No man ever detested knavery more; yet no man was ever more liable to be practiced upon by knaves. But this was owing solely to the perfect simplicity of his faith. As it was wholly free from every trace of skepticism, so it was ready to credit anything. Consequently, when directed to the word of God, it accepted without question, or one wish to modify, everything it found therein. Hence, what Mr. Campbell therein saw by intuition he instantly embraced in the identical form in which he there saw it, and ever afterward held it with marvelous firmness. Thus his great chief power and his pure faith wrought together to perfect him for his grand work.

2. *His Naturalness.*—If of any full-grown man it could ever be truly said, he was perfectly a child of nature, surely it could be said of Mr. Campbell. Of the artificial he had not one vestige in him. He had it neither in his look nor in his talk, in his writing, nor in anything else. Never was man freer from the influence of mere conventionalities. He thought as no other man ever thought, spoke as no other man ever spoke, wrote as no other man ever wrote. He was himself simply, original, natural, true, just as the Father made him. Not a crooked line in him had ever been straightened by art, nor a straight one crooked. In harmony with this, rather as a piece of it, he had no imitation. None but a divine example could move him, and this from no inclination to follow others, but from principle, or as a matter of duty. He could never have succeeded in any of the fine arts. Had he gone to statuary, painting, or music, his name would never have been heard of. And had he gone to the stage he would certainly have died in an almshouse. I should think that any effort he might ever have made in any imitative form must have ended in a failure, nothing short of ludicrous.

Now no one can fail to see the direct bearing which these traits had upon the work of his life. His perfect naturalness completely restrained him from attempting any embellishment of what he discovered in the word of God. Precisely as he there found things, he there left things. They were just to his taste in their original form. If rude, they were natural, and it was right; if smooth, they were natural, and it was right; if grand, they were natural, and it was right—in a word, whatever form they assumed was natural, and therefore

with him right. Again: he imitated nothing, followed no one. Hence ancient precedents and illustrious examples, unless divinely approved, were neither precedents nor examples for him. He set at naught the decrees of councils, and tossed aside the prescriptions of the great, where they stood against the word of God, with as little compunction as he parted the thread the spider had spun across his path. But this would not have been the case had he been differently organized. I hence set down not only his natural endowments, but even his natural deficiencies, as being designed in the providence of God to be a peculiar aid to him in completing his work.

Besides, we can not but think that the very location he chose for his home was specially designed for him in the providence of God, and that it had no small influence on the great work he did. He sat down among the hills of Western Virginia, on the little stream of Buffalo, amid a hardy, simple population, who had no more power to appreciate him than they had to compute the distance from their respective doors to the most distant star. Here he lived in comparative seclusion to the day of his death, dwelling in the same house in which he had married his first wife, and in which his children were born. True, in the course of time, he collected around him a few highly cultivated and gifted friends, as professors in his beloved college. These accomplished brethren were his life-long friends, and helped him much. Still must it be said that for the most part he dwelt alone, far away from the great marts of trade and centres of literature and fashion. Whether these could ever have had any influence on him or not, we, of course, are not able to say; but of this we feel glad, that he dwelt remotely from them. The pride of his life was thus passed in the lap of his own romantic hills. Here on the Lord's day, for many a year, in a rude, untidy little meeting-house, he wasted the splendors of his great mind. His dozy congregation often numbered not more than fifty. They had wound down their hill-side paths to hear him preach. Many of them passed the time as unconsciously as did the bodies of the dead, which slept in the yard close by. Others lent him a drowsy ear, as incapable of appreciating his masterly inductions as were the kine that browsed on his pastures. The week he would pass in his study, amid his choice books, illumining and spicing the pages of his immortal *Christian Baptist*, or enriching with his riper and more sober thought his great *Harbinger*. Many a piece of a day he spent wandering beside his winding Buffalo, or clambering over its neighboring woody slopes. Here, often seated on a log, or perched like the wild mountain bird on some lone rock, he would pass unconscious hours deep wrapped in thought, or searching the meaning of some dark text in his Greek Testament. If he passed a teamster stuck in the mud, he clapped his burly shoulder to the wheel, and shouted to the team, as if he had been bred to the

cart and its toils. If he passed a ragged orphan boy, he stopped him, asked for his mother, gave him his secret penny, and then wept over him tenderly as did the Savior with the stricken Martha and Mary. Such were the scenes amid which he ripened and mellowed for the work to which God in his mercy called him. If the flocks of Midian were the most fitting school in which to train Moses for his immortal mission, were not the oak-covered hills and deep shadowy vales of Bethany the very spot in which to nurse this great restorer of the gospel to the age in which we live? We can not but think that one greater than he had much to do in fixing even his home where it stood. Being here alone he was left free to prosecute his studies and pursue his thoughts in his own original way, with no interference from those great local and religious forces which are constantly at work in large cities. He thus studied Christianity in the light of nature, because in the light of his own unperverted mind. Never could he have succeeded otherwise.

Of Mr. Campbell's religious life it is not necessary that I should speak at length. This was lovely indeed. Nothing human can be pronounced more perfect. His religion, like himself, was as inartificial as the blood on which it was founded. It was a matter of profound conviction and duty. Hence it was sedate, unimpassioned, and uniform; it was neither showy nor fitful, but tranquil, cheerful, and fluent.

At nightfall he collected his family in his homely parlor, and arranged them in order around the room. Each then read a verse, he reading with the rest. In this reading, every soul in his house was expected to take part, from the Indian boy of the wild prairies of the West to the elegant guest of his hospitable home. The chapter for the evening being read, a song was usually sung, when all bowed in the presence of God. His prayers were usually long, inimitably reverential, and chaste. At times they were broad and grand. All this was repeated in the morning. In the intervals, in the social circle, Christ and the gospel were the never-ending themes of his conversation. On these he never flagged himself, nor wearied his delighted hearer. These conversations were often relieved by bursts of eloquence, which even his finest flights in the pulpit never surpassed. Yet his manner was as easy and natural as that of a child. Of his greatness he seemed never for a moment conscious; of his religion, never for a moment unconscious. Not an object in nature did he see, from the orb which illumines day to the insect which lay beneath his glass, that did not suggest to him something of the wisdom, power, or goodness of God. Every accident of life, whether prosperous or adverse, was the text for some appropriate comment replete with hope or consolation. Being an ardent believer in the special providence of God, he looked on nothing as happening without his notice or interference. Consequently,

no matter what occurred, he bowed to it either in a spirit of reverential submission, or in one of cheerfulness and joy. Hence, if he held his hand on the brow of his noble father as he breathed his last, he would calmly say: "It is all right;" if he wept by her grave as men buried his lovely daughter, he would sigh: "It is all right." Thus in the stroke that broke his heart, as well as in that which lifted up his soul, he read the presence of the ever-merciful hand. In the anguish of his spirit he sometimes groaned, but never complained. Truly was his religious life a poem, replete with loveliness and beauty. Among the many things which honored him personally and made him great, we give to this the very highest place.

Of the labors of Mr. Campbell's life I can not consent to speak at length. This must be the work of his biographer. Nor am I willing to speak of them in vague general terms. This could be interesting to none. I must hence, in alluding to them, be brief.

The first thing which seems to have struck his mind with peculiar force, and to have aroused in it that train of thought which resulted so fruitfully, was the existing divisions at the time among the professed followers of Christ. As a fact these divisions were palpable. This needed no proof. Hence the first question he raised was: Are these divisions right? This question he promptly decided in the negative. With this decision we are not surprised; with a different one we should have been. For no candid man with the New Testament in his hand can pronounce it right that the children of God should be divided. With the a view to remedying these divisions, he seems next to have inquired into their cause. This was natural. For if the cause be detected and removed, certainly we should expect the effect to cease. Mr. Campbell seems to have concluded that creeds and confessions of faith are the chief cause in effecting and fostering divisions. Hence to oppose them was with him, not only a life-long work, but a work of conscience. For a few of these preliminary views Mr. Campbell was indebted to his excellent father, who aided him much in his early labors. But his own active and powerful mind once fully aroused, kept ahead of all others in the labor which crowned his life. The rebound from the insufficiency of creeds to the all-sufficiency of the word of God was the next step. No step could have been more natural; certainly none more productive of good. Here Mr. Campbell stood for life. *Indeed the all-sufficiency of the word of God is the true comprehensive generalization of his labors.* To this every thought must be referred; from this every act sprang. This determined the man; this determined his work.

As soon as he had accepted the postulate (for postulate it is) that the Bible alone teaches the religion of God, his positive work began. His first great object was to make himself profoundly acquainted with this book. How well he succeeded I must not trust myself to say,

for I rank no uninspired man with him here. As his own conceptions of this blessed book began to assume accuracy and definiteness, he began to mold and shape the thoughts of others. Immense crowds now flocked to his appointments to hear him. They were delighted with his noble plea for the Bible and the Bible alone. As he taught men how to read it (for at that time, let it astound none, men did not know), their appreciation of it arose; and as their appreciation of the Bible arose, their appreciation of human creeds sank, and their appreciation of creeds once on the wane could never be stopped. Thus the first great blow which Mr. Campbell's position enabled him to strike was his fatal blow at human creeds. From this blow they have never recovered. May heaven grant they never may I

His next most important work was his attack on the traditions and superstitions which had accumulated in the popular religious mind. In order to render this attack successful, he took the position, then bold, always just, that every thought and deed must be subjected to the test of the Bible; and that whatever can not abide the application of this test must be rejected. His masterly defense of this position, and destructive use of it, amazed and alarmed the sects of the day, but delighted the pure in heart, who loved the truth, and had long groaned under the burden of these traditions. The sects grew furious and belligerent; the children of God held up their drooping heads and blessed the Lord for the good day which had fallen to their lot. With the former Mr. Campbell grew daily less popular; with the latter daily more so. The people resolutely stood for the man who resolutely stood for them; and never did man stand for the people in true? fashion than did Mr. Campbell. He told them God had spoken to them; and made them see what God had said. He vindicated, as had never been done before, *their* ability to understand for themselves the Scriptures of truth, and their right to obey the things contained therein. Thus the work went grandly on. The power of tradition was daily weakened—the voice of superstition was daily enfeebled. Ghosts deserted the land; voices were hushed; while "the called and sent" mourned the degeneracy of the times, and vowed that experimental religion was fast becoming extinct.

Among the injurious superstitions of the day, Mr. Campbell attacked none more successfully than he did the silly pretensions of the clergy, that they were specially called and sent. His onset on these men was positively sublime. They were fine marks for his caustic wit and racy tongue; and never did either wit or tongue fall short of its mark. They literally raved; I will not say they swore. The great dialectician of Bethany kept cool, while God helped him to skin and denude these hollow pretenders. The clergy pouted, the people laughed, while pretense after pretense glided growlingly away.

Thus Mr. Campbell's great negative work is summed up in his

opposition to human creeds, his opposition to the superstitions which were traditionally held to accompany what is phrased, "getting religion," and his opposition to the pretensions of the clergy.

But Mr. Campbell's work was far from being merely negative. It did not consist in simple opposition to this or that, however much such opposition was needed. It had in it something still higher, still better. The whole force of his mind was now directed to the word of God. This he was studying with intense thought. Its meaning was gradually opening to him. Among the first things which struck him was the great and imperious necessity for a *pure speech*. By this is meant the expression of revealed thought in the identical words of the Bible. To him it seemed clear that purity of speech was a necessary condition of purity of thought, and purity of thought a necessary antecedent of union. On it, therefore, he insisted with great warmth. Time has only served to demonstrate his wisdom in the item.

Mr. Campbell had now reached the point from which to unfold the true plan of salvation. To elaborate from the New Testament this plan, and present it in its completeness, is the supreme honor of his life. This was his great and peculiar mission. Had he done no more than execute this faithfully, he would still be entitled to the profound gratitude of the world.

In unfolding this plan, then so complete an enigma to those who sought the way of the Lord, his first act was to call attention to the Savior. Christ was to be conceived of only in the light of the New Testament, and to be spoken of only in its terms. All speculation respecting him was to be dismissed. This work Mr. Campbell continued through life. For truly can it be said that the Messiah was his perpetual theme and "his highest delight. To him all eyes were turned as the only source of salvation.

Next faith in Christ was discussed. Its true nature, value, and place were all determined. Mountains of rubbish were here dissipated. For while other subjects were involved in quite as much confusion as that of faith, none was involved in more. That faith is the simple belief of the truth, that it is induced simply by hearing the word of God, that on it all must at once and without delay submit to the Savior—these were strange things in the early part of Mr. Campbell's labors.

Repentance was also defined; and its true nature unfolded and illustrated. It was shown to be an act, and not an impartation to the soul or a feeling excited in it by some occult inscrutable influence of the Holy Spirit. Not only so, it was shown to be an act directly under the control of the will of the party repenting, and not an effect wrought in him in which he is merely passive. To that age these were most heretical positions. With them the common people were delighted; against them the preachers poured out the bitterness of

their souls. For the first time for long dreary centuries men began to feel that Christianity was perfectly adapted to them in their present state; and that hence all its blessings are available things. They now began to feel that salvation is for all; and that all may at once, and without the toils of the anxious seat, attain it. Men grew wild with joy. They vowed the millennium was at hand, and that the new doctrine would take the world. Such were the feelings with which Mr. Campbell and the simple truth as it is in Christ were everywhere received.

Also the true nature of baptism, especially its true design, was unfolded with irresistible force of argument, and all its peculiarities treated with the utmost minuteness of detail. Indeed it is not going too far to say that the whole ordinance, except the simple act itself, was literally exhumed from the rubbish beneath which the criminal folly of men had buried it. We are amazed at the achievements of Mr. Campbell here. It is but just to add that in all this good work he was greatly and signally aided and abetted by many excellent and godly men, most of whom now rest with him. I should delight to honor them by name, but can not here.

Still further, the true office and precise work of the Holy Spirit in the matter of conversion and sanctification were fully set forth in the light of the gospel, and at once became the joy of an age which had lived in painful darkness on this point. This work of Mr. Campbell, and no other deserves higher praise, provoked heavy opposition. He was denounced on all hands as an innovator and a heretic; but he heeded it not. Being bold and scrupulously honest, and feeling profoundly sure he was right, he pushed the cause of his Master grandly on. The spectacle of his controversies and triumphs now became sublime. We should delight to dwell on them, but must not.

Mr. Campbell held during his life three great decisive debates, which deserve a brief passing notice. In his debate with the bold, defiant Owen, he stood the champion of Christianity in America. In this debate Mr. Campbell proved himself a consummate master in the arts of logic. Indeed this has been termed his great debate, and his eight-hour speech in this debate, his great speech. It gave him immense popularity and influence with the people. It marked an epoch in his history.

In his debate with Bishop Purcell he attacked the arrogant and hollow pretensions of Roman Catholicism. In his debate with Mr. Rice the traditions and other baseless tenets of Protestantism were put to the test. These two, we think, are his great debates; and the last of them his greatest. These debates opened for him a broad field of usefulness. To-day we are reaping their fruits. But we can not dwell on them longer.

Mr. Campbell was an editor from 1823 to 1863, a period of forty

years. During this time, including his debates which he merely assisted in bringing out, and two editions of the Hymn Book, he issued from the press fifty-two volumes. In addition to this, must be added, as a part of his work, traveling unknown thousands of miles, and preaching countless numbers of sermons. Such is only a very meagre sketch of the labors of this wonderful man.

Nothing peculiar seems to have marked his dying moments. He was at himself only at intervals. In these he evinced the same unwavering faith and boundless hope which had borne him up through his long life. His last words were an emphatic expression of profound confidence that Christ would hold the candle for him as he stooped beneath the cold shadows of death. And now his work is gloriously done, and he sleeps till the trump of God shall wake him. Grand old man, and tenderly beloved brother! it well-nigh breaks my heart to tell thee good-bye. Yet, since it must be so, fare thee well, thou friend of God, thou friend of Christ, thou friend of the Bible, thou friend of man—fare thee well!

IN BEHALF OF THE QUARTERLY.—We know how unavailing, as a general rule, appeals are when made in behalf of a religious paper. They are too often thought to be made as a matter of course, and hence to have no serious import. We beg that the present one may not be viewed in this light.

We are now approaching the end of the third volume, with a subscription list not yet numbering fifteen hundred. I believe few persons will affirm that this small number is a just measure of the merits of the *Quarterly*. Surely it will not be deemed immodest to think that it might have twice this number. How easy it would be to increase our list up to this point, a moment's thought will satisfy any one. Even the most partial effort on the part of our subscribers would accomplish the end. Can not, then, rather will not, each brother who takes the work determine for himself that he will add another name to the list? This done, the *Quarterly* can be sustained, and its usefulness much increased. We are most anxious to sustain it, and have wrought hard to this end. Surely our brotherhood need the work. It is in the way of no other paper; and, then, certainly its elaborate discussions must do good. To each subscriber, then, I once more appeal in its behalf.

SCRIPTURE TYPES.—No. 5.

(From the Christian Teacher.)

IN our last, which was mainly introductory, we sought to prepare the minds of our readers for an examination of that grand system of types found everywhere in Moses and the prophets. Before we begin, however, to take up the particulars in God's word, we desire to direct attention to some things in God's world that were beyond all question typical of good things to come.

We might expect, if the God who made the world is indeed the God of revelation, that there would be strong analogies between his methods of procedure in each. If he has made a revelation of himself and his dealings with men in a book full of types, figures, and symbols, we ought not to be disappointed in looking for these everywhere in the physical world. Or, to reverse the case: if the student of nature finds in geology and embryology typical forms on every hand, anticipations in one age of what is to come in the next, he ought to find in his Bible a similar method, on the hypothesis that the God of nature is the God of grace.

Taking the former course, let us see briefly if it be true. The ellipse is the typical form for all planetary motion. Wherever the astronomer turns his eye in the planetary spaces, whether to the orbits of planets between us and the sun, as Mercury and Venus, or to those beyond the orbit of our earth, such as Mars and Jupiter, whether he regards the path of *intra* or *extra* mundane spheres, everywhere he finds that all worlds, as well as our own, revolve round the sun in elliptical orbits. This is the first of Kepler's great laws, the discovery of which cost him so much toil, prepared the way for a new era in astronomy, and gave him the title of "Legislator, of the Skies." And so with respect to his second law, "that a line from the centre of a planet to the centre of the sun, called the radius vector, sweeps over equal areas in equal times; and the third, "that the squares of the periodic times are as the cubes of the distances." We can not take time to explain these laws; we allude to them only to show that what is true of one world, as to its form, motion, time of revolution, etc., is typically true of all. That all are arranged on the same type, that all are arranged on the same plan, while each has its special adaptations. We shall find many examples of the same law when we come to consider the general plan and special adaptations in Moses and the prophets.

If we take up another of the physical sciences, chemistry, innu-

merable instances offer themselves to our attention. The union of simple elements forming compounds, according to fixed laws in respect to volume and weight, may be regarded as the basis of this beautiful science. The archetypes of all material entities, of all bodies and all forms, seem to have existed in the divine mind before the world was spoken into existence by the word of God. The *beau ideal* of all things was with him; and according to a clear and well-defined type, they have been composed, as well as arranged, in the universe. The general form which belongs to any tribe of animals or plants is its type, hence we have "types of mankind," meaning thereby the races, such as Caucasian, Indian, Negro, etc. If it were not for typical forms, and the conformity of nature thereto, the naturalist could have no such thing as classification, and we would be lost in the multiplicity and variety of God's works; we could have no such thing as natural science.

But we may observe further, that not only have we well-defined typical forms for each and every creation of God, but we have also, in analogous members of different tribes of animals and plants, expressive homologues that have a parallel in the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian religions. "Then the arms and feet of man, and the fore and hind feet of quadrupeds, the wings and feet of birds, the fins of fishes, are said to be all homologous." So speaks McCosh, who has given us the best book on typical forms that has ever appeared.

We might extend our investigations indefinitely, but the foregoing are sufficient to indicate the line of argument. There is one system of God embracing nature and supernatural; these are not contrary the one to the other, but are in divine harmony, when we read their teachings aright. Typology shows this, and hence those who are best read in the works of God will, if only they have the proper spirit, be best prepared to understand his word.

The geologist can discover in the successive tribes of animated nature, which have in ages long since gone by lived and died, and been buried in tombs of stone, more enduring than the monuments of Egyptian kings, a gradual and constant progress from lower to higher forms, and in the members and limbs of one class, the types and prophecies of corresponding parts in the succeeding class; as from the fin of the fish, nature advances to the wing of the bird, thence to the limb of the quadruped, and the arm of man. But we can discover no reliable evidence that the one of these has been developed out of the other, and therefore that we were once lobsters, then lizards, then asses, then men. This asinine, infidel, and shallow theory finds no foundation in either geology or Scripture, when we have learned to read sermons in stones, hymns in stars, and harmonies everywhere. There are no such cases of development going on now, and it is a baseless assumption to suppose there ever have been.

From this very meagre and imperfect outline, contracted, I fear, to obscurity, we pass to the consideration of that grand system of types which we have a right to expect, and which we do really find in the Scriptures. That system embraces typical persons, places, times, things, numbers, and actions. In the development of God's plan of grace and mercy, that culminates in man's restoration to his presence through the second Adam, each person, place, time, thing, number, and action that belongs to the typical system has its own purpose, its *telos*, or end; and besides this, its common form, or *tupos*, the type to which it belongs. For example, the tabernacle was the place where Jehovah was worshiped by the Israelites, and where he recorded his name and met with them. It was their house of worship, but besides this, its special purpose, it is a most instructive type of the Christian system in its ordinances and worship. In both, the elements of all true religion are found,—guilt contracted, God offended, propitiation made, and acceptance gained. Without these, or any one of them, we can not have the religion of God in any age. Forms and customs may and do change from age to age, but these conceptions are radical and fundamental in religion—there can be no religion without them.

The people cotemporary with the events, times, and actions which sustained 'this prefigurative character did not understand their full significance. It was not necessary that they should. In fact, had they done so, our confidence in the whole system would be shaken, if, indeed, we could have any at all. When we see Abel, Melchisedec, and Isaac acting parte, of whose adumbrative nature they could have, at best, but a very faint conception (and this is apparent from the very nature of the case), we can come to no other conclusion than that Omniscience providentially arranged the whole scheme of their lives, that in them we might have a conclusive proof of the divine origin of our holy religion. The proof that the types, as well as other things in religion, were mysteries unrevealed to the ancients, is abundant; we need only allude to one: "And not as Moses who put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." (2 Cor. iii., 13.)

Is it not a little remarkable that while *tupos*, the Greek word for type, occurs just sixteen times in the New Testament, it should have been represented by King James' translators by no less than eight English words? Thus—*Ensample* five times; 1 Cor. x., 11; Phil. iii., 17; 1 Thess. i., 7; 2 Thess. iii., 9; 1 Peter v., 3. *Example* twice; 1 Cor. x., 6; 1 Tim. iv., 12. *Print* twice; John xx., 25. *Figure* twice; Acts vii., 43; Rom. v., 14. *Pattern* twice; Titus ii., 7; Heb. viii., 5. *Fashion* once; Acts vii., 44. *Manner* once; Acts xxiii., 25. And *form* once; Rom. vi., 17. These references should be well pondered by all who would have a clear view of Scripture typology. Were we compelled to select some one of these eight words to repre-

sent the original, we would choose pattern as the best, and yet it does not answer the whole purpose, and therefore we prefer to use the word type, as more clearly representing to English ears the idea and imagery of the Greek term.

As to the arrangement and classification of the Old Testament types, we prefer to speak of them under the heads of Typical Persons, Typical Ordinances, Typical Things.

We do not affirm that this is absolutely the best division; but we have found it to be the most convenient in arranging our knowledge in a somewhat protracted study of this beautiful field of religious truth.

In entering upon the first division, we must not omit to notice the dualism that appears on every hand in the ancient families of the ancient people of God. In the first household, and immediately after the fall, the drama opens with the introduction of two brothers, an altar, gifts, and a sacrifice. Cain and Abel stand out as the beginning of this dualism. Let us see what we have here. The elder, the younger; the first, nature-born, the second, grace-born; one according to flesh, the other according to faith. The one is generated; the other re-generated. The elder is heir according to primogeniture; the younger by the preference of God. Cain is reprobate; Abel is elect. The former is proud, impious, and resentful; the latter, humble, pious, and submissive. The first kills; the last is killed. We might carry this contrast further; but enough is suggested to enable the reader to trace it into many more points of dissimilarity, and with these in mind to understand the two great types of character and relation in Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, the sons of Leah and the sons of Rachel, Manasseh and Ephraim, Absalom and Solomon. In all these, and more that might be cited, we have two distinct types of persons, and they all set forth some truth in reference to the worldly man and the Christian—the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, those who mind the things of the flesh, and those who mind the things of the Spirit.

How clearly come out these contrasts in Joseph and Benjamin, the younger sons of Jacob, and their elder brothers, cruel, worldly, and lustful! In what a fine light Isaac appears in contrast with his elder brother, Ishmael? The pious shepherd with the bold hunter,—the man whose hand is against no one, and the man whose hand is against every one. Then, again, look at the descendants of Esau and Jacob. Truly, as God said to the agonizing Rebekah: "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be born of thee; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." The ambition and rebellion of Absalom serve as a background to put the wisdom and loyalty of Solomon in a more illustrative light.

Of course, we can only consider in any one case the general homology, and not each separate act of the individual life. No type is perfect, and the best falls far short of setting forth the perfection of the life in God, just as, on the other hand, neither Nimrod nor Pharaoh can symbolize the rudeness, tyranny, and enormity of those "vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction."

The Lord does in every age love Jacob and hate Esau, as he says in Malachi i., 2, 3; and as Paul quotes in the 9th Romans, and surely if we would study the typical character of those Jacobs and Esaus, the general homology, as well as the special purpose of each life, we would have clearer and juster views of God and his dealings with men; the loving and hating which is predicated of him; the election and reprobation affirmed of Israel according to faith, and the Israel according to flesh. We would not apply what was spoken nationally of types in an age of shadows, to men and women individually, under the reign of Christ. We would not attribute to God a capricious partiality, hateful in a human parent; but a grand scheme of mercy worthy the heart of the divine Father of humanity.

G.

STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.—There are few persons who really study the word of God. Most preachers, even when preparing discourses on Scripture themes, study them merely in the light of human reason and experience. Others study the Scriptures only in that degree necessary to prepare their weekly discourses. It is the smallest number who pursue a systematic study of the whole book, with a view to laying a broad and deep foundation for accurate and consistent conclusions. It is manifest that no other method of study is worthy of one who assumes the position of a teacher in Israel. The student of geometry is often required to state the propositions of each book in consecutive order, and to announce them when called by their numbers. Why should not the student of the Bible, and especially the teacher of the Bible, be expected to take up any one book in it, and state its contents in consecutive order, or to announce the subject-matter of any chapter when called by its number? Such knowledge of the sacred writings as this would qualify a man for generalizing any subject of which the Bible treats, for it would enable him to survey the whole field at a single glance. Anything short of this must result in contracted and partial presentations of truth, and often in the admixture of much error. No man is prepared to treat positively and with certainty upon any subject until he has before his mind everything that the Bible says in reference to it. Let him, therefore, who would be a safe and accurate workman, of whom no one need be ashamed, undertake and steadily pursue such a course of study as will put him in full possession of every portion of the Bible, beginning with those portions which demand most immediate attention.

ANOTHER THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.

ON the whole subject of the millennium, the views of both the ancients and the moderns are conflicting and contradictory. But this ought to be no bar to investigation, nor a reason for hopeless abandonment of the subject. The truth is somewhere to be found, and the theorists of all the schools have all and each of them a certain *quantum* of truth mixed up with large portions of error. We must, then, bring to the examination of so complicated a subject great candor of mind, a spirit of searching scrutiny, as much freedom from the trammels of system as can be brought to bear, and some acquaintance with the literature that exists on the question. A man should never write on the subject of prophecy until he has grappled with the master-spirits on the awful theme,

In the first place I must remark, that the leading spirits in the current reformation have never believed in a personal reign of Christ on this earth for a thousand years. They have always contended for a figurative or spiritual reign. In this there can be no mistake; for I have been laboring in this cause, and have been on terms of intimacy with the leading minds, since 1829. Nor is this brought as a reason for the correctness of our views; but for the purpose of showing that there ought to be weighty considerations moving the minds of any of our brethren in this day who shall attempt to change our people, and turn them the other way. For years it has been among us *a sign* of an eccentric tendency in the mind of any man who drifted away out of the main current of thought into the eddies of speculation, to go round with the drift-wood and trash of an anti-progress spirit.

Dr. John Thomas took early ground in favor of a personal reign, but we considered it a proof of his great anxiety to be the reformer of the reformation. Moreover, we have generally accepted it as a sign of disappointment in whosoever turned to the dogma of a personal reign, as the plunging and floundering of a spirit, who has had Pisgah in his eye, but who has become awfully befogged in the swamps beneath. When a man has adopted a creed which is anti-progress, and which he has astuteness enough to perceive is effectually enswamped in difficulties, out of which no ingenuity can deliver it, of course you soon find him turning his eyes toward the clouds of the heavens, waiting for Jesus to descend and relieve this precious creed from the neglect into which it has deservedly fallen. When one believes that man is in his nature totally depraved, and can neither think a good thought nor do a good deed without a special operation of the Holy

Spirit upon his heart, and when he sees that this generation is going to sleep under the preaching of such husks for the truth of God, of course he is despondent, and, hopeless of this means of grace, he casts an anxious look to the clouds for the Son of man to come in his glory, to burn up and crush out these wicked people who doubt his abstractions, and do not receive them as the truth of God.

There have been some among us who seem to have been emulated by the success of Bro. Campbell at reforming the abuses of the religion of Jesus, and in an effort to induce a return to primitive Christianity. They have essayed to reorganize the churches, and to change the order of the worship, assuming that all insufficiency or want of success is the result of the old organization and order. These have, in general, been men of a speculative turn of mind, of no power in winning souls, and building up the saints; but fond of their own thoughts and theories, and down upon everything old, because it is not new, and because it is not theirs. Such men, if they fail to convince the brethren of the magic power of their untried and yet vaunted theories, sulk away into despondency, and rust out in grumbling at all and sundry of whatever stands in their way. The last hope of the disappointed and desponding spirit is the personal reign dogma of the Apocalypse.

The very able article of the *Quarterly*, by the editor, styled "A Theory of the Millennium," is not implicated in any of the above cases, nor do we consider its editor as having taken his pipe, and seated himself in the corner with the men of the forlorn hope. We look upon it as its title indicates, as "A Theory of the Millennium," presented for consideration, for adoption, or rejection, according to the convictions of the brethren; and rather as a test of the judgment of our brethren generally. With much in the article we are pleased, and only take exception to the idea of a personal reign of Jesus Christ on earth. This we shall do by filing insuperable objections against the theory of a personal reign, and then by supporting the theory of a figurative or spiritual reign. Thus we shall avoid the tedium of a minute review of and reply to the able article of the *Quarterly*.

In the first place, then, we must ascertain what is the main character of the style of the Apocalypse. Unless this is first done we can make no sure progress. The editor very properly admits that its style is eminently figurative, gorgeous, and grand, even to sublimity. This is true; but consistency requires that when we adopt a principle of interpretation we must stand by it, and not do as the editor has done, admit *that feeling* is legitimate as a guide where faith fails to give its light. This surprised me in the editor. To say that the Apocalypse is figurative in its general style and statements is only to admit that it is mainly prophetic of the future; and almost all the Old Testament prophets speak of the future, both as to persons, king-

doms, and events, in highly wrought figurative language. For instance, Jesus is called by Isaiah a "Rod," a "Branch," a "Tender Plant," a "Root," a "Servant," and "Mine Elect;" a "Child," and a "Son;" and Daniel calls him "the Messiah, the Prince." Besides, when Isaiah contemplates him as ruling in righteousness, he says: "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isaiah xi., 4-9.)

If a literal meaning is placed on the above passages, then it follows that Jesus is not the Messiah promised to the nation of Israel, nor is he the Savior of the world. That was the mistake of the Jews, who rejected him as not being the Messiah their prophets predicted. This ought surely to put us upon, our guard against adopting a similar mode of interpretation which resulted so fatally to them. Jesus was to be a king, a spiritual king, sitting in heaven, and ruling on earth, by his laws, by his word, by the faith his people had in him. The Jews looked for a literal king, an earthly monarch, who should reign in splendor in Jerusalem, push out the Romans, conquer the Caesars, and subdue the kings of the earth. The real sufferings predicted for him they interpreted figuratively, and applied all such passages as personifying the nation in its trials. They gave the literal passages a figurative meaning, and the figurative passages a literal meaning, and the work was done. They had a plausible and imposing apology for their unbelief. This mistake was general. Even the disciples asked after the resurrection: "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

The Redeemer uttered the great truth concerning his kingdom to Pilate, when he said: "My kingdom is not of this world;" but none of the disciples understood it until after Pentecost. In Peter's first discourse he said, quoting from the Prophet Joel: "And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come; and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Has the sun been turned into

darkness, and the moon into blood, literally? This language is highly figurative, and may indicate only that the light and influence of the ruling powers, civil and ecclesiastical, were to be obscured and put down. The things done to those powers explain the meaning of the passage. The glory of the renowned nation of Israel departed and was turned into darkness in the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the dispersion over the world of its fragments of families that escaped the sword, the pestilence, and the famine, that wasted it. The leaders of the people, the doctors of the law, with the Sanhedrim, were bathed in blood. Thus "the moon was turned into blood." Jesus called Herod a "fox," and James and John he called "boanerges," or sons of thunder. Of course our Lord exposed the craftiness and the cunning of Herod under that name, and foretold the energy and power of James and John in the proclamation of the gospel. Paul called Elymas a "child of the Devil," and the High Priest a "whited wall," intending in the first case to show, as the Savior said to the Jews: "Ye are of your father the Devil, and his works ye will do, for he was a liar, and the father of it;" and in the last case, the hypocrisy of sitting to judge him according to the law, and commanding him to be smitten contrary to the law.

If the above thoughts had been considered, the editor might have saved himself the labor of that graphic description of the fearful birds falling down upon the wicked, and plucking out their eyes, and tearing out their hearts! Although such a description is very alarming, and might be too much for the nerves of the timid and nervous, there is, in fact, something far more awful and harrowing awaiting all the enemies of Jesus.

There is one law of interpretation that is fatal to this theory, and that is, that facts are not to be explained by figures, but figures by facts. The resurrection of the dead is plainly stated in the teaching of Jesus and the apostles, and the facts of the resurrection must not bend to the figurative instructions of the Apocalypse; but those figurative passages must be explained in harmony with the unbending facts of that teaching. To begin with the teaching of our Lord as to the resurrection, and the judgment ensuing, he says: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left," etc., etc. Paul says: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." (Rom. xiv., 10.) "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the thing's done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. v., 10.)

The resurrection of all is always spoken of in the unfigurative, matter-of-fact passage, as taking place at the same moment of time "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v., 28, 29.) "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." There is no hint given here that a thousand years will intervene between the resurrection of the just and unjust. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "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." In the same moment, then, the dead shall be raised; not the righteous dead, but all the dead; not a thousand years apart, but in the "twinkling of an eye." Again, Paul says: "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when 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; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. i., 7-10.) Both of these things are to be done at one and the same time; that is, *when* Jesus comes to take vengeance on the wicked, and to be glorified in his saints. Away forever with the confusion which results from interpreting facts by figures. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. ix., 27, 28.) "Once to die, but after this the judgment." Not once to die, and after this a thousand years reign on earth; but after this, next after this, the judgment.

We have another test by which to try the doctrine of a personal reign, and that is the second coming of Christ. His first coming was in the flesh, on a mission of mercy to men; not to judge the world, but to save the world. His second coming will be, not to save the world, but to judge all mankind. There is an appropriate symbol connected with each of these comings. The first is the *cross*, the second is the *crown*. The first is for sinners, the second for saints. When Jesus was here, in person, he pointed to two distinct events—one at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the other at the end of the world. The apostles also spoke of his coming to judge the world, and called it his second coming. From this it follows that his coming

to destroy Jerusalem was a figurative coming, not a literal one. He has all power in heaven and upon earth, and the reins of government are in his hands; therefore, he came in the Roman army as the providential ruler. The time of this figurative coming was not revealed; and therefore the Lord said to his disciples: "Watch, therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." He was to come "as a thief in the night," when none were expecting him. Daniel says: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and offering to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate." This was literally done by the Roman army, but figuratively by Jesus, as Daniel saw and said.

Before we examine the passages relied on to prove a personal reign, it will be well to look at another collateral argument against the idea of a personal reign. If the coming spoken of is a literal coming and not a figurative one, it follows unavoidably that the Savior has failed in his great work, and Satan has triumphed over him. It seems to me that such a consequence, resulting from any view held by me, would be sufficient to cause me to doubt my reasonings if such conclusion legitimately followed. Not only does this fearful result flow from the premises, but many clear prophecies will fail of their fulfillment. If the mediatorial work ceases on the binding of Satan, and if the martyrs are raised up, and Jesus personally descends to destroy the wicked, and reign with the saints on earth a thousand years, then has the Savior lost his cause, and error has triumphed over the truth. The great-conflict of the Savior was a moral conflict, and victory for him must be a moral victory. The Devil knows better than to defy Omnipotence to arms. That Jesus can put down Satan in a moment, by his divine power, every well-instructed Christian believes. But this, if done, would not bring glory to him. It would be strange that Jesus should have done so much since the days of Martin Luther, by his providence and by his word, and without a miracle; and that now, with all that has been gained, give up the conflict and wind up the state of probation in which he was gaining territory from the enemy every year.

The conquests of Jesus are made by his cross, by his love, by his moral worth; he wins the hearts of men; he helps them to subdue their appetites and passions, to cast off the old man, to put on the new man; here is the honor of Jesus. The personal reign theory is the natural ally of the physical agency in conversions, of creed-mongers and waning sects, of those who make man a machine and deny his liberty, of all who say the word of God is a dead letter, and who deny all moral causes. It seems strange to me that any who believe in the omnipotence of truth, in the power of the word of God, should give heart-room to the withering influences of the per-

sonal reign theory. Let me now show that many clear predictions will fail of their fulfillment. My first passage is from Isaiah: "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isaiah xi., 9.) Will any one take the ground that there has ever been a time in the past; or is it true of the present, that the knowledge of the Lord has covered the earth as the waters cover the sea? We deny that such a time has ever been; and it must, therefore, be in the future. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea." (Isaiah xi., 11.)

Our last passage was not fulfilled by the return of Israel from Babylon, because the countries named were not parts of that empire. "He will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah, from the four corners of the earth." (v. 12.) Centuries may pass away before this work is completed. Peter the apostle, speaking of Jesus, says: "Whom the heaven must receive (retain) until the times of restitution (or fulfillment) of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii., 21.) This takes away all probability of a personal reign; and, therefore, we are now prepared to consider the passages relied upon in its support.

"And I saw an angel come 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 shall be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." (Rev. xx., 1-3.) Upon this highly figurative passage, it is obvious to the reader that a literal meaning is inadmissible. The use of three words shows it. The words *key*, *chain*, and *seal* indicate the meaning, if nothing more had been said. Are spirits held by chains? Are they locked up by keys? Are they labeled by seals? If not, then the whole passage is figurative, and indicates clearly that great restraint will be laid upon the world-wide deceiver of our race. A chain is a symbol of restraint; that the person chained is not robbed of motion, but limited in his movements to the length of his chain; a key is a symbol of power, to shut up within certain bounds; and a seal is that which identifies and marks either men or things.

A man going forth on a white horse is a symbol of the everlasting gospel going forth with power, in the scenic pictures of the Apoca-

lypse. The angels that poured out the seven vials are represented as doing all with their own hands, without reference to other instrumentalities; but the sober interpreter knows that most of the work was done by the fleets and armies of the world. In Egypt the ten plagues were ten miracles wrought by the power of God alone; but the *tableaux* which John saw in Patmos were not literal realities, but graphic pictures, the hieroglyphics of the future. As, for instance, John was ordered to take a reed, "and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months." (Rev. xi., 1, 2.) Finding such passages as this in this highly figurative book, and finding frequent references in it to the temple, the altar, and the court, and the holy city, many German writers take the ground that the whole book refers to the troubles and trials of the Jewish nation after the death of Christ, and that the whole of its figures are exhausted in the destruction of Jerusalem and the winding up of their ecclesiastical polity.

Having seen clearly enough that the literal meaning of the binding of Satan can not be the meaning intended by the Holy Spirit, we adopt the figurative interpretation, and shall now proceed to consider the next passage. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them", and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." (Rev. xx., 4, 5.) This is the real battleground for the millennium; and, therefore, we must examine it with care, speak of it, as the editor of the *Quarterly* does, with much hesitancy and circumspection. If it establishes a personal reign we must accept it, however much it deranges our plans and jostles our theories. We believe with Solomon: "That whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it; and God doeth it, that men should fear before him." (Eccl. iii., 14.)

That it is not a literal description the very language implies. John saw the *souls* of the martyrs, not their bodies; and with the editor's leave, I will suggest that he is mistaken beyond the shadow of a doubt in making the passage describe two different classes of persons; namely, the martyrs, and all the rest of the followers of Christ. No such idea is found in the passage without doing violence to its meaning. There were three characteristics given of the same souls: 1. "They were slain for the witness they bore to Jesus, and for the word of God they had preached." 2. "Nor had they worshiped the

beast, nor his image." 3. They had "not received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." This all relates to the martyrs. John had seen these *souls* before, in the opening of the fifth seal: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." (Rev. vi., 9.) We have already seen that there is not literally taught, in any passage, a separate resurrection of a part of the dead; but, on the contrary, we have seen that-all the dead will rise at once, in the same moment of time, the good and the bad, and stand up for judgment. This creates the necessity for a figurative meaning here, or else we have a contradiction on our hands. To avoid a contradiction, and to allow unfulfilled prophecy time to develop its still hidden resources, and to prevent the inaccuracy of making the coming of Jesus to judgment at the end of the millennium his third coming instead of his second, according to the teaching of the apostles, we agree to a figurative reign, and not to a personal advent.

One of the angels of the vials, after John had seen the scenic and symbolic panorama of the future, and knowing that he was puzzled over it, said to him: "Come hither, and I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters." (Rev. xvii., 1.) "And the angel said unto me: Why didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns." (v. 1.) "And here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." (v. 9.) "And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings." (v. 12.) "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." (v. 18.) "And he saith unto me: The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." (v. 15.) Here is the interpretation of the angel; can we trust it, or not? And we certainly do not trust it when we give a literal exposition of a book which is thus explained by the Holy Spirit. A woman stands for a great city; seven heads stand for seven mountains; ten horns stand for ten kings; and the waters on which the city was built stand for peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues. This, then, is the *key* of interpretation. As such we accept it, and shall now suggest a few thoughts to the brethren.

We must remember that the religion of Jesus Christ, as originally planted in the world by the apostles, has been made by Satan an instrument of death by the corruptions of that arch-enemy. The martyrs lost their lives by bearing testimony in favor of Jesus and his word as originally given, and by refusing to acquiesce in and give their sanction to the corruptions of the holy and life-giving truth. How natural, therefore, to expect that when the time should come for Satan's power to be broken, when the nations devoted to his interest are broken

of their power, and when popery and infidelity—the great engines of his power—are braved and met by the friends of truth, and driven in shame from the field, *that the spirits of those martyrs should live again in the friends of Jesus*, and show the same firm faith, the same unyielding spirit, even unto death; to encourage the faithful to the onset, and to the death-struggles they may pass through, before the truth finally and forever triumphs. A figurative resurrection, then, explains the passage, and everything remains consistent and harmonious. That is, the martyrs' are reproduced in those who, in our own day, are waking up to realize the grandeur and the divinity of the cause of Jesus Christ, and who are preparing to bare their bosoms to the storm, and, if necessary, to brave death as witnesses for Jesus.

Dark as is the present time, and gloomy as is the prospect, because of the clashing of arms and the strife of forces that ought to be standing together facing the common enemy, still, in comparison with the times of the Albigenses and the Waldenses, in the long dark night of popery, when "all the world wondered after the beast," the present is a time of brightness, a time of hope; and poor is the spirit of the man that shrinks now, and backs down from the conflict with such magazines of means all around him. The Bible is being translated into all the languages and dialects of earth; the sons of science are out in all latitudes and in all seas exploring the fields of botany, and exploring the valleys and mountains of earth for their mineral treasures, and riches of all kinds; and all hopeful spirits are on the tiptoe of expectation, waiting for and fully expecting large results from the working of the principles of Lord Bacon; never doubting that all the dreams of the alchemists of the past, like the mists of the morning, will pass away, and God will be honored, loved, adored, and worshiped by all his creatures as soon as they learn how good he is, and how full of hidden treasures all his works teem for the good of man. Let the disciples of Jesus, the sons of God, who "have tasted that he is gracious," despond no more, and dream no more about impossible things; but humbly trust in God, and work on, each in his proper sphere, under the influence of hope and trust in the good word, and they will realize the truth of the old saying, that "the darkest hour of night is just before day."

Can it be possible that the children of God have become unbelieving, when such mighty results have already been achieved for the Bible? A pure text already sought out for the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and for the Greek of the New; endless stores of learning on the history of the literature of the East, the old kingdoms of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon almost exhumed, and made to testify in favor of Moses, Ezra, and Isaiah; criticism, endless, upon the words of both Testaments, and all these compared with the writings of the oldest, uninspired, who have written of the past; the manners and customs

of the East set before us in a grand museum of learning; the products of Palestine, the animals, the agriculture, the seasons, and all minutely and graphically set forth, and every help now at hand and inviting investigation and use; also a corresponding awakening among all classes, in all countries, to the necessity of a learned and duly educated ministry; colleges and universities, with their thousands of hopeful and aspiring students, busily at work sending forth their *alumni* to open the roads, to traverse the seas, and push on this mighty accumulation of means, to bring in during the next fifty years a harvest of results which, in comparison with all the past, will appear miraculous. Is it possible that, in this evidently preparatory and elementary process, any believer in the Bible can conclude that all these initial and introductory piles are collected and prepared for the eternal burning, and not for use, to bring about grand and glorious results in the future? Let the chilling, withering thought be crushed out and brushed out of every believing heart.

Let us, after this episode, fall back upon the passage. That the spirits or souls of the martyrs are to live again in the future advocates of the cross, and Jesus pre-eminently reigning over them by his laws,—his authority no longer contested, and all unbelief put down, uninterrupted peace, and the people all happy and contented, the days of strife and hatred having passed away,—will surely be worthy of a picture such as John saw in the isle of Patmos. Moreover, this is one of the modes of Scripture prophecy. John the Baptist is, in prophecy, called Elias. Not that he was the literal prophet, raised up and sent again to the Jewish people, but "he came in the spirit and power of Elias;" and in speaking of John, the Redeemer said: "This is Elias which was to come." We are told that "the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." (Rev. xx., 5.) This doubtless means that none others but the martyrs lived again, or were thought worthy of an honored place in this picture gallery, because they were not heroic, they were ordinary Christians who worked their way in life's common struggles; but their example was not necessary, like that of the "noble army of martyrs," to stir up the energy of an heroic faith, and to blow up the fires of resolution and fearlessness to a white and glowing heat. Moreover, there is in this same chapter a plain prose statement which will justify all we have said upon the subject: "And I saw a great white throne, and him who sat thereon, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." (Rev. xx., 11, 12.)

This plain prose statement evinces clearly enough that at the conclusion of the millennium the judgment will take place, just as our Lord and the apostles have taught us in all their references to that subject. Long ages may pass away, however, ere the traditions of men give way to the truth of God; and before all national churches are removed, and give place to the faith and practice of primitive Christianity. The Jews are yet to be converted and returned to their own land, and become missionaries to all nations, as they will go from all nations and speak all languages which they were trained among; God will move them by his Spirit, and they will become the honored instruments, as their fathers were, in melting down the opposition of all mankind. "Oh, happy day! Oh, glorious hope, my heart rejoices at the thought I" There can be no doubt, from the mighty work that has to be done, but that ages of conflict still lie before us. The Lord will give strength to his people according to their need and according to the measure of their trust in him and their devotion to him. God works not as man works; but, on the contrary, makes one class of errors destroy another. Universalism is Calvinism run into the ground, and Mormonism is fanaticism, which believes in whispers, and feelings, and experiences, whether according to the word of God or not, all stranded and run aground. Puritanism is regular antagonism to Catholicism, and by its bitterness and hatred is ready to execute heaven's vengeance, as Puritans believe upon the Man of sin. These hostile hosts are already marshaling their forces for the bloody conflict. May the good Lord shelter his people in that awful day!

Many contend that the Church of God is referred to in Ezek. xliii., 10-12. Dr. Scott, in his notes on this passage, says: "This may be also referred to the times when the whole church shall be reformed according to the standard of Scripture; when all denominations of Christians shall discern by that light their deviations from the truth of God, in doctrine, discipline, worship, and practice; repent of them, and attempt to rectify them; and this beginning of humiliation will make way for their more complete instruction in every part of the divine will." Archbishop Tillotson says: "Remember that there is a very odd passage in Mr. Herbert's poems, which, whether it be only the prudent conjecture and foresight of a wise man, or there be something more prophetic in it I can not tell; it is this:

"Religion stands on tiptoes in our land,
Ready to pass to the American strand;
When *Seine* shall swallow *Tiber* and the *Thames*,
By letting in them both, pollute her streams;
Then shall religion to America flee;
They have their times or gospel even as we."

The meaning of it is this, that when the vices of Italy shall pass into France, and the vices of both shall overspread England, then the gospel will leave these parts of the world and pass into America, to

visit those dark regions which have so long sat in darkness and the shadow of death. And this is not so improbable, if we consider what vast colonies in this last age have been transplanted out of Europe into those parts, as it were, on purpose to prepare and make way for such a change." (Vol. iii., fol. ed., p. 581.) We should remember, that Tillotson wrote the above near 200 years ago, and Herbert's work was then an old and nearly forgotten publication. Bishop Hurd, says: "He who the most dispassionately contemplates so sad a scene, can hardly reconcile appearances to what must have been his natural expectations. Here, then, the prophecies of this work, I mean of the Apocalypse, comes in to our relief. They show that the end of this dispensation (the Christian) is to promote virtue and happiness, and this end shall finally, but through many and long obstructions, be accomplished. Thus, they reconcile us to that disordered scene which hath hitherto been presented to us, and""give repose to the anxious mind, in the assured hope of better things to come."

Dr. Jortin says: "The too literal expounding of passages has produced strange and precarious notions among ancient and modern Christians concerning the millennium; thus it has been supposed that Christ shall come and reign personally upon earth a thousand years, that the old Christian martyrs shall rise again to reign with him, that the Jews shall have a temple rebuilt and a temple-service renewed." (*Rem. on Eccl. Hist.* Vol. ii., p. 424.) Mr. Stephens wrote, 200 years ago, as follows: "For the nature of this kingdom, we desire that we may not be mistaken. We do not plead for a personal reign, nor a literal resurrection of the martyrs, nor a confluence of all sensual delights, as many have done. That which we principally stand for is the universal subjection of the nations to the laws of the gospel, and the rest of the church from such persecutions as have been in all anti-christian times." (*A Calcul. of the Numb.*, etc., p. 91.) Dr. Joseph Towers says: "And I must not omit to observe that Dr. Lightfoot, who was so intimately conversant in the Jewish phraseology, thinks that this and similar passages are indubitably not to be interpreted of Christ's actual advent. By writers of reputation the belief of his personal reign on earth is, indeed, very generally rejected. This, however, I believe, to adopt the words of Mr. Pyle, "that he shall reign in the hearts, and holy lives, and examples of his followers." In a note on the same page is the following: "Among others, it is rejected (that is, a personal reign) in express terms, by Crellius (in Rom. xi., 23), Vitringa (in Apoc, p. 848), Brenius (*De Regno Christi*), Dr. John Edwards (*History of the Various Dispensations of Religion*. Vol. ii., p. 654), Peganius (on the Apoc, p. 238), Dr. Thomas Burnett (*Theory of the Earth*. Vol. ii., p. 308), Whitby (on the Millennium, chap. iv.), Hurd (Vol. i., p. 123). Mede, speaking of this subject, says: "I dare not so much as *imagine* that it should be a

visible converse on earth" (p. 741). And how strongly Dr. More condemned the contrary opinion the following citation from him will evince: "The personal reign of Christ upon earth and of his holy martyrs is a very rash, and groundless, and unsafe conceit." (*Mystery of Godliness*, p. 181.) The passage that follows is from Dr. Burnett: "That Christ should leave that right hand of his Father to come and pass a thousand years here below, living upon earth in a heavenly body; this, I confess, is a thing I never could digest." (*Illust. of Prophecy*. Vol. ii., p. 263.)

At the sounding of the seventh trumpet, it is written: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." (Rev. xi., 15.) Of course, this can never be upon the principle we are opposing, of a personal and speedy reign of a thousand years. The kingdoms have never yet become the Lord's, nor can they be if the martyrs only are raised; and it can not be forever if it only lasts a thousand years. So that, considering the several objections and difficulties that come up and form a barrier in our way, we may safely conclude that the personal reign of Christ on earth must be given up; and then, if we must interpret the round number of a thousand years as the other numbers are interpreted, we have space enough, and time enough, to give Jesus a thousand for every one Satan has destroyed. But on this subject we will not insist, lest the mind might become fatigued with improbabilities. A figurative reign will answer all our purposes, whether it last a thousand or a hundred thousand years. For the present, until our arguments and objections are removed, we shall let the foregoing suffice, and conclude the present article by presenting to our brethren two very singular circumstances.

Mr. Robert Fleming published some discourses in 1701, in which he interpreted the pouring out of the seven vials of the sixteenth chapter of Revelation. In speaking upon the fourth vial that was to be poured out upon the sun, he concluded that it would be fulfilled on France, by 1194. And although, as a general rule, it is unsafe to venture predictions on the future, because prophecy was not intended to make uninspired men prophets, still, in this instance it is curious, and we will give a few of his remarks as quoted by Dr. Towers: "The chief thing," says Mr. Fleming, "to be taken notice of there is, that *the sun* and other luminaries of heaven are the emblems of princes and kingdoms, as we took notice of before. Therefore the pouring out of this vial *on the sun* must denote the humiliation of some eminent potentates of the Romish interest, whose influence and countenance cherish and support the papal cause. And these, therefore, must be principally understood of the houses of Austria and Bourbon, though not exclusively of other popish princes. So that there is ground to hope

that about the beginning of another such century things may again alter for the better; for I can not but hope that some new mortification of the chief supporters of antichrist will then happen; and, perhaps, *the French monarchy* may begin to be considerably humbled about that time; that whereas the present French king takes *the sun* for his emblem, and this for his motto, *Nec pluribus impar*, he may at length, or rather his successors, and *the monarchy itself* (at least before the year 1794) be forced to acknowledge that (in respect to neighboring potentates) he is even *singulis impar*. But as to the expiration of this vial I do fear it will not be until the year 1194." (*Illust. of Proph.* Vol. i., p. 3.)

Our last case is found in *Jones' Biblical Cyclopaedia*, quoted from Fuller's *Discourses on the Apocalypse*: "The sounding of the seventh angel is the signal for the commencement of the pouring out of the vials, and is supposed to have taken place within the last five and twenty years. The vials are interpreted on the principle of their resemblance to the trumpets; namely, the first, poured out on the "earth," is supposed to denote the late wars on the continent between France and the other continental powers; the second, poured upon the "sea," the wars carrying on in the maritime nations of Spain and Portugal; the third, poured upon the "rivers and fountains of waters," the wars which, if the principle here adopted be just, will ere long befall Italy and Savoy, the countries where was shed in shocking profusion the blood of the Waldenses; the fourth, poured upon the "sun," the oppression of the supreme government, to which the antichristian church will be subjected at the time; the fifth, poured out on "the seat of the beast," *such judgments as will either drive him from his den, or render him very miserable in it*; the sixth, poured on "Euphrates," and producing the battle of "Armageddon," partly the overthrow of the Turkish empire, and partly the ruin of the adherents of Popery; the seventh, poured into the "air," the overthrow of the spiritual power of Popery and of every other species of false religion." (Rev. xvi.) The remarks on the fifth vial we have italicized, as having been fulfilled in our own day, when the Pope had to fly from Rome, and was only brought back by French bayonets, and who has been guarded by them ever since. Alas, for that *guarding power!* its judgments are about to come. Here, for the present, we leave the subject, praying to be protected in the coming struggles.

TITUS.

NOTE.—Of the foregoing we have simply to say, that if Titus has hit the true view of the millennium, then reasoning and exegesis should be abandoned, and guessing reduced to a science. What is the millennium? If any one can tell from the preceding, crown him for penetration.—ED.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church: **and** the gate of hell **shall** not prevail against it."—MATT. xvi., 18.

THE prevailing ignorance upon the subject of Christianity; the divided condition of the so-called church; the rapid increase of infidelity and wickedness in the world; and the very general expectation, on the part of the learned, of the speedy termination of the present dispensation, combine to render an accurate knowledge of all things connected with the church of God of the very highest interest and importance. It is not expected to exhaust the subject in a single article. Attention will, however, be directed to the consideration of the following items, to wit, the foundation, the materials, the beginning, the apostasy, the restoration, the reformation, and the glorification or triumph of that church which Jesus, in the language quoted above, proposes to build.

I. *The Foundation*.—"What is it? It would certainly be difficult, if not impossible, to exaggerate the importance of obtaining a correct answer to this question. If the covenant which God made with Abraham is the foundation or rock upon which Christ built his church, then it may be that all the laws, rites, and ceremonies connected with that covenant are yet binding upon the members of the church or body of Christ. But this is an assumption wholly unsupported by the word of God, and may therefore be dismissed without further notice. Again: if the church is built upon Peter, as taught by "almost every modern expositor of any note," then it may be that the Roman Catholic is correct in claiming that the pope, as the infallible successor of Peter, is alone competent to give the knowledge of the way of life and salvation. It may be well to bestow upon this assumption something more than a passing notice; inasmuch as it is the central and controlling idea of the Church of Rome, and is also very extensively believed by Protestants. In support of this theory it is affirmed that rock, in the language under consideration, refers to Peter. In the English text there is manifestly no such reference; hence an appeal is made to the Greek. But here there is as little; for, notwithstanding the words (*Petros* and *Petra*) from which Peter and rock are translated, are similar in orthography and pronunciation, still they neither agree in gender nor meaning. *Petros* is masculine, and means a stone, or a piece of rock. *Petra* is feminine, and means simply a rock in the broadest sense of the word. Now the rule governing the reference of one antecedent to another requires that they shall agree in gender. Therefore there can be no

such reference in this instance. To what, then, does Jesus refer by the use of the word rock? Unquestionably to the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, which Peter had just confessed. The walled city of Caesarea Philippi, which was built upon a cliff of solid rock, stood near the scene of this conversation. Now to this city Jesus evidently alludes when he speaks of building his church on a rock, and of giving the keys which control admission into it into the hands of Peter. But the church is not a material edifice, but a spiritual house, or, literally, an organization of men and women. It is not, therefore, built upon a material foundation; but, like every other *organization*, it is founded upon some leading and controlling idea or truth. Paul says the church is built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone. (Eph. ii., 20.) Now the meaning of this passage is, doubtless, this: By the ministry of apostles and prophets, the Jews and Gentiles, who had prior to the organization of the church been entirely distinct, were now united in the one body upon the central idea that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Again, speaking of the church of God at Corinth, this same apostle says: "I have laid the foundation and another builds on it. But let every man take heed how he builds on it. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ." (1 Cor. iii., 9, 10.) Paul here affirms that he had laid the foundation of the church at Corinth; and Luke tells us how he laid it. He says: "Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ. And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts xviii., 5-8.) Now from this statement it is obvious that the expression, "which is Jesus the Christ," is elliptical, meaning "which is that Jesus is the Christ." Then, expanding the whole sentence a little, we have the emphatic declaration of an inspired apostle that other foundation for a church of Christ can no man lay than that which I have laid, to wit, the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Having now ascertained what the foundation is, we next inquire as to its sufficiency. A covenant may be annulled, a man may die; but a truth necessarily endures forever. That the truth upon which Jesus built his church is not an exception to this statement is evident. Isaiah says: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation." (Isaiah xxviii., 16.) Jesus himself says of this foundation: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." But I am aware that almost, if not all, critics have referred this declaration to the *church*, instead of the *foundation*. It will be necessary, therefore, to bestow upon this point especial care. In the first place, it is important that we have a correct definition of the terms employed. The word hell is translated from the Greek *hades*, which means "the unseen world, or place of departed

spirits, or that state in which the spirit remains while the body is in the grave." The word gate means "an opening or passage from one place or relation to another." But the word gates is plural; therefore there must be at least two. Now it is a well-established law of language that every word must be employed in its usual or literal acceptation where this can be done. All the words under consideration in this case can be thus employed without any violence to the sense of the passage.. What, then, is the gate or passage into the unseen? Death. And what is the gate or opening by which the spirit leaves the unseen world? The resurrection. These, therefore, must be the gates of hades. David, speaking for Christ, says: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (*hades*); neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." (Psalm xvi., 10.) Peter, speaking as directed by the Holy Spirit, connects this expression with the death and resurrection of Jesus; hence he says: "He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hades, neither his flesh did see corruption." (Acts ii., 31.)

It is here taught that the soul or spirit of Christ went into hades at the time that his flesh was expected to see corruption; but that time was death. It is also taught that by his resurrection his soul left the unseen world. This illustration confirms our definition. But while the words composing the declaration of Christ to Peter must, as we have shown, all be taken in their literal acceptation, yet, as a whole, the phrase "gates of hell" is figurative, meaning death and the resurrection. From the 21st verse of the chapter in which this language is found we learn that "from that time Jesus began to tell his disciples plainly that he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be put to death, and be raised again the third day." This was a startling enunciation, and well calculated to make them doubt the truth that he was the Christ. How fitting, therefore, that he should prepare their minds for this most remarkable intelligence by assuring them, by the use of a figure which they could not fully comprehend in the moment of its utterance, that though he must die and revive again, still it is true that he is the Anointed of God. We are now fully prepared for the question *i* Against what did Christ promise that the gates of hades should not prevail—the church, or the rock? The church, as we shall see, is a visible organization of men and women, immersed upon a confession of their faith in Jesus as the Christ, and governed by his laws, as made known by his ambassadors, the inspired apostles. If the language under consideration refers to the church, then Jesus must have promised his disciples that if they would become members of the church he was about to build they should never die; or, if they should die, that they should be raised again,—for in no way could death and the resurrection prevail against the church except by

prevailing against the men and women of which it was composed. And not only so, but there is only one way in which death and the resurrection can prevail against any one, and that is by his suffering death and not being raised again. But did Jesus promise that the members of his church should not die? Certainly not; for "it is appointed unto man once to die." (Heb. ix., 27.) Wherever, therefore, man is found there is also the divine appointment that he shall die. Besides, our own observation teaches us that the righteous die as well as the wicked. If, then, Jesus promised that death or the first of the gates of hades should not prevail against his church, his promise has most certainly failed. But his promises can not fail; therefore he could not have referred to the church. But the gates of hades could not be said to have prevailed against a man if, though he should have died, yet the second gate was not barred against him, or, in other words, he enjoyed a resurrection from the dead. And may this not have been the meaning of the Master's promise? If so, then that promise amounted to nothing, and must have been intended to deceive his disciples in order to induce them to become members of his church; for he had himself before taught them that "the hour is coming in which *all* that are in their graves shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v., 28, 29.) It thus appears that the language under consideration can not refer to the church. It is also equally clear that it can only refer to the rock or foundation on the supposition that it is the truth confessed by Peter; for if the rock is Jesus in person, or the apostle Peter, then the gates of hades have prevailed against it; since they both died, and the resurrection was barred against Jesus until the third day, and is yet barred against Peter. But the gates of the unseen, instead of prevailing against the truth, rather established it, inasmuch as his death and resurrection were necessary to the confirmation of the divinity of his mission. But as the position assumed will not be readily granted, we shall present a philological argument in its favor, which we believe to be unanswerable. It is a universal law of language that where two or more substantives closely precede a pronoun in the same sentence that one is its antecedent which expresses the leading idea or topic of conversation. As an example of the application of this rule, the reader is referred to Acts iii., 2: "And a certain man lame from his mother's womb was carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful." In this passage, the word temple stands nearer to the pronoun which than the word gate does; and would therefore, according to the principle of interpretation by which church is made the antecedent of the word it, in the text, be the noun to which the word Beautiful belongs. But this is not the case, as we learn from the tenth verse; and for the very good reason that the leading

idea is not expressed by the word temple. It was not simply by the *temple* that the impotent man was laid, but at one of the *gates* thereof. Therefore the word *gate* is the antecedent. Now let us apply this rule to the statement under consideration. Attention is called to the context, beginning with the 13th verse: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying: Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am? (Not, What do they say of my church?) And they said: Some say that thou art John the Immerser; others, Elijah; others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He said to them: But who say you that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said to him: Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jonah; for flesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but my Father who is in heaven." It is evident from this narrative that the identity or sonship of Jesus was the leading topic of thought and conversation; nor is the church once alluded to until the truth elicited by the questions which the Nazarene propounded to his disciples had been publicly confessed by one of the number. The sum of the whole matter is this: Jesus asked whom his disciples and others thought him to be. Peter declares his belief that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God. For this good confession Jesus blesses him, and confers upon him special honors; and by calling him Peter, which signifies a little stone, he declares his fitness to be built, as one of the lively stones, into his spiritual house or church, which was soon to be erected on the rock or truth just confessed. It is as if he had said: This truth is a rock upon which I will build my church, and neither my death nor resurrection shall affect it injuriously. And not only so; though my church shall be overcome by the corruptions of the world, as I myself shall be by the power which my Father has given my enemies over my person; and though my people shall be scattered, and the Man of sin shall triumph; and though my name shall be dishonored among men; and though this foundation truth shall be covered up with the rubbish of an apostasy of frightful proportions; yet it shall forever endure as the rock laid broad and deep by God's own hand upon which alone the shattered and fallen walls of Zion may ever be rebuilt.

II. *The Materials.*—Of what is the Church of Christ composed, or what is the character of that material which is built upon the one foundation laid in Zion? Peter says that those who are chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. (1 Peter ii., 5.) It will be seen from the above declaration of holy writ, that the church is composed of persons who, having purified their

souls in obeying¹ the truth through the direction of the Spirit, are now capable, as priests, of offering acceptable sacrifices to God. Two things must here be granted: first, that none who are incompetent to act for themselves; and second, that none who are not obedient to the directions of the Spirit, can form any part of the material of which the church is composed. But upon this point it is important that we speak plainly. The reader is, therefore, referred to the statement of Luke, "And the Lord added the saved daily to the church." (Acts ii., 47.) Here, as we shall hereafter see, is an account of the additions made to the church on the very day of its organization; and as the additions were made through the labors and under the direction of the ambassadors of Christ, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, we may rest assured that they were just such materials as Christ would desire to build into his spiritual house. But as these were saved or pardoned persons, we inquire: How are persons saved? Jesus says: "He that believes and is immersed shall be saved." (Mark xvi., 16.) Luke says: "Then they that gladly received his word (believed it) were immersed, and on that day there were added to them (those who formed the materials of which the first church was composed) about three thousand souls." Again: the saints at Ephesus are said to be built upon the one foundation. But how were they made suitable material for the church of Christ? "Paul, after passing through the upper districts, came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, said to them: Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed? They said to him: We have not even heard whether the Holy Spirit is given. And he said to them: Into what, then, were you immersed? They replied: Into John's immersion. And Paul said: John immersed with the immersion of repentance, saying to the people, that they must believe on him who should come after him; that is, on the Christ Jesus. And when they heard this they were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts xix., 1-5.) Again: the disciples at Corinth are declared to be members of the church of God, and to have been built upon the foundation that Jesus is the Christ, and Luke informs us how they were built thereon. "Paul was roused in spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were immersed." Paul, in referring to the same matter, says: "I make you to know, brethren, the gospel that I preached to you, which also you received (believed), in which also you stand (having obeyed it), by which also you are saved, if you hold fast the word which I preached to you, unless you believed in vain." (1 Cor. xv., 1, 2.) Once more: the church and the body of Christ are declared to be the same. (Col. i., 18. Eph. i., 22.) Now the apostle affirms that those who are in the body were baptized into it. (Rom. vi., 3. 1 Cor. xii., 13.) But if Philip would not baptize a man without his believing with all his heart that

Jesus Christ is the Son of God, it is not to be supposed that Paul or Apollos, by whom the Corinthians were baptized, would; for they were all directed by the same Spirit. But those who were baptized were, according to Paul (Rom. vi., *i*; Col. ii., 12.), buried, in which they had also risen with Christ to walk in newness of life. Therefore, we conclude that the materials of which the church is composed are only immersed believers. That any other persons have ever been admitted into the Church of Christ must be clearly shown before it can be conceded. This Conclusion is expressed by Christ himself. He says: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii., 5.) When the Master says I can not, I dare not say I can.

III. *The Beginning.*—When did Jesus Christ build his church? On this point one thing is certain, namely, it was not built until after the conversation at Caesarea Philippi. His own language is decisive of this. He says "I *will* build my church," which he could not say in truth if it were already built. Again: he says he will build it on a rock. Now, as we have seen, this rock is the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. But this rock was not laid in Zion until after Jesus was crucified. Now, unless his church could be built before the foundation was laid, it could not have been built until after his crucifixion. Again: it has been shown that the church was composed only of persons who were, according to the Scriptures, saved or pardoned. But Jesus himself fixed the conditions upon which persons may be saved. Until these conditions were made known none could be saved according to the Scriptures. Now these conditions were not made known, even to the chosen apostles, until the day in which Jesus ascended to heaven; and even then he forbade his apostles making them known to the world, for whom alone they were designed, until they were endued with power from on high. This power they did not receive until "the day of Pentecost was fully come." This must be admitted when it is remembered that the same authority which required them to announce the terms of salvation in a single instance, required them to "preach the gospel to every creature." Now, as they were uneducated men, and as there were various languages then as now, it was absolutely necessary that they should be qualified to speak with tongues. Therefore, as they were all with one accord in one place in Jerusalem on the ever-memorable Pentecost after the death of the Man of Sorrows, "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Acts ii., 1-4.) This day, about ten days after Christ's ascension, is the earliest possible time for the establishment of the church, inasmuch as it was the first time in which material suitable for the building could be found. Moreover, it was not until that day that the foundation truth was laid in Zion. But on that day, and

afterward, the church was in existence; for many were added to it. Now, since it was in existence on that day, but could not have been built prior to that day, it follows of necessity that on that day it began.

IV. *The Apostasy*.—Two questions of interest present themselves here: 1. What was the nature and extent of the apostasy? 2. When did it take place? Paul, in speaking of the second advent of Jesus Christ, says: "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day will not come unless the apostasy come first, and the Man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself above every one that is called God, or that is worshiped, so that he sits as God in the temple of God, openly showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii., 3, 4. Anderson's Translation.) Daniel says: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them. * * * And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hands." (Dan. vii., 21, 25.) John, calls the Man of sin a beast, and says: "There was given him a mouth that spoke great things and impious words. * * * And it was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and authority was given him over every tribe and people, and tongue, and nation." (Rev. xiii., 5-7.) From these passages of Scripture the following conclusions are necessary: 1. Some power that should cause the church to apostatize was to arise prior to the second advent of the Messiah. 2. This power was to have its rise within the church or temple of God. 3. It should assume and secure political power to change and regulate times and dates. 4. It should assume the ecclesiastical power of making laws for the church. 5. It should wear out, overcome, and prevail against the saints. 6. It should blaspheme the name of God in speaking great things, or making great claims of power and privilege. 7. Its complete triumph was to be by the assistance of arms, or victory in war. In addition to this prophetic delineation of the apostasy, we present the following from Mosheim's *Church History*, pp. 138-9: "When once the ministers of the church had departed from the ancient simplicity of religious worship, and sullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to set bounds to this growing corruption. Abuses were daily multiplied, and superstition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of absurdities, which were added to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. * * * To be convinced of the truth of the dismal representation we have here given of the state of religion at this time (during the sixth century), nothing more is necessary than to cast an eye upon the doctrines now taught concerning the worship of images and saints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good works, i. e., the observance of

human rites and institutions toward the attainment of salvation, the power of relics to heal the diseases of body and mind; and the like sordid and miserable fancies which are inculcated in many of the superstitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epistles and other writings of Gregory the Great. Nothing could be more ridiculous, on the one hand, than the solemnity and liberality with which this good but silly pontiff distributed the wonder-working relics; and nothing more lamentable, on the other hand, than the stupid eagerness and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them, and suffered themselves to be persuaded that a portion of rancid oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a supernatural efficacy to sanctify its possessors, and to defend them from all dangers, both of a temporal and spiritual nature." Now it is supposed that all who will read this are acquainted with the New Testament description of the Church of Christ. In order, therefore, to remove every doubt as to the complete overthrow of the church in the sixth century, we shall, in a few items, place in contrast the Church of Christ and the Church of Rome.

1. The Church or Kingdom of Christ was not of this world, and therefore had nothing to do in creating or regulating the political relations thereof. The Church of Rome was both political and religious.

2. The Church of Christ had no laws but those of Christ and his inspired apostles. The Church of Rome made its own laws without regard to the great Head of the church, Jesus the Christ. Its bishop sat in the temple of God, assuming all the prerogatives of God, and thus led the church into the wilderness of a terrible apostasy.

3. In the Church of Christ God alone was worshiped, through Jesus Christ our Lord. In the Church of Rome saints and images were worshiped.

4. In the Church of Christ the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ was taught. In the Church of Rome the doctrine of justification on account of works of supererogation prevailed.

5. In the Church of Christ the blood of the crucified but exalted Redeemer alone was declared to cleanse from sin. In the Church of Rome the fires of purgatory were declared to be efficacious in cleansing the soul from the sinful pollutions of the flesh.

6. In the Church of Christ the Christian was taught that the whole armor of God, as described by Paul, afforded the only protection against the wiles of the Devil. In the Church of Rome the possession of rancid oil was believed to accomplish the same purpose.

7. The Church of Christ kept the word, and held fast the name of the Son of God. The Church of Rome did neither.

With the above contrast before us, it must be admitted, we think, that the apostasy of the church was radical and complete. Or, in other words, that the church was prevailed against and overcome,

and consequently lost its existence on the earth. I am aware that this position will not be readily granted. But if any one is not yet satisfied on this point, he is requested to re-examine the apostate church with care, and then candidly ask himself whether he **could** admit that any organization of the present day, having the same or like characteristics, has any right to claim to be the Church of Christ. But it is claimed that God has always had a people on the earth since the rise of the little horn, and the apostasy of the general or catholic church, who were not connected with and under the influence of the Man of sin, such as the Novations, the Donatists, Luciferians, AErrians, Paulicians, Waldenses, and Mennonites. This is freely conceded; but still it is denied that these people constituted the Church of Christ any more than the seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal did. The church is a definite organization, to which Christ can at all times say in truth: "Thou hast kept my word and hast not denied my name." Now this he could not say to any one of the organizations referred to, notwithstanding, in many things, they kept the ordinances as they were delivered to the church. That there were among these people, as well as in the apostate church, many true children of God, who lived equal to the light and privileges they enjoyed, and who are now, like Noah, Job, and Daniel, resting in the paradise of God, we have not a doubt. But that they passed through the Church of Christ on earth we can not believe.

Having now, as we believe, satisfactorily ascertained the extent of the apostasy, we would next direct the attention of the reader to the consideration of the question: When did this great apostasy occur? It has already been observed that it took place, according to Moseheim's account, some time during the sixth century of the Christian era. To ascertain the exact time of the falling away of the church and the rise of this little horn it will be necessary to bear in mind not only that the apostate power arose within the church, but that at the coming up of the little horn three of the ten horns or kingdoms into which the Roman empire had been divided were to be plucked up by the roots. (Dan. vii., 8.) Gibbon, the Roman historian, informs us that the Emperor Justinian issued a decree, in the year 533, constituting the Bishop of Rome "the chief of the whole ecclesiastical body of the empire, and the true and effectual corrector of heretics," thus conferring upon him not only the headship and, entire control of the church, but also temporal power quite sufficient to enable him to wear out the saints of the Most High. It will thus be clearly seen that the horn began to rise in the church in the year of the Lord five hundred and thirty-three. But Daniel says that arms shall stand on the part of that vile person whom all recognize as the Bishop of Rome, notwithstanding "he shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries." (Dan. xi., 31, 21.) He rose up quietly in the church or tem-

pie of God, and by his flatteries insinuated himself into the confidence and esteem of the emperor, and thus obtained the grant of power above quoted. But it was one thing to secure the issuing of the decree, and quite a different thing to obtain the dominion therein granted; inasmuch as one, at least, of the horns resisted his authority. Therefore, in order to make good the decree, it became necessary for Justinian to summon his forces and subdue the disobedient kingdom. This he did, and Belisarius, in command of an army, was sent into Italy to compel the submission of the Ostrogoths; the other two horns, the Heruli and the Vandals, having been previously plucked up. But it was not, according to Gibbon, until March, A. D. 538, that the Ostrogoths were conquered, or the last of the three horns plucked up. While, therefore, we must date the beginning of the final and complete apostasy from A. D. 533, yet we must date the consummation of that sad affair from March, A. D. 538. We conclude, therefore, that the Man of sin was revealed, and the Roman Catholic Church substituted for the true Church of Jesus Christ, in the month of March, A. D. 538, the necessary preparation having been begun just five years prior to this time. It should be observed, moreover, that the hindering cause which withheld the revelation of the Man of sin was removed A. D. 312, when "Constantine took the religion of Christ into the unhalloved embrace of the State, assuming to unite in his own person the civil and ecclesiastical dominion." The church having been in an apostatizing condition for more than two hundred years, and the mystery of iniquity having begun to work even in the apostles' own day, it was not difficult to effect the complete destruction of the church when once the Bishop of Rome had obtained entire dominion therein.

V. *The Restoration.*—We now approach a subject of transcendent interest. Are we to regard Christianity as a failure, inasmuch as the church was so soon overcome and destroyed? Or shall it be rebuilt on the same imperishable foundation on which it was first erected? The Scriptures certainly favor the latter view. Daniel says, the horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them until the Ancient of days came, and the saints were vindicated, and once more put in possession of the kingdom. (Dan. vii., 22.) This statement clearly implies that the power which corrected heretics and shed the blood of the saints should have an end. But how long was this persecuting power to continue? The prophet says, that times and laws, or civil and ecclesiastical powers, shall be given into his hands until a time, times, and the dividing of time, or half a time. (v. 25.) I believe that all critics agree that a time, in the Scriptures, signifies a year of 360 days. But in prophetic language a day always represents a common year. Now, in a time, times, and a half a time, there are three and a half times, which, reduced to days, give 1,260 days, representing just so many years. Again: John says, power was given to the

beast to continue forty-two months, which, multiplied by thirty, the number of days in a month, give 1,200 days or years. Thus do John and Daniel agree as to the time of the continuance of the apostasy in its full force. But it must be observed that this power was to terminate at the same time that the Ancient of days should come; and that these two events should take place just 1,260 years from the date of the overthrow of the church and the rise of the little horn before which three other horns were plucked up by the roots. Now add 1,260 years to A. D. 533, the date of the beginning of these events, and we have the year 1793, as the time when we may expect the papal power to begin to decline. Add the same number to March, A. D. 538, the date of the plucking up of the third horn, and of the full establishment of the Roman Catholic Church, and we are brought to March, A. D. 1798, as the time set for the overthrow of the persecuting power of the pope, the vindication of the saints, and the coming of the Ancient of days, or the re-establishment of the kingdom of heaven. This prophetic view of the subject is fully confirmed by authentic history. The revolutions in France, in favor of infidelity and in opposition to the so-called church, began in the year 1793, and in the month of March, A. D. 1798, the Pope of Rome died in exile, the prisoner of the French. True, another pope was granted the Papists, and established in office, but not in power. This the emperor retained in his own hands, saying to the new pope: "You, sir, may take care of the souls of men; but henceforth I will take care of the sword of Caesar." From that day to this the power of the papacy has been but a mere nominal thing, held at the pleasure of the French nation, the balance-power of the world, and consequently the mistress thereof. But did the Ancient of days come at the time the thrones or powers were thus cast down? It must have come, or else the prophet of God testified falsely. But this is inadmissible; therefore, that is at least probable, if not quite certain. But what is this Ancient of days? "The God of heaven," says one. But this can not be; for God did not come to our world at the time the prophet said the Ancient of days would come; nor has he promised ever to come, so far as we have been able to learn from his word. "Then it must be the Son of God," says another. Neither can this be true, unless he is to come to himself at some period yet in the future; for we are informed that one like the Son of man (the name by which he usually called himself) came with the clouds of heaven (just as he has promised to come the second time), and he came to the Ancient of days. (Dan. vii., 13.) Now to ascertain what the Ancient of days is, it is only necessary to determine what it is to which the Son of man will come. But all agree that he will come to his people—to his church; therefore we conclude that the Ancient of days is none other than the woman that fled into the wilderness, in which she remained during a period of one thousand two hundred and three-score days, or 1,260

years. But do the facts of history sustain the predictions of the prophets? Most certainly they do, or else truth is not consistent 'with itself. It may be safely assumed that two things are essential to the existence of the Church of Christ. These are, first, that his people shall keep his word; that is, they shall take the word of God as their only rule of faith and practice. Secondly, they shall hold fast his name; that is, they shall wear his name to the exclusion of all other names. This, no organization of Christians did from March, A. D. 538, until March, A. D. 1798. But at that time, which was the very month in which, as we have seen, the thrones were cast down, James O. Kelley, John Dispain, and others, met in council and unanimously passed the following resolutions, viz.:

1. "That henceforth we will take the word of God as our only rule of faith and practice."

2. "That we will wear the name Christian to the exclusion of all other names."

This was done in our own America, and was certainly a step in the right direction. This little organization of Christians now possessed the prominent characteristics of the Church of Christ as none had done before since the apostasy. To it the language of the Master was strictly applicable: "I know thy works; behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it; for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name." That the Lord did set before his church restored an open door must be apparent to every one who realizes that there are now, in this country alone, more than half a million souls who wear the name of Christ and are governed wholly by his word. Besides, there are millions more, perhaps, who are almost persuaded to be simply Christians. Human creeds and human names for the people of God have been weighed in the balances of Eternal Truth and found wanting; and are now tottering to the fall. May God hasten the day of their complete and final overthrow!

VI. *The Reformation.*—It will not be thought strange that the church, after its restoration, should need reforming, when it is remembered that it had fallen far away from its first love long before its complete apostasy. The corruptions of the dark ages had so blinded the eyes and darkened the minds, even of the people of God, that it could not be expected that any should at once discover the whole truth. The angel doubtless alludes to this fact in his address to the prophet. He says: "Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand. And from the time the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days." (Dan. xii., 9-11.)

On this passage we may remark:

1. The words which are declared to be closed up and sealed are doubtless the words whereby salvation is offered and enjoyed. Their being sealed up has, perhaps, a twofold reference: first, to the ignorance of the truth in the church; and, secondly, to the political status of the world being such as to forbid the truth of the gospel access to the people. Both of these difficulties existed for many years after the restoration of the church. As evidence of the fact that much ignorance of the truth prevailed in the church the following may suffice: Instead of teaching the people that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," the ministers of Christ taught them that God must put forth a power above and beyond the truth, and by this secret, invisible, and almighty energy of his Holy Spirit break up the deep fountains of their souls, and bring them trembling and penitent to the feet of the bleeding Lamb, where, by wrestling with God in prayer, they might at length induce him to give them faith, which alone was sufficient to secure the pardon of their sins. And when, on one occasion, where many penitent believers were crying out in agony of soul, "What must we do to be saved?" the minister arose and said, in the language of the inspired Peter: "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," even these pure and holy words sent a thrill of horror through the soul of him who had uttered them, so little did men understand the book of God. While, therefore, the scriptural doctrine of the baptism of the penitent believer, in order to remission of sins was displaced by human appliances for "getting religion," such as the "mourner's bench," or "anxious seat;" and while the word of God was set aside for impulses which were thought to be the work of the Holy Spirit; and while the doctrine of justification by faith only was substituted for the true doctrine of justification by faith made perfect by obedience, there was certainly an imperative necessity for a reformation of the church. In reference to the statement that the world was not prepared to receive the gospel even at the time the church was restored, it need only be remembered that the Turkish power in the East, alone closed every avenue of access to millions of our fallen race.

2. The revolutions which were to result in the breaking down of the political power of the pope, and the re-establishment of the Church of Christ on the earth, were also designed to purify, make white, and try many who had not been reached and influenced by the efforts of the so-called church. Or, in other words, a great revival of piety and holiness was to take place. The religious excitements, in various portions of our own and other lands, which occurred in the close of the last and the beginning of the present century, were evidently the

fulfillment of the foregoing prediction. These revivals took place in close succession, in seven distinct localities, and with so little reference to one another, yet with such similar results, that John in his apocalyptic vision compares them to seven thunders which uttered their voices.

3. But the wicked were to continue to do wickedly; nor were any of them to understand how any new organization could set up a stronger claim to the approbation of God than the existing organizations had been able to establish. That any class of men and women should claim to be simply Christians, and to be governed in all things by the word of God alone, was a mystery which none of the wicked or lawless could penetrate. Hence the advocates of sects and parties, doctrines and commandments of men, denounced, in bitterest terms, the children of God as heretics and infidels; and this they did with so little regard for law, or order, or even decency, that they have, in the severest and strictest use of the prophetic language, done wickedly. But they that are wise unto salvation understand these things, and give thanks for the watchful providence of God, who doeth all things well, and causeth even the wrath of man to praise him.

4. The angel fixes the time for the breaking of the seal, or the needed reformation of the church. This time is twelve hundred and ninety days, or years, from the setting up of the abomination that maketh desolate. Now, as we have before seen, this was commenced in the year of our Lord 533, and consummated in the month of March, A. D. 538. To these dates let twelve hundred and ninety years be added, and we have A. D. 1823 as the time for the commencement of the reformation, and A. D. 1828 as the time for the final breaking of the seal and the opening of the prophetic words. John also connects the eating of the little book with the sounding of the seven thunders, or the development of the truths of the Bible with the religious revolutions of the early part of the nineteenth century. Now it only remains to be determined from authentic history whether these prophetic representations have been accomplished. We, therefore, submit the following facts, which will be admitted by all who are acquainted with the history of the present century. In the year 1823, one of the most learned and pious of all the theologians of the world began to declare in the pulpit and through the religious press that baptism properly administered to a penitent believer was for the remission of sins, and that all human inventions for "getting religion" were dishonoring to the Head of the church, and should be wholly discountenanced by every loyal subject of the King of kings. These efforts were earnestly seconded by many of God's true noblemen; but it was not until the year 1828 that these views were generally adapted by any religious body. At this time the seal was broken, and many ministers of the gospel planted themselves on the immovable rock of God's eternal

truth, from which they have persistently refused to be driven by the dashing waves of a persecution scarcely equaled in bitterness since the days of Nero. The second part of the seal was also broken at that time. In the year 1828, Asia, Africa, and the isles of the sea were providentially thrown open to the gospel of the grace of God; and thus, at the precise time foretold by the prophet, and for the first time since the great apostasy, was the seal broken, the world opened to the gospel, and the gospel in its fullness and simplicity proclaimed to the world. In the tenth chapter of Revelation, John says that when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, or the seven consecutive religious revolutions had taken place, he was about to write, but was forbidden by a voice from heaven. And an angel, standing with one foot upon the sea, which represents Romanism, and the other on the earth, which represents Protestant sectarianism, lifted up his hand to heaven and swore by him that liveth forever and ever that time should no longer intervene; but the mystery of God shall be finished, according to the declarations of his prophets. Personating the leader of the reformation, John says: "The voice (of revelation) which I heard from heaven spake unto me again, and said: Go, and take the little book (the Bible) which is open in the hand of the angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the earth. And I went unto the angel, and said unto him: Give me the little book. And he said unto me: Take it, and eat it up (develop its truths); and it shall make thy stomach bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey." That is, the persecutions which shall follow the development and proclamation of the truths of the book of God shall be bitter, notwithstanding there is no pleasure so sweet as that which flows from the study of the mind and will of God. The book has been eaten and the promised results have followed; and now he to whom the Lord committed this sacred trust, having prophesied (taught) before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings (either in person or by his influence), rests from his labors, but his works do follow him. Though John preceded him into the paradise of God by nearly 1,800 years, still we doubt not they will enter upon the enjoyment of their final reward at the same awful moment, and together walk the golden streets of the New Jerusalem during an eternity of bliss. Before dismissing this subject, it may not be amiss to devote a few moments to an examination of the principal Protestant reformations. The first and perhaps the most important of these was that of which Martin Luther was the acknowledged leader. This reformation began in the year 1517 of the Christian era, but was not reduced to a complete system until the year 1530. At that time, however, through the systematic efforts of Philip Melancthon, order was brought out of chaos, the Augsburg Confession was adopted by the reformers, and that which has ever since been known as the Lutheran Church was established. This reformation was,

however, simply an effort to reform the Church of Rome. As we have seen, the Church of Christ was not in existence on the earth at the time of this reformation. Therefore, it could not have been a reformation of the Church of Christ, even if such a thing had been intended. True, the Bible was disenthralled, and a light thrown upon the world, without which the foundation-stone would most likely never have been discovered; and consequently the church might never have been rebuilt. With much confidence, therefore, we conclude that God providentially raised up Luther for the very work which he accomplished. But that work was not the restoration of the Church of Christ. Indeed he never even so much as discovered the foundation which God had laid in Zion. Still, however, every pious heart will give thanks to God for that which he accomplished through the instrumentality of Luther and Melancthon.

The next reformation of importance was that effected by the labors of John Calvin, which resulted in the organization of the Presbyterian Church, in the year 1536. As a reformation of the abuses and priestly assumptions in the Church of Rome was the central and controlling idea with Luther, so a better and more scriptural church polity was the great end sought by Calvin. But in this case again the foundation of the Church of Christ was not discovered, and consequently no effort was made to rebuild the fallen temple, though much good was undoubtedly accomplished. The third reformation demanding attention is that which occurred in England under the leadership of Henry VIII., and which resulted in the establishment of the Church of England and the adoption of the Liturgy in the year 154T. This reformation was not so much religious as it was political, the leading idea being the transfer of the headship of the so-called church from the pope to the king. The object was accomplished; but no effort was yet made to restore the Church of Christ as it is described in the New Testament. By this reformation but little good was accomplished; yet for that little we are grateful to the Giver of all good. During the dark ages there were, doubtless, at all times, some who resisted as far as they could the corruptions of Popery. This is specially true in reference to baptism. The Roman Church deliberately exchanged the primitive practice of immersion for affusion. This high-handed move was bitterly opposed and resisted by a few, who were faithful to the word of God. This opposition, after passing through various phases, assumed a more definite form in the year 1531, under the teachings of one Simons Menno, for a time a Romish priest, but afterward a zealous Anabaptist. The influence of his teaching, and that of others of like religious views, so affected the Presbyterian congregations that by the year 1689 there were upward of one hundred of these in which the immersion of a penitent believer was held to be essential to Christian baptism. These congregations sent delegates to the city

of London, revised the Westminster Confession of Faith, and adopted it as expressive of their views, and then and there organized what has since been known as the Baptist Church. This reformation, doubtless, approached about as near the primitive model of the Church of Christ as it was possible for any reformation of the apostasy to approach. Still, the set time for the coming of the Ancient of days had not arrived; and hence a human creed was adopted, and a human name assumed, which must ever be regarded as two of the marks of the beast. The Baptists themselves are, most of them at least, no doubt, the children of God; nor would it require the sacrifice of a single principle on their part to place themselves on "the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Are they not ready for a step so grand and glorious as this? Many of them, we are assured, are fully prepared and will promptly act. The fifth reformation to which we invite attention is that which took place in the Church of England, under the leadership of John Wesley, just one hundred years ago, which resulted in establishing the Methodist Church. As in all the other efforts to which we have referred, so also in this, no effort was made to rebuild the Church of Christ, according to the primitive model, on the foundation truth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, against which even the gates of hell could not prevail. Now permit the following recapitulation: In 1517 the Lutheran Church was formed, which is a reformed Roman Catholic Church. In 1536 the Presbyterian Church was organized, which is a reformed Lutheran Church, or a twice reformed Roman Catholic Church. In 1689 the Baptist Church was organized, which is a reformed Presbyterian Church, or a thrice reformed Roman Catholic Church. Then returning to the year 1541, we find the headship of the Roman Church, so far as it was limited to English soil, assumed by the King of England, and the Episcopal Church established, which is simply the Roman Catholic Church but slightly reformed. Then, in the year 1766, the Methodist Church came into existence, which is the Church of England reformed, or the Roman Catholic Church twice reformed. But the fact should not be overlooked, that even the last of these reformations took place many years prior to the time fixed by the prophets for the re-establishment of the Church of Christ.

VII. *The Glorification.*—On this last point we shall say but little, and even of some of that little we can not speak with perfect confidence. Still, of some things we are quite certain. It will be admitted that the temple in Jerusalem was the type of the church. Now this temple was first erected under the special direction of Jehovah. Of its grandeur and magnificence we need not speak. But it was thrown down and destroyed. It was, however, afterward rebuilt, but so inferior was it to the former temple that when the old men looked upon it they wept bitterly. But the prophet Haggai encouraged them with

the promise that "the glory of the latter house should be greater than that of the former," inasmuch as "the Lord should come suddenly to this temple." So in the antitype; the apostles, under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, built the Jerusalem Church, the glory of which filled the whole earth; but, alas! it was, like the temple, thrown down and destroyed. The model was, however, preserved, and the new church rebuilt, as we have seen; but not in splendor equal to the primitive church. But as the Lord by his first advent, gave a superior glory to his temple, so by his reappearance, we feel assured he will glorify his church; for "he shall come in the clouds of heaven, and come to the Ancient of days." At that time "the wrath of God shall be revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness." Thus does it appear that those who know the right, and yet the wrong pursue, may be destroyed with the brightness of the coming of the Son of man. Let every one who enjoys a place in the Church of God beware lest he be not prepared to share in the glory of the church of the first-born from the grave. And to the millions who are still identified with MYSTERY, BABYLON, and her harlot Protestant daughters, the Spirit utters its warning voice, saying: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." As possibly indicating the time when all these things shall come to pass, the reader is referred to Daniel xii., 12: "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days." Now let the thirteen hundred and thirty-five years here indicated be added to five hundred and thirty-three, and thirty-eight, respectively, and we have A. D. 1868 and A. D. 1813 as the extremes of the time for the blessing and rest of the saints. Thus it may be the happy privilege of many of the saints now living to witness the glorious appearing of the Lord. But of the day and hour of his coming no man knoweth, therefore we say to all: Be you ready; for at such a time as you think not the Son of man cometh.

OTHNIEL.

NOTE ON THE FOREGOING.—The article of Othniel certainly has the merit of being very calmly and thoughtfully written. Besides it gives evidence of commendable research and an earnest desire to be just to the truth. Still, we think it, in some of its most material features, utterly in error. The "rock" is not that against which the Unseen is not to prevail; neither has the church ever become extinct. These we deem gross errors. Other features in the article we think equally wrong, but shall leave the reader to detect them for himself.—ED.

BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES.

THE following letter and address, taken from the *Religious Herald*, will give the result of the recent Convention in Richmond:

Messrs. Editors:—At the late meeting of the Convention of Baptists and Disciples, held in Richmond on the 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th of this month (April), it was agreed that as we had failed to find any basis on which we could, with propriety, jointly recommend an ecclesiastical union of the two bodies, the minutes of our proceedings should not at present be published; especially as the Convention was altogether voluntary on the part of its members, and claimed ecclesiastically, to represent no body or bodies of Christians. The minutes, however, were committed to two members of the Convention,—one from each party, for preservation. These brethren were instructed not to publish the minutes, unless they should hereafter, on account of some necessity not now perceived, *jointly* agree that the publication of said minutes would do good. At the same time an *address*, which had been reported by a Committee in an imperfect state, was taken up for correction. The hour of adjournment being at hand, we could not find time to make the verbal alterations deemed necessary, the address was committed to Elder J. W. Goss and myself, members of the Committee, that we might correct and publish it. Elder Goss and myself being compelled to separate, and there being no prospect of an early opportunity for us to meet again, the paper was left with me, to make such alterations, verbal or rhetorical, as I should think proper, strictly, however, preserving the sense of the original. Fatigued by the labors of the Convention, and pressed for time, I have done this work hastily, and yet I believe, have fully and faithfully represented the entire spirit and meaning of the address.

W. F. BROADDUS, Charlottesville.

ADDRESS OF THE CONVENTION OF BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES, HELD IN RICHMOND, APRIL 24, 25, 26, AND 27, 1866, TO THE CHURCHES OF THESE TWO BODIES IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Dear Brethren:—We have met in this Convention, not as delegates appointed to transact business for you, but as a voluntary convention of professed Christian men, earnestly desirous to promote the cause of Bible truth, and to bring nearer to each other the divided forces of our Lord's great army.

It had been hoped by many that the influence of time, and the more thorough study of the divine word, had brought us so near to each other in mind and heart, and in the interpretation of the Scriptures,

as to make it manifest that we could jointly recommend to our churches in Virginia a mere intimate ecclesiastical co-operation than has heretofore existed,—hoping that fraternal, mutual courtesies would sooner or later lead to a cordial ecclesiastical union of the two bodies.

With a view fully to ascertain each other's views of the teachings of the Bible, we have for four days met for conversation and kind discussion of the questions deemed necessary to be discussed on the occasion. We have frequently united in appealing to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would by the Holy Spirit lead us to right conclusions in the premises. During our entire session, there has prevailed as much of Christian courtesy and brotherly kindness as we have ever seen manifested in a body of thirty men engaged in the discussion of questions involving Christian fellowship. But after all, we have reached the conclusion deliberately, however reluctantly, that the time has not yet come when the Baptists and Disciples are, on both sides prepared, with a prospect of perfect harmony, to commit themselves to any degree of co-operation beyond such courtesies and personal kindnesses as members of churches of different denominations may individually choose to engage in.

We would express, however, with much gratitude to our common Father, the gratification we have felt and still feel, in having developed by this interview, an agreement of views as to the great facts, and truths, and duties of the gospel, far more extensive and practically identical than many of our brethren had supposed to exist; and we would earnestly recommend to the brethren of the two bodies in the State of Virginia, to cultivate the spirit of fraternal kindness and Christian courtesy toward each other—to keep in mind the prayer of our Lord, that all his people might be one; and while they cultivate the spirit of peace, to refrain as far as possible from everything that would tend to alienate from each other those who, in regard to so many precious and important truths taught in the word of God, give the same interpretation, and in regard to so many Christian practices are of one mind.

Signed by the direction of the Convention.

W. F. BROADDUS,
J. W. GOSS.

April 27, 1866.

To the preceding we also append, from the *Religious Herald*, the following comments on the Convention, its objects and results, by Dr. Jeter:

"While we can not comply with our promise in the paper of last week to furnish a full account of the proceedings of the Convention, we will give such a statement of them as the limitations imposed by the body may seem to permit.

"The meeting was conducted in a courteous, dignified, and kind

manner. Not a single unpleasant word was uttered on either side. We have sat in many bodies for religious conference, but never in one freer from excitement. The intercourse was frank, free, and faithful. The conference developed that on some points on which we were supposed to differ, we were in agreement; that on other points on which we differed, the differences were not so great as had generally been supposed; and that while our differences are such as to prevent ecclesiastical union and inter-communion, they are not such as to call for denunciations, or to forbid the hope that time, kindness, the study of the Scriptures, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will efface them.

'.' The desirableness of the union all must concede. We are agreed on certain important points, in which we differ from the rest of the world. We believe that only immersion is Christian baptism; that only believers are entitled to the ordinances; and that churches are constituted only of immersed believers. Our views, too, of the great, vital evangelical duties, repentance and faith, as disclosed by the conference, are identical. On various points we differ, but some of these differences relate to terminology; some to matters of comparatively little moment, and some may yet be the offspring of misconception; but still there are differences between us, the most serious of which, perhaps, concerns the design of baptism. It would be a bright day for the principles which we hold in common if these differences could be removed or overcome, so that their advocates, instead of wasting their time and energies in fruitless controversies, could heartily combine all their influence and efforts for their wider diffusion. It is our plain, solemn duty to pray, not merely for the union of all Christians, but especially for the union of those Christians whose approximation to each other affords ground to hope for their harmony.

"But what we pray for we are bound to seek, if it lies within the sphere of our influence; and we are able to do something to promote the union of Baptists and Disciples. What, then, should we do to secure this object? We certainly should not sacrifice our principles. Union that is not based on a common discernment and love of truth is not worth seeking. There should be no compromise of essential truth, however yielding we may be in matters of indifference or expediency. Calm, candid, fair, discriminating discussion may do something to promote the object; but it must be admitted that there is but little of such discussion, and that its influence is usually very feeble. Certainly strife, denunciation, and bitterness do not promote union. It must be gained, if gained at all, by kind intercourse, reasonable concessions, and gradual assimilation.

"We found to-day a striking confirmation of this view. A highly esteemed minister was in our office who was formerly a Disciple, and

who some years ago became a Baptist. He stated that he was led into the Baptist Church by ministers who treated him fraternally, solved his doubts, shed light on his path, and gradually convinced him of the soundness of their views. What occurred in his case may occur in the case of others. Nor is it wise for fallible beings like ourselves to assume that our own views can not, by the study of the Scriptures, fraternal intercourse with enlightened Christiana, a wider observation of others, a deeper experience of the tendencies of our own hearts, and earnest prayer for divine instruction, be modified or enlarged.

"We are hopeful that the Conference will be the means of advancing the interests of truth and of promoting harmony.

"We desire that our remarks should be understood as having exclusive reference to the Disciples in Virginia, or such Disciples as those who participated in the Conference. It is said, and, we presume, correctly, that there is a wide difference between the Disciples of Virginia and the West. Of the nature and extent of this difference we are not accurately informed. Our brethren in different sections of the country should, and no doubt will, deal with the subject as they find it. If under the name of the Reformation, or the "Ancient Gospel," or any other title, they discover a tendency to Rationalism, or the rejection of a spiritual Christianity, let them oppose it with an earnestness proportionate to the value of the soul and the preciousness of salvation. Our course in Virginia can be no guide to those who are encompassed by errors which do not trouble us. Even if an ecclesiastical union had been formed between the Baptists and Disciples of this State, and properly formed, too, that would be no reason for the formation of such a union in States, if such there be, in which the Disciples hold anti-evangelical sentiments. There are certain great principles or articles of belief, which we have inherited from our fathers, and hold in common with most Protestant Christian sects, which should never be abandoned or concealed. Among these we may mention the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, the tri-unity of God, the divinity of Christ, the efficacy of his sacrifice in the expiation of sins, the agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of believers, the justification of a sinner by faith in Christ without the merit of any good works, and we might mention other facts and truths. These are essential to the vitality and efficacy of the gospel, and are to be held with unyielding tenacity. But we owe it to ourselves, the cause of truth and piety, the harmony of sincere Christians, and the glory of our Master, that we should judge of the views of those who differ from us carefully, ingenuously, and in the fear of God, seeking not to widen but to narrow the breach between us; not to divide and alienate, but to win and harmonize. It is one of the saddest exhibitions of human infirmity, not to say depravity, to see

men, fallible and ignorant, as all must be, contending for what they deem the doctrine of the "meek and lowly" Jesus, with fierceness and denunciation. Can the wrath of man work the righteousness of God? Does the cause of truth and of Christ need our angry bitterness and strife for its support?

" We can not more appropriately close this article than by an extract from *Campbellism Examined*, showing that our views on the subject of union between Baptists and Disciples are not new:

"Still there is ground to hope for the ultimate scriptural and cordial union of these parties. The work of assimilation between them is going on, and it will go on, with increasing rapidity, as the original causes of irritation are left behind and forgotten, and the veterans in the strife gradually quit the battle-field. In many places Campbellism has lost its pugnacity, and is fast losing its distinctive elements, and receiving a new impression from the religious principles with which it is ceaselessly coming in contact. The Baptists, too, it must be admitted, are not precisely what they would have been had there been no Reformation. They have not been uninterested spectators of the religious convulsions and changes around them. While they have seen no cause to abandon any of their distinctive principles or practices, they have corrected many of their mistakes, burnished their armor, and, learning wisdom alike from the successes and failures of their opponents, have prepared themselves for concerted, vigorous, and determined efforts in support of what they deem the cause of truth and of Christ. Let the process of assimilation go on. Good men should earnestly pray for its progress. All should aim to promote it by an honest, earnest adherence to the teachings of the Scriptures, by diffusing the light of truth, and, above all, by cultivating the spirit of the Redeemer—the spirit of love, gentleness, meekness, and candor." (pp. 357-358.)

COMMENTS.

From the preceding documents it appears that the recent Convention in Richmond failed to agree on a basis of union for the two bodies in whose interest its members met. The failure, it may be, is matter of regret; yet it should occasion no surprise. That two bodies, who have differed as materially as the Baptists and we, and not always possibly in the most lovely spirit, should, in the first interview had with a view to union, have been completely successful, was more than we had sufficient reason to expect. While, then, we confess to no disappointment at the result, we shall still cherish the hope that the end is not yet reached. Good has been achieved; more good we trust than is yet apparent. Leading men of the Baptists and the Disciples have met in Convention, met avowedly to consider the question of a union of the two bodies, met and prayed together, met and ascertained many points of agreement, met and spoke frankly on matters of differ-

ence; parted in a spirit of fraternal kindness, parted with the grounds of difference perceptibly narrowed, parted in hope. I confess that he who sees no good in all this seems not to me to be counting on what may be in the seeds of things. We are by no means sanguine, for we have a great enemy who has a deep interest in keeping the children of God apart, yet we claim the right to anticipate still further good. Conversations had in the Convention will be reiterated widely over the land; points of agreement there will become points of agreement elsewhere; the spirit of Christian courtesy and kindness borne thence will be reproduced in other bosoms; the improved opinion of each other with which the brethren of the Convention separated will become the opinion of those respectively agreeing with them; and thus the future will, we hope, be constantly coming to us with increasing prospects of still further agreements. Should this state of things continue, as let us all fondly pray it may, it will be marvelous if in the end differences are not so worn away that a union may yet be effected.

But while hoping and praying and working for union with all the children of God, we feel it to be a solemn duty we owe to those with whom we seek conditional fellowship, and to the truth, to be candid. The Baptists, as a people, are not in a condition to take the step looked to in the proposition of Mr. Broaddus; and with their present holdings such a step is not to be desired by us. This is said in no fretful mood. It is the calm utterance of a matured conviction. How long it will take to effect the necessary changes we can not tell. By every means in our power we would certainly abbreviate the time to the shortest period possible. But this whole question of union rests with the Baptists. To us they can look for nothing, except the most cordial willingness on our part to be at any amount of pains to make ourselves perfectly understood by them, and an equal willingness to understand them where we now fail to do so. More than this, let me tell them, they may not look for. If they expect us to change, or in one single item to abandon the ground we now hold, they know not the people with whom they seek to confer. Especially if they expect us to cease to be what we now are, and to become Baptists, which is about all, we incline to think, they do expect, then the sooner they learn that they are idle dreamers the better. They will never realize their expectation if this be it.

For one I am not ashamed to confess to a bearing and a feeling of self-respect, which compel me to think something due from the Baptists to us before they can on any reasonable ground expect us to proceed further in the matter of union. For the last forty years, we as a people, have been contending that the Bible, and the Bible alone, teaches the religion of God, that all it says must be believed, and that all it commands must be done. To this great generalization we have, by the Lord's help, been meekly striving to conform our affections

and our lives. Yet, during the whole of these forty years, we have been persistently denounced by the Baptists as a "pestilential sect," as "baptized infidels," and as less entitled to their respect than the infant-sprinkling parties who in days not long gone whipped Baptists at the post and locked them in dungeons. Now all this I am more than ready to say we should magnanimously forgive; nay, let the very memory thereof perish within us. But this is not the point I make. In view of these facts, I hold it to be an act of stern justice to my injured brethren, that before Baptists proceed one inch further in the direction of union they shall formally and distinctly recognize us as *Christians* in the truest sense of the word. It is an insult to the name of Jesus Christ, which we wear, to confer with any body" of people claiming to be Christians who deny to us this honor. But in reply, it may be said that any proposition from Baptists looking to a union is an implied recognition of this claim. I am not quite sure of this. I much incline to think that Baptists look on us as apostates from the Church of Christ, and as having forfeited our claim to be held as Christians, and that what the vast majority of them now seek is that in penitence we shall return to them, be tried by them, and if deemed Christians that then we shall be so treated, not before. Let my brethren not be deceived, the tone of the Baptist press sounds a pretty intelligible note. When I endeavor to forecast the time when the recognition here insisted on is likely to occur on any large scale, my hopes of the proposed union are low. But never till it comes do I want my brethren to agree again to meet Baptists in council with a view to a union with them. But to all this Baptists may say: We can not recognize you as Christians till we know you to be such, and this we can not know till we examine you.' Be it so, then; and here let the matter rest. We can and do recognize Baptists as Christians; yet we never examine them. If in like manner they can not so learn us, the fault is theirs, not ours. What we teach is before the world; what we are is before the world; and the Baptists have the Bible. Paul, on one occasion, bore himself a little proudly in Philippi. We like his Roman spirit. As a people we owe to Baptists nothing; for they themselves well know that we are what we are not by their leave; and if now a union with us is sought for any end, at least let us be approached as Christians.

Between no two separate bodies in any country, we venture to think, are the points of agreement so many and the points of difference so few as between Baptists and us. Of course it would be an easy matter to multiply points of difference in discretionary matters and in matters of opinion; but of these we are not speaking. We speak of agreement and difference in matters held to be taught in the word of God. Here, by us at least, everything is held to be essential, nothing not so. The many points in which we here agree and the few in

which we differ, would certainly suggest to any just mind the necessity of an effort to agree completely, provided, of course, union were mutually held to be necessary as it is in the present case. It may not be amiss to enumerate some of these points of both classes; that is, points of agreement and of difference:

1. The Baptists believe in the one living and true God who is Spirit. So do we.

2. The Baptists believe that Jesus Christ is his Son; that within he is perfectly divine, or of the same nature with the Father; but as to his body perfectly human. So do we.

3. The Baptists believe that in his death he made a complete atonement for the sins of the whole world, and that through his blood alone is remission attainable. So do we.

4. The Baptists believe that the Holy Spirit is a person; that his work is to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and to strengthen and comfort the saints. So do we.

5. The Baptists and we agree that by "obedience to law no man can be justified in the sight of God; that hence justification is a matter of grace, not of debt.

6. The Baptists and we agree that without faith in Christ no man can attain the salvation which is in him.

7. And in the recent Convention its members agreed both on faith and repentance.

8. We both agree that the believer in Christ alone is entitled to baptism.

9. We both agree that immersion in water alone is baptism.

10. We both agree as to the perfect independence of individual churches.

Here, now, are ten highly important points of agreement. To these, perhaps, others might be added. Is, now, a union on these, notwithstanding existing differences, legitimate or desirable? I am free to say I think not. The union could never compensate for the strife and confusion which would ensue. The result would be the compromise of the truth by us, not the abandonment of error *by* Baptists. On offensive points we should, in deference to Baptist feelings, continually incline to be silent. This would end in indifference as to these points; indifference would soon be followed by forgetfulness; and forgetfulness by abandonment. Thus the eclipse of the truth would begin; and this once begun, we should begin our trip to Babylon. We are anxious for a union with Baptists, but we are anxious only on emphatic conditions. Let the agreement on all matters clearly taught in the word of God be first as complete between us and them as it is among ourselves; and then let them learn to make matters of opinion no test of fellowship. This done, and a union would be natural, necessary, and productive of incalculable good. But many will say: Let us first

unite and then the agreement will follow. We say: Let us first agree, then the union will follow. If agreement is to come at all, let it precede the union; and if it never comes, then let there be no union. With a view to this agreement we should delight to cultivate with the Baptists the very kindest relations; should be glad to meet them often; and to hold with them the fullest and freest conferences on the matters of difference between us. But Baptists must make the advance; we can not. Hitherto they have treated us as heathens and infidels. Till they change their views and change their treatment they must not think it strange if we prove a little shy.

On the points of difference between us and the Baptists, I have little inclination to speak. Still it is due them, as it is us, that these differences should be mutually known. If to be disposed of at all, we shall then know to what end we work. Taking now the Baptist denomination as such, and not the members of the recent Convention, and the differences are substantially these:

1. We differ as to what faith is, and as to how it is induced.
2. We differ as to what repentance is, and how effected.
3. We differ as to the conditions of justification: the Baptists holding that it is by faith alone; we, that it is by faith, repentance, and immersion, or by faith only when it is perfected by repentance and immersion.
4. The Baptists hold that to be born again is to be born only of the Spirit. We, that to be born again is to be born of water and the Spirit.
5. The Baptists hold that immersion is not essential to remission of sins. We, that it is.
6. The Baptists hold that in conversion the Holy Spirit operates immediately on the heart of the sinner. We deny it; we agree as to the Spirit dwelling in the Christian.
7. The Baptists hold that they may innocently wear a name un-sanctioned by the Bible. We, that it can not be done.
8. The Baptists believe in telling experiences. We utterly repudiate it.
9. The Baptists believe in all the operations connected with the mourner's bench. We wholly reject them.

Now how with these differences we can ever be one people, I can not see. The plain truth is, the thing is impossible. *These differences must first be done away before a union can ever be effected.* That agreement on them is a very practicable thing I well know; but the difficulty respecting them is wholly with the Baptists. On them we have taken our stand firmly, and, as I believe, immovably. Whatever changes are to take place, must take place elsewhere; they will not take place in us. Baptists had just as well know this fact first as last; for learn it in the end they will.

We should like to see the day come when both we and the Baptists should mutually recognize each other as Christians; when they should sit and eat with us, and we with them; and when letters of commendation should be mutually acceptable in our respective churches. This much we should be glad to see occur at once; but more than this, we candidly feel would be disastrous now. These courtesies and kindnesses we stand at all times most willing to exchange with Baptists. But while they repudiate us as heretics, and insult us by immersing our members a second time when they wish to unite with them, let them not think that we even so much as seek their friendship, much less a union with them. Here, now, we leave the whole issue with them. They know where we stand; the rest is with them.

Two items occur in the remarks of Mr. Jeter, which we believe should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. We regret that he should have felt called upon to turn aside to matters so ill-timed and gratuitous. Otherwise his piece should have passed without comment from us. His language is:

1. "We desire that our remarks should be understood as having exclusive reference to the Disciples in Virginia, or such Disciples as those who participated in the Conference. It is said, and we presume correctly, that there is a wide difference between the Disciples of Virginia and the West. Of the nature and extent of this difference we are not accurately informed."

First, let me tell Mr. Jeter, upon information which he can trust with implicit confidence, that not even the semblance of the difference exists of which he speaks. Second, that he had better never make a draft on his imagination when we are the subject of thought; for in such a case his imagination never yet delivered the truth. To hear untrue things of us and lack accurate information has been with him a life-long infirmity.

2. " We found to-day a striking confirmation of this view. A highly esteemed minister was in our office who was formerly a Disciple, and who, some years ago, became a Baptist. He stated that he was led into the Baptist Church by ministers who treated him fraternally, solved his doubts, shed light on his path, and gradually convinced him of the soundness of their views."

This is paltry. Who this "highly esteemed" minister is we know not; but we venture we should hazard nothing in pronouncing him either a simpleton or a knave. No honest man, understanding our views, ever yet left us and took the route he went. He is with his own.

RENAN.

RENAN, a French topographical engineer, was employed by the "man of destiny" to explore Ancient Phoenicia in the years 1860 and 1861.

He is an atheistic-spiritual doctor of the latest type. He tells us that, being fatigued, he determined to go up into the mountains of Lebanon and spend the summer months. There no work nor recreation presented itself so inviting or so sweet as an attack upon the grounds of the Christian's hope. Better had he taken the shoes from his feet and softly walked where angels would have lightly trod. Here, amid scenes which should have inspired the holiest thoughts, which should have awakened within his heart the deepest gratitude for what Jesus had done and suffered for him, with but few volumes around him, he writes his book, "*Renan's Life of Jesus.*"

He discredits many of the geographical, chronological, and historical statements of the four evangelists. He regards their writings, however, as in the main correct. John the Immerser he thinks was a bold and successful reformer. His plan was new and striking, well calculated to please a people such as he addressed. The Savior, he supposes, was very much embarrassed and perplexed during the fore part of his ministry. His cousin John had got the start of him, and was astonishing thousands of the people by the singularity, simplicity, and beauty of his teachings. But happily he conceived the thought of becoming one of John's disciples, and of afterward drawing off by degrees and forming a party of his own.

The Savior's teaching that himself was the Son of God, in a sense different from that in which all men are the sons of God, was a strategy of a shrewd reformer, resorted to in desperate emergencies to save a sinking cause, and this not till late in life.

The stories of the angels appearing to the shepherds by night, of the descent of the Holy Spirit, of the water turned into wine, of the Few loaves and fishes multiplied, of the widow's son restored to life, 3tc, etc., he regards as mere legends, as naughty, but in the premises, perhaps, pardonable lies. Mary, Martha, and Lazarus, he thinks, conspired to give their friend immortal renown by giving out that he had raised Lazarus from the dead, whereas he had never died, only he pretended to be dead. Of course he denies that Jesus rose from the lead, and hence he leaves all our hopes of future bliss and heaven in the dust.

Although he does not allow that Jesus wrought miracles, he apolo-gizes much for him for pretending to do so, or rather for permitting

his disciples to have it so. He thinks that few men would have done better among a superstitious and credulous people, who would not be satisfied with a creed unless it had much of the marvelous in it. Jesus simply acquiesced in the wish of his disciples to invest him with divine honors; he did not in the first place seek them. Both parties, as to their intentions, were comparatively innocent.

Thus writes this bold adventurer into the literary and theological arena.

It has been often and well said that between bald Atheism and Christianity there is not a resting place for the soul of man. With certain necessary premises, Christianity follows; without them, Atheism. The premises necessary to Christianity are: There is a God, and we are his creatures. These premises granted, Christianity follows; these premises denied, Christianity must be denied; and if I must deny these premises, I am an atheist. By the atheist the premises are denied, not on principles of *a priori* reasoning, but, as he supposes, for want of evidence. As in the conversion of the sinner, God may have a score of methods of direct approach to his mind and heart; as God may send the angel of his presence to stand in the sanctuary of his inner man, and touch the chords of his soul's lyre so lightly, and yet so effectually, that the dull senses shall never know the fact, and yet we are bound to deny that such is the case, because we have no proof of it; so the atheist might admit that there may be a God our Maker, but he promptly denies it on logical grounds, for want of proof; he does not believe.

The proposition, there is a God, etc., affects the various classes of infidels very much as that of the Messiahship did the Devil. If thou be the Son of God do some miracle, he commanded. Whether he denied in mind that the Savior could perform miracles, or that the thing demanded being done he would admit or deny the sonship of Jesus, I know not; it is not said. Mr. Renan does not deny in words the possibility of a miracle, though in effect he does. He says: "We do not say miracle is impossible." But his position is: "There has been hitherto no miracle proved." Here lies his strongest ground; here stands his tower of strength. He meant to say but little about it; meant to pass it as a statement should be passed, which is so plain and simple as to need no elaboration, and thus hasten the attention of his reader away with him, in his airy, rhetorical flights, from this crazy, leprous spot which fouls the page of his book. At another point we will notice this position with some care.

But suppose the Savior to have wrought miracles constantly in attestation of his divine pretensions and missions, would it follow to his mind that he was the Son of God in any peculiar or high sense? No. On the hypothesis that miracles are wrought, he says it must be admitted that: "1. Supernatural acts do come to pass in the world.

2. That the power to perform them belongs or is delegated to some men."

Disprove miracles and you disprove the Bible. Do this, and the existence and character of the God of the Bible is not demonstrable. Nay, the very idea of Abraham's God is impossible to man. Give me miracles, and like David, with his simple shepherd's sling, I could demolish, in the name of Israel's God, every Goliath of opposition which any infidel, uncircumcised Philistine might throw in the way. Miracles denied, and the atheistic theory is hence the logically true one. This theory is not a faith, but a negation of the faith—of all faith. No miracles—the only means possible by which God could demonstrate his existence or will to man—and the man of logic wheels at once into his true position of denying everything, the belief of which requires miraculous attestation. But with miracles admitted, Christianity is true; hence, as before, between Christianity and Atheism there is no middle ground. Admit Jehovah's existence and that he made man, and the conclusion is as immovable as the everlasting hills, that God has revealed himself and his will to man, which he could not do without miracles.

. God having made man, which is here taken for granted, I shall conclude:

1. That he has revealed himself to man.
2. That he wrought miracles in doing so.

1. Man, fresh from the hand of the Maker, must have been wholly incapable of providing for his own physical and spiritual wants. Without experience, he could not have known what would have been for his physical good, and ere the necessary experience could have been attained, would certainly have died. Therefore, from the fact that man is, I think I may infer that God did directly supply man with the knowledge necessary to his physical being and well-being. These direct communications, which were revelations, would continue, for the very reason that they were made at all, so long as the necessity which gave rise to them in the first place existed, but not longer. The amount of revelation necessary for man's physical wants not being very great, and this knowledge not being easily lost or forgotten when once acquired, we should expect to find in a revelation from God but little on this subject; and so we do. Man was told simply that he must eat; he was advised as to the things he should eat; and perhaps he was instructed as to the mode of procuring and preparing them, and there the matter rests.

Man's spiritual wants were greater, almost infinitely greater, especially after the fall, than were his physical. Nor is it true that he had by nature, or that he could of himself have acquired, the knowledge necessary for the demands of his spiritual nature.

I shall assume, as a thing requiring no proof, that the spiritual

knowledge needed by man, at his creation, was that which was necessary to enable him to attain the end of his being or creation. To suppose that God had no end in view in man's creation, is to suppose that he worked as no intelligent man ever works. Reasoning from the known to the unknown, as we must, this conclusion is absurd. To suppose that he intended man's misery, or that human suffering was the end God had in view, is to make God worse, perhaps, than the very worst man that has ever lived. This is monstrous and inadmissible. I think that it will not be denied that God intended man's happiness, when he made him, whatever else he may have designed. If God designed man's happiness when he made him, he must for the same reason have intended his perfect happiness. Now no sane man, who knows anything of the history of our race, needs to be told that man is and has ever been incapable of attaining the end here set forth, or of making any very near approach to it, without a revelation from God telling him his duty in order to his destiny. The necessity of a revelation from God being thus apparent, and the necessity of a thing being the reason for it, I must conclude that, if there be a God and we are his creatures, he has revealed himself and his will to us. These revelations would, of course, be made as the necessity should arise; would be made at such times and be of such character as the nature of the case might require. They would cease to be given only when the reason which called them forth at first ceased to exist.

The only objection that occurs to me as likely to be raised to this reasoning is this: man does not attain the end of his being even with the revelations given, and hence the grounds of the argument being gone the argument itself is fallacious. It must be admitted that the objection is apparently valid; but it is not really so. True, the happiness contemplated by our Maker in our creation is not attained at once, even with the aid of all the revelations of God. But it is claimed that in so far as the revelations of God are possessed in their purity, intelligently understood, and practically obeyed, so far man does approach the end.

This the condition of the different nations possessing or not possessing and appreciating the Bible fully verifies; and it is further claimed that the Bible does propose this perfect consummation as the goal that shall be reached by every man that knows and does the truth.

Mr. Renan's objection to the inspiration of the Bible is, not that it is not historically credible, but results from his want of faith in miracles. His objection to miracles is, not that "miracle is impossible," but that "hitherto no miracle has been proved." This point, treated so cavalierly by our recondite author is, nevertheless, of most vital importance to his successfully attacking the Christian's faith. This point carried, and his effort is a success; this point lost, and his

book is a miserable failure. For, with Nicodemus and with reason, we say of Jesus: "We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." (John iii., 2.) Nicodemus knew that God was with Jesus by the miracles which he wrought. If God be with him, which is evidenced by the numerous and mighty miracles which he performed, then is he the Messiah. Thus reasoned Nicodemus; and so do we. Hence, ere we can intelligently reject the Savior's sonship, we must reject miracles, the evidence upon which it rests.

Mr. Renan's plan of argument is as follows: "In our day have we not seen nearly all men the dupes of gross prestiges or puerile illusions?" "Marvelous acts attested by nearly every inhabitant of small towns have become, under a more severe scrutiny, acts of felony." That is, all those in our day—and their name is legion—who are making pretensions to miracle-working, are impostors; are found to be so. The reader is left to infer that the works of Jesus and the apostles were impostures also. But his own conclusion, in his own words, is drawn in the following graceful line: "It is not, therefore, in the name of this or that philosophy, but in the name of constant experience that we banish miracle from history." Of whose experience does Mr. Renan here speak? 1. Of his own, simply? The argument would then stand thus: Whatever *I* have not experienced is not to be believed; *I* have never experienced a miracle; therefore a miracle is not to be believed. The major premise is ridiculously false, and the argument is a fallacy. 2. But does he mean to include in the phrase "constant experience," the experience of all the people of his own generation? Then the argument would be that what his generation had not experienced, no other ever did; which is sufficiently absurd to need no refutation at my hands. 3. Does he, by the phrase "constant experience," mean to include the experience of all men, past and present? Then the argument stands thus: That which has never been experienced by any man in any age of the world, can not be a proper object of human faith; a miracle has never been experienced by any man in any age of the world; therefore, a miracle is not a proper object of human faith. In the minor premise, he begs the question; that is, he denies the very point in controversy, and this, too, without himself being a competent witness in the case, and without having any such witness who testifies in his favor. On the contrary, Nicodemus, Peter, James, John, etc., who were competent witnesses, declare that this minor premise is false. They speak what they saw, heard, and handled, and therefore what they knew to be true. As a high finish to their elaborate testimony, and as proof that they were not induced thereto from any sinister motives, they render it without fee or earthly reward, and, most of them, at the cost of their lives. It is not true that

we can, "in the name of constant experience," taken in any possible sense, banish miracle from history. The whole affair is a shallow fallacy, reproduced from Hume, who displayed upon it much more genius, critical thought, and learning, than has Kenan. He treats the subject briefly; that is sharp. He talks lustroly about the subject. He waves his hand, wags his head, and with knowing mien walks away.

But ere he goes we shall hear him once more. He says: "None of the miracles with which ancient histories are filled occurred under *scientific conditions*." (Italics mine.) By this he means, that the apostles and the hundreds of others who gathered around the Savior, and witnessed first and afterward testified to his miracles, were not competent witnesses, not being, as he thinks, scientific men. But how much science is necessary to determine that now this is water, now it is wine? The veriest plebeian could make the distinction as well as could Humboldt or Agassiz. Here are five loaves and a few fishes. Thousands of men and women are fed bountifully of these, and twelve baskets full are taken up of the fragments. Must nature's priests be called in to examine this transaction, or we be compelled to reject the account of it? The plainest cobbler or tinker could understand it as well as they. The Holy Spirit falls on the Savior as he comes up from the water; the heavens are opened, and God's voice is heard: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." John the Immerser saw and testified: "This is the Son of God." (John i., 34.) He said not, that Jesus was *a* son of God, but *the* Son of God. Was not John a competent witness? Who, however learned, could be more so?

It is assumed, without proof and without truth, that the Savior's miracles were of such a kind, and that they were performed under such circumstances, that to determine their true character it would be necessary to summon a commission of most scientific men. Though I am not very learned in the science of physiology, etc., still there is a deep conviction in my mind that I know when a man is dead, that I know when a man walks upon the water, that I know water from wine, that I know a storm from a calm, etc., about as well as any "scientific commission" could know them. The apostles, though plain men, were strong-minded, calm men. These things, their writings attest. Now, though one might admit that they could have been imposed upon by a shrewd, designing trickster for a while, yet that they should have been deceived by an artless, plain one, in whose teachings and works the most undoubted evidences of truthful intent and entire unselfishness are obvious, so much so, that the most inveterate enemies are constrained to acknowledge "for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all that dwell in Jerusalem, and we can not deny it" (Acts iv., 16), is not the conclusion of reason, is not probable.

That these deceptions should have continued for years, with daily opportunities of detecting the impostures, if such they were, increases the embarrassments and difficulties of the skeptic much, and makes his way, like that of the transgressor, hard. Now that these apostles, and scores of others, should have testified to the Savior's miracles, to the sonship of the Son of the living God, in a word, to Christianity, knowing all to be false, with no prospects before them so certain as stripes, bonds, imprisonments, the block, the fagot, and the flame, is a conclusion reached, I should think, by no sane mind,—is an abortion of reason, furnishing strong grounds for alarm.

Did Julius Caesar live? Then Jesus lived. Did Julius Caesar murder his million of men in Gaul and elsewhere? Jesus wrought miracles in Judaea and Galilee. Did Alexander the Great humble the world at his feet? Then Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Who that was an eye-witness of Caesar's deeds has testified to us of them? Not a man. We have some fragments of accounts given by himself, to which tradition adds but little; still there is no doubt but that Caesar lived; and the main facts stated in his history are, I think, believed by skeptics themselves. Then, with less doubt, nay, with tenfold greater probability of its being true, must the skeptic believe the facts in the history of Jesus' life.

Most of the things which we believe in this life, and upon which we act, staking all that is valuable and dear, are things of history, and they are appropriated by us through faith in the testimony of others. The great sum of our valuable knowledge lies without the circle of our own experience, but through faith in human testimony we have it, and use it freely and to profit. We sit on juries, and upon the testimony of others take the lives of our neighbors, not doubting that our verdict is true, and shall we doubt testimony which is credible beyond anything ever heard in human courts, and thus reject the counsel of God against ourselves? Let it not be so.

I admit that we should not accept the statements of history without regard to the rules of historic criticism. But what rules of evidence does Mr. Renan give us in obedience to the inexorable behests of which we must conclude that a miracle is incredible? None whatever. True, he suggests that should a miracle take place now, and he or some scientific cotemporaries should witness it, and test it, if it were found to be truly one, as they think, then "a probability almost equal to a certainty would be attained." But this is no rule of historic criticism, nor does it even suggest one. It involves the question of the validity of our sensible knowledge, and nothing more. This question I shall take to be a settled one, and shall hence dismiss it after a single remark. Hume, in the contemplation of it, lost all his physical and intellectual moorings, and hence was led to deny his own personal identity.

What we ourselves witness we know; we can not rationally doubt it; we were made to believe it, to know it. What we ourselves have not witnessed, that comes to us supported by competent testimony, we believe; we can not reasonably doubt it; we were made to believe it. Historical events are to be received or rejected upon competent evidence. The nature of the event will vary the nature of the evidence necessary to establish it, and also the character of the witnesses testifying. The evidence must be homogeneous with the proposition to be proved, and the witnesses must be, in number, intelligence, circumstances, and character, competent. By homogeneous evidence, I mean, such as is adapted to the proposition to be proved; *e. g.*, a man professes to be able to raise the dead. That he should walk, talk, eat, and leap, would not be proof of his proposition; would not be proof homogeneous. Should he say that he is able to calculate an eclipse of the sun, and should engage his time wholly in the mechanic arts, of course he would fail to prove his proposition. In fine, if he should announce himself a messenger from God, with a proposition to the world of salvation from sickness, sorrow, pain, death, and the grave, and should he declare that no powers of nature, of demons, or of the Devil, could possibly defeat him in his purpose, if only man is faithful, it is demanded by the rules of criticism that he should heal the sick, sooth the sorrowing, raise the dead, burst the grave, still the tempest, cast out demons, and vanquish the Devil, ere it is possible that he should be received as such a savior. These *a priori* demands of reason are all met in the evidence which we have concerning the Son of God. Hence, the evidence being homogeneous with the thing to be proved, the proposition is not to be rejected, but must be accepted, unless some want should be found in the witness. Let us then speak of the witnesses, and

1. *Of the Number.*—Can any one object that the number is too small? Mr. Renan does not; and, not to be tedious, I shall conclude that no one does. Certainly no one ought.

2. *Of their Intelligence.*—Does any one object that they were not intelligent, that they were not competent to understand the events transpiring around them? Peter was just as competent to know the difference between a living and a dead man as was AEsculapius, Galen, or Harvey. Peter was a man of remarkably good common sense, and so were all the apostles of whom we know much. Luke was a learned physician, and Paul was a very learned doctor of the law. His miracles, being done in public and in open day, are declared to have been witnessed and examined by hundreds of the most learned, and, generally, the most bitter opponents of Christianity that were to be found among the Jews, with the same invariable result: "A notable miracle has been wrought, and we can not deny it." Plain men, of sound brain and organs of sense, and of unsophisticated heart and

life, are the very kind of witnesses whom we would have to tell us of the simple and yet sublime events upon which our soul's salvation depends.

3. *The Circumstances of the Witnesses.*—A witness must be so circumstanced in reference to an act done that he may take sensible notice of it himself, so that his testimony shall be that which he knows to be true. Or he must be able to testify of his own knowledge to some cognate circumstance from which the main fact would necessarily follow, else his testimony would be inadmissible, he is not a competent witness. If it were known that, from any circumstance whatever, he could not know the fact to which he testifies, he must stand aside. The facts in the case under examination are, that the Savior's miracles were performed mostly in open day, and that they were inspected most minutely by the apostles and by thousands of others. And so satisfied were they that their examinations had been perfect—examinations running through years of the most intimate association with the Savior, that they spoke of the events as things of no possible doubt. They saw, they heard, they handled; they knew whereof they affirmed.

4. *Of the Character of the Witnesses.*—Were they honest, truthful men? Never did all history better unite to make a proposition more certain. Without one single dissenting voice, all competent authority since the Christian era assures us that the men of whom we speak devoted their every earthly interest, ease, and happiness, and finally their lives, vowing all the while, living and dying, that Jesus had risen from the dead, and that they knew the fact. You may possibly think them dupes and fools, but dishonest you can not think them.

Thus we find, not only that the testimony is just what we would expect it to be, what the nature of the proposition to be proved requires, but that the witnesses, as to number, intelligence, circumstances, and character are such as to command our implicit confidence in their testimony. Hence my faith is unwavering that Jesus wrought miracles, and that he was, therefore, the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Let us for a moment look for witnesses on the other side. Messrs. Volney, Hume, Voltaire, Paine, Gibbon, and Renan will take the witness stand. Gentlemen, Jesus the Nazarene is on trial. He claims to be the Son of God, and as proof declares that he worked miracles. What do you know of the facts? Nothing, is the answer of them all. Gentlemen, do you know any competent witness who testifies against Jesus' miracles? We do not. Have you ever read or heard of such witness? We have not. Gentlemen, stand aside. The trial being ended, the court, in rendering its judgment, would, I should think, say: We find no fault in the man. Pilate said: "I find no fault in this man." (Luke xxiii., 4.) One cotemporary says: "He casts out

demons by Beelzebub;" and the guards about the sepulchre say: "His disciples stole him away while we slept." (Matt. xxviii., 13.) It is, of course, not necessary to notice these testimonies; in them we have about the sum of all the rebutting testimony that can be produced from witnesses that could hold the slightest claim to competency.

W.

ORPHAN SCHOOL FOR BOYS.—We learn that a number of brethren in and near Midway, Ky., have in view the founding of a school for orphan boys. A more humane object can not engage the attention of Christian men. Next to the Christianization of these unfortunate children stands their education; and indeed on this, in no small degree, may depend that. By all means educate them, and educate them *well*. From this we suppose no benevolent man will dissent. But how can this be most certainly and most successfully done? This is the serious question. Is it best to build for this purpose, and endow' a separate institution? To do this will cost large sums of money; and whether the investment of large sums of money in this way, will, in the end prove best for the orphan, is at least questionable. Might it not accomplish the same result in a preferable way, to raise and invest in safe stocks a large sum of money; and use the proceeds arising therefrom to educate in schools and colleges already in operation? is it wise to group so many orphans together; and thus insulate them from the world while educating them? Again: for which one of these plans can the largest sum be collected? These are all questions to be most calmly considered before any final step is taken. Still further: is now the precise time to make an appeal to the country to give its thousands for this purpose? Burdened as it now is, might not a more favorable period be selected? This must be made no light question? Then, where should the institution stand? In the county that will pay most money for it? Why not? And to whose curatorship shall the enterprise be intrusted? Let plans be well matured, so as to insure success. Especially let a failure, by every possible precaution, be guarded against. If it shall turn out that we have the wisdom to avail ourselves of the incalculable power for good now slumbering undeveloped in the poor orphan boys of the land, then shall we show ourselves to be wise indeed. God grant that such may be the case.

CAN WE DIVIDE?

IN all large religions bodies periods of unusual excitement must come. That in many instances they are attended with good, in many with evil, it would be idle to deny. Certainly they are not all beneficial; certainly they are not all bad. It would not therefore be just either to condemn them indiscriminately, or to approve them indiscriminately. That they will come, we may accept as a settled fact. What effect, then, do they have, what lesson do they teach, and how shall they be managed?

One effect which they certainly have, is to create alarm. This may be a benefit, as it certainly is, where it simply leads to vigilance and a closer adherence to the word of God. It may be an evil, and is so, or rather it may lead to evil, where it leads to predictions of division among the children of God. True, this maybe an abuse of these periods of excitement; still we know that they lead to such results, whether from abuse or not. These predictions are unlovely things, and are justifiable only in cases of extreme danger. Brethren should be more than cautious how they indulge the propensity thus to predict. The great fear is that the prediction arises too often, not from simple fear of division, but in fact from a desire for it. Hence the necessity of thinking well before such a thought is allowed to find utterance.

It is not extremely rare, in the present day, to read expressions from brethren which imply, or seem to imply, a belief on their part, that we as a people may one day become divided. We must certainly regard such expressions as hasty utterances. Indeed we do not believe that there is the semblance of adequate ground on which to base them.

On what principle, let me ask, is the predicted division to take place? For there are principles which underlie and control divisions as real and determinate as those which underlie and control unions. A division has its cause, and proceeds in its own appropriate way, as much so as any other event of time. From what cause, then, can we as a people divide? I am free to confess I see none. But suppose we were to divide. What then? Would the two halves of the divided body both be equally legitimate? The thing is impossible. The adhering half would still be the body of Christ; the separating half would be a division proper, or a sect, and no part of the church. That is, this would be the case, provided the division were permanent and incurable. Certainly a temporary estrangement of brethren might take place, which would not deserve to be called a division in the sense

in which I am now using that word. Of such an estrangement I am not speaking; I am speaking of those deep rents in the church, which are certainly possible, but which end only in one of the rent-off parts becoming an apostasy. But this is not properly speaking' a division of the church. It is a separation from it, not a division of it. A division of the church, were such a thing possible, would be such a rent in it as would leave each of the halves still halves of the church. But the Church of Christ in halves, or a divided body of Christ, is impossible. The moment the church is so divided the one part becomes an apostasy, the other remains the church. Hence we at once settle in the negative, the question: Is the church divisible. Still, waiving all dispute as to the character of the parts, is not a rent in our body possible? I certainly think it would be going too far, in the light of the New Testament and of the history of the past, to pronounce such an event wholly impossible. Still, though I should be unwilling to go this far, yet I am more than willing to pronounce it improbable in the very last degree. For how, let me repeat, is such division to be effected, or from what cause is it to spring? When we soberly consider this question, an answer to it is not easily found.

Suppose the division to have its origin in some doctrinal question. In what light, then, should it be viewed, and how disposed of? Of course, in that case the first question raised would be: Is the doctrine clearly taught in the word of God. If clearly taught in the word of God, the case admits of a very simple solution. The party rejecting the doctrine would stand, on that ground, and for that reason alone, condemned; while the party accepting, would have to be held as no party, but as the church. But suppose the doctrine not to be clearly taught, or suppose it to admit of a reasonable doubt whether it is taught or not, how, then, should we proceed? In that case the difference should be regarded as a difference of *opinion*, and hence should be made no test of soundness in the faith, or of fellowship. Here, if brethren were possessed of even the most ordinary share of love, the difference would either permanently rest or permanently cud. But if one of the differing parties should persist in an effort to force its opinion on the other, or should dogmatically require subscription thereto, or should make it any such test as has just been named, then such party would have to be regarded as having become heretical, and would have to be repudiated. The other party would have to be held as the church.

To illustrate what I mean: it is held to be doubtful whether a Christian man can go to war according to the New Testament. For myself I am candid to think he can not. But others, let me allow, with equal candor think differently. Suppose, now, we as a people, were equally divided on the point. Neither party could certainly force the other to accept its view. The difference should be held as a

difference of opinion, and should hence be made a matter of forbearance. But should either party attempt to compel the other to accept its view, and in case of failure should separate, I should not hesitate to regard the separating party as a faction, and hence as condemned by the New Testament.

But suppose the point about which the difference existed to be clearly not taught in the word of God, and that this was by all admitted. For example, many brethren think we may, with perfect innocence, if we choose, have missionary societies; others think we may not. About such societies the New Testament says nothing. This all admit. How now shall we proceed in this case? Much, certainly, as in the one just instanced. Neither party should attempt to force the other to accept its view; and with us there is not even the remotest probability that such will ever be the case. But should any man, or set of men, rise up among us and attempt to make missionary societies a test of fellowship, and should he, in case of a failure, separate from us, his act would be regarded as the act of a factionist, and the condemnation of the brotherhood would rest on him. He would soon find himself alone, neglected, and forgot ten. Thus it appears far from being an easy matter to rend the body of Christ; and we may add, alas for the man that attempts it.

A number of years since the Methodist body in this country divided into a northern half and a southern half; and each half remained an indorsed and approved half of the body. Such a division as this *in* with us absolutely impossible. This must be apparent to any one who will even for the shortest time study our structure. As a people, we claim to be individually members of the body of Christ. This we claim, and this is the extent of our claim. Hence no one member, as such, has any superiority over another. Each is alike dependent within certain limits; while beyond these limits, each is alike independent. One member, therefore, has no power to prescribe to another what his faith shall be, his conduct, or his opinions. His faith each takes immediately from the word of God. Here, therefore, he is wholly independent, and in no sense to be interfered with. Yet at the same time, in one sense, he has neither liberty nor discretion. Precisely what is in the word of God he must accept; he has no alternative. If he reject, he is a heretic, and himself to be rejected. If he modify or alter, he is to be looked upon as rejecting. The same is true of his conduct. It must in each case, which is held to be a matter of duty, be strictly determined by the word of God, and no interference therewith is allowable. Thus no individual among us possesses the power, nor can he ever acquire it, to produce such a division as the one just instanced. From individual action, therefore, we may fairly conclude it can never come. **On** scriptural grounds, of course, it could never be effected; and should any individual attempt

to effect it on any other, sure I am his failure would be complete. In a word, on scriptural grounds we never *can* divide; on unscriptural, we never *will*.

Again: we have no great ecclesiastic organization through which to effect such division. The only organizations among us possessed of even a vestige of authority are our churches; and these are absolutely independent one of another. How through these, then, is such division to be brought to pass? If one church becomes heretical, or fifty churches become heretical, they are all to be repudiated. But this is no division of the body of Christ, but the creation of a faction. This faction is condemned in the New Testament, and is no part of the church. It is not a division in our ranks, but an apostasy from them. The case, therefore, presents no difficulties. To make the point still clearer. Suppose fifty of our churches were to combine to produce a creed, to introduce organs, and to encourage dancing. As a people, we certainly have no power to prevent it; still we are not without our remedy. As far as the three points named are doctrinal, they are clearly heretical; as far as they are practical, they are clearly schismatical. Hence the churches so combining and so determining would fall certainly under the condemnation of the Scriptures, and would, if they persisted in standing apart on these grounds, have to be rejected. This is as strong a case as can well be imagined, yet it presents no difficulty. Certainly great mischief might thus be done, and the children of God might be made to feel deeply scandalized; still the final disposition of the case admits of no doubt; It might cause much pain, yet our duty would be clear. Neither, then, from an organization can any division come, for the simple reason that we have no organization; nor can it come from any individual church; nor yet can it come from any combination of churches. We can hence well afford to ask how or whence, if at all, is it to arise? If it can not spring from things in the Bible, nor from things out of it; if not from the individual member, nor from a combination of them; if not from the individual church, nor a combination of them—if it can spring from none of these sources, we feel safe in concluding that it can spring from none. From the premises now before us, while it is an easy matter to talk of division, it seems a very difficult thing to lay down the cause from which it is to arise, and to show how it is to be successfully carried out. Indeed, a division of the body of Christ, except in the sense of causing a faction, is impossible. What divine authority makes one it is difficult for man to make two. God works against the man who attempts it, and brings his counsels to naught.

Moreover our past experience may afford us some aid in forming a correct conclusion as to the question in hand. As a people, we have not been wholly free from attempts to produce the precise result of

which we are speaking. With what success were they crowned? Far more correctly we could ask: How signally did they fail?

Very early in our effort at reformation, Dr. Thomas, in Virginia, made a vigorous attempt to become the head of a party or sect formed of material collected from our ranks, and holding as its characteristic tenet the doctrine of materialism. He long and obstinately persisted in his effort; and would occasionally find a person weak enough to accept his nonsense as part and essence of revelation. Soon, however, he began to wane, and soon his adherents began in shame to hide their heads. Now we hear his dishonored name mentioned not once in half a score of years. This attempt, too, was made at a time when we were comparatively weak,—at a time when we had not, as we now have, a thousand noble sentinels on the walls of Zion, imbued with an intense love of the truth and a never-lessening zeal for its purity, sentinels who, with sleepless eye, watch even the most distant approach of error, and at once sound loud the note of alarm. Yet, if the attempt then failed, what, we may confidently ask, would be the end of a similar one now?

Subsequently to Dr. Thomas arose J. B. Ferguson, and tried his hand at effecting a rent in our ranks. Few men will ever possess more of the elements of success than did he. A man of very respectable talents, pleasing manners, and most fascinating address; a man of extensive acquaintance, large Family connection, a witching preacher, and one that stood high indeed; a man of rare oratorical tact, who so thoroughly magnetized his audience that he left them with little power to resist him. This man stood at the head of one of the finest churches in our ranks, in a gay, fashionable city, in which he was petted with the affection of a household god. He first tried to drug the carnal portion of his audience with the indulgent doctrine that after death the gospel would be again preached to them in the Unseen; and that then and there they might all repent and be saved. By and by he began to evolve and inculcate the more charming features of Universalism. Remonstrances now set in. He heeded them not. He stuck close to tried friends, and tried friends stuck close to him. For as yet the veil was on their mind, and they neither suspected him nor understood him. Spiritualism, with its occult charms, mystic writings, and smothered wraps, now began to take root in many a mind. It was just the thing for Ferguson. It soon taught him that the Bible is a book of lies; that Satan and hell are purely fabulous things; that human affection is confined by no limits; that whomsoever a man loves, her let him love, and him let her love. And now he was at the height of his glory and in the depths of his disgrace. Surely he could lead off a grand party and himself become its great chief. But surely he ingloriously failed. As he sank a few sank with him; they growled and he growled; at last all glided out

of view; and now hopeless oblivion has taken the place of former fraternal feeling and respect. He is now a vagrant lecturer against the Bible, and in the interest of Spiritualism; his followers are buried in apostasy, and are powerless for harm. And such we venture to predict will be the mournful fate of every man, be he great or small, gifted or the reverse, who is rash enough to undertake a like work. God will ensnare the man who seeks to subvert his truth, and cover with infamy him who seeks to divide his people.

After Ferguson and recently came poor Walter Scott Russell, and tried to "reform the reformation," *alias* lead out a sect. Like the gilded candle-moth, he flitted gaily for a little season around the dazzling but dangerous lamp of French philosophy, till at last it scorched his wings, and left him fluttering on the ground in littleness and neglect, himself the ruin he had criminally sought to work in the house of God. A few unstable and erratic spirits, as usually happens in such cases, determined in their madness to die with him, *and they did die*. True, in their death-struggle they well-nigh wrecked a church, and for all their pains now have a name that only a convict might covet. After these examples and the doom which has overtaken them, even the most daring of heretics would, it seems to me, act wisely to pause and forecast the probable consequences of his deed, should he attempt to add another to the number of efforts already made to rend our ranks.

Not only have these men been able to produce no division among us, nor in any other way hurtfully to affect us, save by ruining themselves and a few other individuals; but causes far more powerful than they have been successfully withstood. From the moment of our denominational origin in this country up to the very present, we have had the exciting and dangerous question of slavery to encounter. Our brethren South stood strongly for, our brethren North strongly against, the institution. Never for a moment did it cease to chafe and fret. At times it certainly became threatening and wore an ugly look. Brethren on both sides would occasionally flame high and talk loud. Still, all through the strife it excited, all through the passion it aroused, we lived without even the semblance of a breach. Other bodies it divided; ours it could not. And if slavery proved inadequate, we may with much composure question the adequacy of other causes. And now the angry topic is laid aside forever. Brethren who opposed it courteously decline to exult; brethren who favored it magnanimously decline to complain. It is settled forever. It has spent its force, and still the children of God are one. As a nation we can never be reproached with it more; as Christians it can never again make us fear. For these results let us be thankful.

But further, we, as a nation and as Christians, have just passed the fierce ordeal of a terrible war, a war in which passion ran to its

height, and feelings became as ferocious as feelings ever get. We had many brethren on both the opposing sides. Many of our churches stood precisely where the carnival raged most. Yet not a rent in our ranks did the war produce. True, for the time being it cooled many an ardent feeling, and caused old friends to regard one "another a little shyly. Still it effected no division. And now even those kindly feelings are obviously beginning to flow back; and brethren from the two hostile sides are meeting each other as brethren should ever meet. They even seem to vie with each other in acts of magnanimity and high Christian bearing. The war is never mentioned but in accents of sorrow; crimination and recrimination are never heard; the cause of Christ is the constant topic of conversation; while all noble hearts are beating high with joy that our unity is left to us perfect. If now we have triumphantly come through this storm, and still gloriously stand an undivided people, have we not reason to count with confidence on the future? May we not boldly say, trusting in God to help us, *we can never divide?*

And now let every brother in our ranks show himself a master in efforts to heal whatever of alienation may yet remain. Let not a word be said in any pulpit, not a remark be dropped in the social circle, not a paragraph or sentence be written in any paper, that can chafe or wound. And if heretofore we have known it, let us never more know any North or South in our ranks. Let no river separate us; let no State or other lines keep us apart; but let us henceforward and forever know each other only as the children of God, and never recognize even the remotest chance of a division, nor allow any cause to estrange us in our feelings. Let no sectional conventions be called, no sectional papers be printed, no sectional preachers be sustained; in a word, let the very notion of sectionalism perish from our memories and our hearts. Let us, as a whole and undivided body, work with whole and undivided hearts for the great cause of the Savior. Let us be jealous for the truth, and keep it pure; let our action be one and never slackening; and never did future so enchanting open up to any people.

THE DATE OF THE QUARTERLY.—It will be observed that each number of the present Volume comes out three months behind its date. As this is not accidental but designed, it needs explanation. We wanted to issue the first number of Vol. III. with the 1st of January, 1866; but this would have left too great a space between the dates of Vol. II. and III. We hence antedated Vol. III. three months. This will explain the discrepancy between our date and the time of issuing each number. Vol. IV. will both be dated and commence with the beginning of the year.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1866.

No. 4.

THE THIRD CHAPTER OF JOHN.

THE New Testament is not supposed to contain a more important passage than the one here announced. By almost all denominations is this sentiment held, and by most with great firmness. The countless sermons delivered to elucidate the passage, the numberless tracts and essays written to explain it, together with the thousands of criticisms to which it has been subjected, all evince the high estimate in which it is held. In the justness of this estimate I fully concur. But while these sermons, essays, and criticisms show the esteem in which the passage is held, they would, at the same time, seem to imply that its interpretation is attended with no ordinary difficulties. Nor can it be denied that this is the case. From what causes the fact springs it is not necessary now to inquire. The fact itself must be conceded. That an obscurity, real or apparent, lies on the passage few will be bold enough to deny. Whether this obscurity was designed or not, whether it is in the passage itself or in us, are points I stop not here to consider. Neither shall I deny that it possibly may yield to criticism, especially if it be patient and sufficiently extended. With no sanguine hope that I shall set the difficulty at rest, or vain belief that my reasonings will be found faultless, I yet propose jotting down my thoughts on the passage.

In whatever the new birth may consist, no matter what nor how many its component parts, nor yet what processes may be necessary to complete it, of one thing I feel assured, that its solution must be sought mainly in a well-conducted analysis of the conversation with Nicodemus. If on examination this conversation do not suggest the explanation of the doctrine, then shall I despair of ever attaining one. Confirmation this explanation may receive from other portions of holy writ, but a solution the doctrine itself can not receive. The interview with Nicodemus we believe to be the precise soil in which the pearl we seek lies buried. Whether we shall be enabled to penetrate it to the depth necessary to reach the object we are in quest of must be left to future decision.

During discussions on the chapter the name of Nicodemus has suf-

ferred by censures which I believe to be unjust, and which, for that reason, I shall pause long enough to notice. He has been censured, first, for coming to the Savior by night; and, second, for not understanding him when he spoke of being born again.

As to the first censure, it is wholly gratuitous. Valid, prudential reasons may have determined the conduct of Nicodemus, and doubtless did; and where conduct can be ascribed to honorable motives, it is uncharitable to ascribe it to any others. From the miracles which Christ wrought, Nicodemus recognized in him a teacher come from God. In this he was just, and showed himself both capable and willing to reason accurately—far more accurately than his censors. Christ's miracles certainly proved him a teacher come from God. This much they could prove, and did; but more than this they could not. As a premise, therefore, Nicodemus collected from them all that they warranted. But Christ claimed to be more than a simple teacher come from God. This much he certainly claimed, but just as certainly he claimed far more. He claimed to be *the Son of God*. This his miracles could not prove. The Father alone could avouch this, and this the Father did; first, by audibly, in the presence of the people, acknowledging him as his Son; and, second, by raising him from the dead. Nicodemus was doubtless aware of this claim of Christ. Now, before he committed himself to pretensions so high, I hold it to have been an act of simple prudence that he should have sought the interview he had. As to his seeking it at night, there is nothing in this. It was necessary that the interview should be as private as possible, and this it could not so well be at any other time as at night. Had Nicodemus been seen, in broad daylight, in company and in friendly conversation with the Savior, this would have been construed by the people as an indorsement by the former of the pretensions of the latter. Before this indorsement could be given publicly, Nicodemus felt it to be necessary to learn privately whether it was merited. This he did by an interview at night; and this is all I see in it. As to his act being cowardly, a single incident in his life should disprove it. When the Savior's abandoned and pulseless body hung on the cross, Nicodemus, with Joseph, went boldly to Pilate and begged the body, that they might bury it. This, at that time, was not the act of cowards. To so allege is most unjust; and it is matter of regret that it should ever have been done. I love the bold and manful courage that craved that body, nor less the hearts that paid it the compliment of a decent burial. The fingers that wrapped it in decent linen, that wiped the blood from that glorious brow, and straightened that clotted hair,—these have claims on my sympathy, and I am unwilling that the semblance of censure shall attach to them. The man that helped to bear that mangled form to its quiet bed in a stranger's lot should not, without good reason, be unkindly spoken against.

But Nicodemus should have understood the Savior when he spoke of being born again! Should he, indeed? Now I affirm that Nicodemus, on hearing the Savior's first announcement, understood him in the only sense in which he could have understood him, and in the very sense in which the Savior designed to be understood. The Savior said: "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." Here now is the word born, a well-known word at the time, with a fixed current meaning. It is introduced without qualification, indeed without even one hint or circumstance to indicate that it is used in any new or unfrequent sense. In such a case Nicodemus had no discretion. He was compelled, unless he proceeded arbitrarily, to understand it in its usual acceptation. He was hence compelled to understand the Savior as speaking of a literal rebirth. Birth in some new or figurative sense he had no means of inferring. It could not possibly occur to his mind. Hence, to censure him for not collecting from the Savior's language what, in fact, he could not collect, and what, at that stage of the conversation, it is necessarily certain it was not designed he should collect, is clearly to censure him without cause. After the Savior explained what he meant by being born again, then confessedly Nicodemus should have understood him; but not before. Hence, when he is censured for understanding the Savior, in his first announcement, as speaking of a literal rebirth, he "is censured by men who themselves know neither the laws of language nor the laws of thought. It is they, not Nicodemus, who deserve the blame.

Again: by understanding the Savior to speak of a literal rebirth, Nicodemus would be the more deeply impressed by the notion of a different birth when that notion was once suggested to him. The very antithesis would give vividness and power to the new thought; while the contrast would infix it the more deeply in his mind, and cause him to attend the more strictly to its explanation. A notion, novel by some vividly felt contrariety, always strikes the mind with more force than a familiar one, while the explanation thereof is certain to be attended to with severer attention. I hence can not doubt that the Savior designed Nicodemus to understand him precisely as he did.

But what is it to be born again, in the sense in which the Savior designed the language, in the end, to be taken? This is now the question which must employ our thought. A more important one could not easily be brought before us. Indeed I shall not allow that its importance can be exaggerated. Its patient examination is therefore held to be a weighty necessity. That to be born again is to be born of water and of the Spirit, no one at all conversant with the teachings of the New Testament will, I believe, deny. Hence we have only to determine what it is to be born of water and of the

Spirit to know what it is to be born again. In these two items the new birth is complete; and it is complete in neither without the other. It is not enough to be born of water; nor yet enough to be born of Spirit. We must be born of both; and if not of both, then are we born of neither, that is, we are not reborn at all. But we must be very careful not to regard being born of water as a process in itself complete and independent, and so of being born of the Spirit. These are the mere parts of the new birth, and neither is of any known value without the other. The new birth is itself a process, but its parts are not; at least they are not each an independent and separate process in itself. As parts of a process, they, of course, must themselves be partial processes; but the value of each is contingent and dependent, and must be held as complete and available only when connected with the other. To be born of water takes no man into the kingdom, neither does being born of the Spirit. It takes them both, and without them both the kingdom can not be entered. Men may flatter themselves that this is not true, but their deed is but flattery. If nothing else shall do it sooner, at least will death wake them to the result of their folly.

The expression "born of water" naturally distributes itself into the two simple clauses "born of" and "water." These two clauses understood, and we certainly know what it is to be born of water. What, then, is their acceptation?

First, of the term water. In what sense must we take it? With very general consent the religious world replies, *in a figurative sense*. But why does the religious world so reply? Ah, this is the question which reflects so little credit on the religious world. Is it intuitively clear that the term is figurative? If so, then to all men the fact would be equally apparent. But the fact is not only not intuitively clear to all men; it is intuitively clear to none. Or is it shown by any fact or circumstance attending the word that it is figurative? The attempt has often been made; yet the attempt has never been successful. Clearly the word is not figurative; and when it is asserted to be so, the assertion is made without the semblance of ground on which to rest it. A more arbitrary assertion human mind can not conceive, nor human pen indite. Yet for generations it has been recklessly and criminally reiterated.

But why, I am curious to know, is the word held to be figurative? What first suggested the thought to the brain which first gave it utterance? For the sake of erring man I wish the answer were difficult; but it is not. Construe the term water literally, and nine-tenths of all who claim to be Christians are excluded from the kingdom. This is the reason for construing it figuratively. The literal meaning stands heavily against this proportion of the religious world, and condemns it; hence the desire of this proportion to get rid of the

literal meaning¹. No desire to be just to the word of Christ leads to the figurative construction; neither do the laws of language require it. Men hold one faith, the Bible teaches a different one. That must be abandoned, or this must be explained away. Hence the word is figurative. This is the brief, but true, explanation of the question. If the literal meaning of the word favored sprinkling, the attempt would never be made to construe otherwise. But the literal meaning annihilates sprinkling. Hence it must be repudiated. Is it not strange that the world can not see this? A child ought to see it; yet men, who have eternal interests depending on it, will not see it. But when we have explained the word figuratively, have we got rid of the obligation to be born of water? Or will Christ substitute our explanation instead of his truth? Of course not. He will laugh at our folly, and condemn us for our crime.

But even allowing the word to be figurative, still the word has a meaning; for clearly figurative language has meaning no less than literal. Only the figurative meaning is often not so obvious as is the literal; still it is none the less real. Granting, then, the word to be figurative, what does it mean? This question the advocates of a figurative construction will never answer. Indeed, they can not answer it. An impossibility is on them. But let them make the attempt; let them say what the word signifies, or write down in a plain unfigurative term its meaning. This done, then I will engage to show that except a man be born of that thing, whatever it is, which the word means, which is one thing, and of the Spirit, which is another thing and a different thing, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Or, still more fully to present the same thought, I will engage to show, first, that the Holy Spirit is one thing, and that the thing denoted by the word water is a different thing; that they are two unlike things, and can never be confounded, identified, or unitized; and that without being born of both these it is impossible to enter into the kingdom of God. I hence do not see how insisting on a figurative meaning of the word lightens in the least our burdens, or relieves us of the slightest responsibility. We still have *two* things of which we *must be born*. True, in that case we have a different thing from water, but whether a thing of which we can be the more easily born is far from being shown.

But how is it that those who contend for a figurative construction of the word have never themselves discovered their utter inability to point out its meaning? Certainly they have often made the attempt; yet hardly have any two of them succeeded in discovering the same meaning. They widely differ among themselves. Each proceeds in his own way, and each reaches a different conclusion. Yet, if the word be figurative, it ought either to suggest much the same meaning to all minds, or from all equally hide its meaning. To all it would be

about alike dark, or alike clear. The fact that the word suggests no uniform meaning as a figurative word should be proof conclusive that it is not figurative.

One thing certainly follows on the hypothesis of a figurative construction, namely, that no man living knows what the term means. Its import is, in that case, an eternal secret; its light is forever eclipsed. From this again it follows that no man can tell whether he is born again or not; and hence, whether he is in the kingdom of heaven or not. Whatever degree of doubt hangs over the meaning of the term water, of necessity hangs over the question of being born again; and whatever degree of doubt attaches to this, attaches also to the question of being in the kingdom. Hence, if the meaning of the word water be not clear, then no man knows with certainty whether he is in the kingdom or not. Now surely the Savior never designed to leave a matter of so much moment as this in doubt. Were such the case, the Christian's life would be passed in overwhelming uncertainty, and at last it must end in doubt and gloom.

But if any weight is to be attached to the judgment of the soundest thinkers in the premises, then the word water is to be taken literally, and not figuratively. So far, consequently, as mere human authority can settle the meaning of a term, this must be accepted as the meaning of the word water. I hence feel bound to this conclusion.

But construing the word literally, as we feel compelled to do, and still the question remains: What is the meaning of the expression "born of water?" Certainly in no view can this question be deemed difficult. All attempts to make it so are against the truth of Christ, and injurious to the human family. To be born is a familiar current expression, with a precise, well-known meaning. Literally, it denotes the event which brings us into natural life. But in the case in hand we are compelled to take it figuratively, since we can not be born literally of water. But though to be born of water is not a literal birth, yet is it an event as real as though a literal birth. It is none the less actual because figurative. Hence, to be born of water has a meaning as precise and real as a literal birth. Whether its meaning is as determinate or not is a different question. One thing, however, we think clear, namely, that the act or event which the phrase "to be born" figuratively denotes, when standing connected with water, must resemble more or less minutely the event which it literally and currently denotes. This resemblance, moreover, must be so close and so striking as to empower the word which expresses literally the one instantly to suggest the other. Otherwise there would be neither propriety nor beauty in the figure. But let the event which the word figuratively denotes be first determined; then we shall be enabled to compare them, and to see how close the resemblance is. For this

purpose I shall select a few scriptural facts, in which the word born must be taken figuratively, and subject them to a sufficiently close examination.

1. Christ is called the first-born from the dead. This is the statement of a fact. In this statement occurs the word born. Now, as in the literal sense of the word, no one can be *born* from the dead, it thence follows that the word must be taken figuratively. To this conclusion we are determined by the nature of the case. But what is the fact expressed by the word born? Before replying directly to this question, it is necessary to notice that the word born does not apply to the soul or inner man of the Savior. It applies exclusively to his body. This alone was born from the dead; for this alone was mortal, and hence this alone died. Applying the word born then to the Savior's lifeless body, and, I repeat, what is the fact expressed by it? Indisputably the fact of its resurrection. To this fact the word applies; to none other can it. Hence in the act of being raised out of the grave we have the act expressed by the word born. Christ came out of the grave, from among the dead, and this was being born from the dead. The act of rising, then, was the act of being born. So clear is this, that simply to state it is enough. But does this act, figuratively expressed by the word born, bear any resemblance to a literal birth; especially does it bear so close a resemblance as to justify us in applying the word born to it? In reply, I shall only request him who is in doubt on the point to compare coming out of the grave into life a second time with coming out of the womb into life the first time. He will hardly feel the need of more than this. At least I shall assume that the comparison will cure his doubt. A lifeless body is buried in the earth; three days after it rises out of the earth; and this is called being born from the dead. A human being is dead to sin; this being is buried in the water, and rises out of it again. That rising is called being born from the dead. In the name of reason, what shall this be called but being born of water?

2. But Christ is called the *first-born* from the dead. This implies that there will be the second-born from the dead. Who will these be *I* Christians, of course. But these Christians lie sleeping in their graves, they are buried in the earth. Rising out of the earth will constitute their being born from the dead. If now we can apply the word born to the act of a Christian rising out of the grave, from the close resemblance of this event to natural birth, can we not, with equal fitness and from the same reason, apply the word to the act of a man, dead to sin, rising out of the water? Nay, do not the very same laws of language and of thought, which require and justify the procedure in the one case, require and justify it in the other? To deny it, would be arbitrary and without warrant. Hence, how clear it is that to be born of water is the act of emerging from it in immersion!

3. Many of the children of God lie sleeping in the sea. These will rise among the second-born; and their act of emerging from the sea will be their act of being born from the dead; that is, the word born is used to express this act, not certainly because it is a literal birth, but because it strikingly resembles one. No act could more strictly resemble an immersion. If, then, that act can be called being born from the dead, surely can emersion from water be called being born of water.

Hence, from all the premises now before me, I conclude that the word water is to be taken literally, as denoting the material element we usually express by it; and that to be born of water denotes the act of emerging out of it,—in other words, emersion. I see not how it is possible to escape from this conclusion, or on what ground it could be successfully attacked. Indeed, attacked successfully it never can be. As long as truth and honest common-sense stand together, as being for each other, it will stand.

As further confirmation of this conclusion, if further it need, I may call attention to the fact that there is but one ordinance of Christ in which water is always present, and from which it never can be absent. That ordinance is immersion. Hence, if water is ever present and used in Christianity, of necessity it must be in immersion. But in the expression "born of water," water is indisputably present. Hence necessarily is it present in immersion. This is irrefutable and final.

Again, Christ says: "he who believes and is immersed shall be saved." Where now are all the saved, in or out of the kingdom of God? Certainly the saved, and no others, are in the kingdom. All out of the kingdom are unsaved. Indeed this makes the great material difference between those in and those out—the one are saved, the others not. Hence he who 'is saved is in the kingdom of God, and therefore is born of water and of the Spirit; for otherwise he could not enter the kingdom. In believing and being immersed, consequently, a person is born of water and of the Spirit. Now as believing can not correspond to being born of water, it follows that being immersed must. Hence, to be immersed and to be born of water must be identical. They are merely two different names for the same act.

Here I shall close my examination of the phrase "born of water." More might yet be said to profit, but I believe the foregoing comments and criticisms, if carefully weighed, will be found sufficient to set the point in question at rest in all thoughtful minds. More than this has not been designed.

We have next to examine the phrase "born of the Spirit." Whatever of difficulty stands connected with the third of John will unquestionably be found in this phrase; or if not in the phrase itself, in facta and other phrases related to it. Nor should we wonder at the circumstance. To us, while in the flesh, spirits must ever remain an inscru-

table mystery. Of this mystery their acts to some degree will partake. We can not reflect long on an act without seeking to refer it to its cause. In the case of spirits, this at a single step leads us beyond the ken of the triable by the senses. The actor and the act overlap and reach into each other to such an extent as to make it difficult, indeed impossible, to understand fully the one in itself and in its accidents without understanding the other. The act itself and its effects we may sufficiently know, but on these we must be careful to pause. No inquiry can be successfully pushed beyond. In the case in hand we shall endeavor to confine our remarks to legitimate matters of Investigation, and leave the others to the dreamer.

I shall set out with the assumption that after stating in what the new birth consists, the Savior proceeds to an explanation of so much of it as is spiritual, that is, as originates in spirit and relates to spirit. The other part of the new birth needed no explanation, hence none is subjoined. To be born of water is an expression which to Nicodemus needed no explanation. As soon as he learned from the Savior that he was not speaking of a literal rebirth, instantly the meaning of the phrase would flash on his mind. He would intuitively take the word water literally; this done, and the meaning of the expression "born of" would be at once seen. But not so with the phrase "born of the Spirit." Of necessity all would be dark here. With Nicodemus it was impossible that it should be otherwise. Of being born of the Spirit, or of being begotten by it, he had no means of information. To him the subject was absolutely *new*. Not one incident of universal history could shed a ray of light on it. In his case, therefore, an explanation was a special necessity. Hence the assumption that one has been given.

With this corresponds the next verse, namely, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." I hardly think it can be said that this verse is free from difficulty. Not that its difficulty is great, but only that the verse is not entirely free from it. In the expression "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," we have the statement of a simple well-known matter of fact. In this statement every word is to be taken literally; nor can any one acquainted with the fact stated misunderstand the statement. Flesh produces flesh literally, or the one is the offspring of the other. This we know to be so. But the difficulty lies not here. It is in the expression "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" or more correctly perhaps in the parallelism which we draw between the two expressions. In the expression last cited the word born is not to be taken literally; for in regeneration no spirit, personally considered, is produced; in other words, the Holy Spirit does not produce the human spirit in the sense in which flesh produces flesh. In regeneration the human spirit is only *changed*, not *produced*. Hence the word born,

in the second expression, is not to be taken literally, but figuratively, as denoting, in a general term, and as already said, simply a change. Now the difficulty, as I conceive, arises here: In drawing the parallel we make Spirit stand to spirit as flesh stands to flesh, in each case the one producing the other. Clearly this is wrong. Certainly flesh produces flesh; but Spirit only changes spirit. Here there is no product, that is, no product of substantive spirit. Hence in the first expression the word born is to be taken literally, but in the second figuratively. This causes, unless carefully noticed, confusion, and in the confusion lies the difficulty. But how, it may be asked, do I gather this, or from what do I learn it? I answer, from the very nature of the case. In regeneration the human spirit, which is the thing to be changed, is not to be produced. It already exists. This is clear. Hence production in the sense of flesh producing flesh is out of the question. The difference in the subjects spoken of compels us to use the word born in different senses in the two different expressions, though the expressions are found in the same connection of thought, and one immediately succeeds the other. This, as a general rule, requires us to take a closely recurring word in the same sense. Only the subject-matter, as in the present case, can set the rule aside.

But on the supposition that the Savior is now explaining what it is to be born of Spirit, this is precisely the subject we should expect him to introduce. The word born denotes a change; the human spirit is the subject in which this change takes place; while the Holy Spirit is the agent effecting it. All this is indicated in the expression, "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Clearly in the matter of regeneration the Holy Spirit is the spirit of which we are born; while the human spirit is the thing born of it. The Holy Spirit begets the human, or the human is begotten by the Holy; that is, the Holy Spirit effects the change which takes place in the human. In this process four distinct items present themselves to view, which may be fully brought out in four corresponding questions: 1. Who effects the change? 2. What is changed? 3. How is the change effected? 4. In what does it consist when effected? The first and second of these questions we now have answered—the Holy Spirit effects the change; the human spirit is changed. Only two remain to be answered. Of these the Savior, in the following verses, answers only the third, namely, How is the change effected? The fourth is not answered by him in the interview with Nicodemus, but is answered elsewhere in the New Testament, as I shall show before this article is concluded. These four questions exhaust the subject of being born of the Spirit, and of being born as to spirit. A fifth question can not be conceived.

Here it is proper to determine another point before proceeding further. Should we say born of the Spirit, or *begotten* by it? This

depends altogether on how we are viewing the subject-matter in hand. If we are viewing regeneration as a completed process, completed in both its parts—completed in water, completed in spirit,—then it is proper to say, born of the Spirit; otherwise it obviously is not. Whenever the two parts of the process are viewed apart, then clearly we should say begotten by the Spirit, not born of it. The Holy Spirit begets the human, or more severely begets a change in it, prepares it for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. In this preparation the Holy Spirit is an agent, acting on the human spirit and simply changing it. The human spirit is not conceived of as coming out of, or proceeding from, the Holy Spirit. Hence begotten, and not born, is clearly the more appropriate term. Again: being begotten by the Spirit is the first part of the whole process of being born again. It hence antedates the other part, being born of water, and is for this additional reason more correctly denoted by the word begotten than by born. Further: as the word born applies to the last act in natural generation, so likewise it applies to the last act in regeneration. This act in regeneration consists in being brought forth out of the water. To the antecedent act, therefore, the word begotten strictly applies. But this is the act of which the Holy Spirit is author and the human spirit subject. Hence, again, I conclude it to be correct to say, that which is *begotten* by the Spirit is spirit, and not that which is born of it, except as above.

There is still another reason why we should say begotten by the Spirit. The word born means more than does the word begotten. They differ, not in denoting two different things, but in the one denoting the whole of a thing, and the other only a part of the same thing. Born means all that begotten means and something more. They are identical to the full extent of the meaning of begotten, but born reaches still further. In translating, this fact should always be borne in mind and be made to appear. But how shall this be done? By translating the original word, in all cases where it occurs without a qualifying epithet or any modifying circumstance, as having at least its narrower sense. This much it must mean: more it may, but not necessarily. Guided by this rule we can not be wrong; proceeding without it we may. Of course, whenever the word is attended by any circumstance indicating that it has its larger meaning, then it must be so rendered.

It may be well to make an application of this rule to a few cases in which the original word occurs, to show the sense it yields and the precision with which it works: 1. "By faith Moses when he was born was hid three months of his parents, because they saw he was a proper child." Here the word is so attended by modifying circumstances as to compel us to render it born. Hence, of course, we correctly do so. To render it begotten would certainly not make nonsense nor bad

sense; but then it would cause one part of the verse to contradict another. For, first, how could his parents see that the child was beautiful unless he was born? and, second, how could they hide him? Obviously we can not say: "By faith Moses when he was begotten was hid three months by his parents, because they saw he was a beautiful child." We hence render the original by the word born, because the circumstances of the case demand it; but were the word unattended by these circumstances, then we should render it begotten.

2. "Jesus answered and said to him: Verily, verily, I say to you, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Here the original word is attended by no circumstance compelling us to render it born. Hence, with perfect propriety, we may render it begotten; and the probability is that we render it the more correctly when we do so. The verse would then read, modernizing it: "Jesus answered and said to him: Indeed I tell you truly, except a man be begotten anew he can not see the kingdom of God." It should be added that either rendering makes good sense here; and in such a case it is often very difficult to say which is preferable. The train of reasoning which seems to decide the case is this: a man must certainly be begotten again before he can see the kingdom of God, though it may not be necessary that he should be born again. To render by begotten, therefore, we can not be wrong; whereas to render by born we may be. It is hence deemed safest to render by the former word, as the rule requires. Other illustrations might be added, but these are deemed enough. The intelligent reader can supply them at will.

Accordingly the verse in hand would perhaps be more correctly rendered: "*That which is begotten by the flesh is flesh, and that which is begotten by the Spirit is spirit.*" This much we know must be correct; more than this might not be. It is hence best to say this much and no more. Certainly in the fifth verse we must render the original by born. The verse reads: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Here begotten is wholly inadmissible, since we can not be begotten by water, but must be born of it. Again: it is not by being begotten simply that we enter into the kingdom of God; it is by being born. In the fifth verse the word denotes the act that translates us into the kingdom. Hence it is the act of being born, not of being begotten. But in all the subsequent verses where the word occurs, it is best to render it begotten. I shall accordingly do so, as already in the sixth.

It will be remembered that we are now writing under the assumption that, after the fifth verse, the Savior proceeds to explain how we are begotten by the Spirit. With this agrees the seventh verse more naturally than with any other hypothesis. The verse reads: "Marvel not that I said to thee, ye must be born again." When I am speaking to a man, and it is obvious to my eye that he does not understand

me; and I say to him: Wonder not that I should have spoken to you thus, for what most naturally does my remark prepare him? Does it prepare him for an explanation, or an illustration? If I have already explained myself, clearly it prepares him for an illustration. For after an explanation nothing further in this way is needed. An explanation or some variation is now demanded. But if no explanation has been submitted, then certainly it prepares him for an explanation. Now in the case in hand the Savior had submitted no explanation; hence, most naturally, it seems to me, would his remark prepare Nicodemus to expect one. Accordingly we still assume that the following verse contains one.

The verse reads thus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

No passage in the New Testament has been so variously and so inconsistently construed as this. Hardly any two men understand it alike. Hence it is cited to prove anything or nothing, as may happen to suit the tenets of him who uses it. Generally it is quoted to prove how inscrutable the mystery is of being born again. But this it fails to do; for to any one who is bold enough to think for himself, it is clear that the passage, as it stands in our common version, has simply no appreciable meaning at all. To elicit from it any obvious consistent sense is not in the power of man. Still it subserves an end and answers a purpose. It is dark, very dark; and a sectarian and an owl are alike in more respects than one—the brighter the light the blinder each grows. Hence flush the one in the blaze of day, and at once he darts away into the darkest wood he can find; and spring the other on the intelligibility of the terms of salvation, and instantly he buries himself in the gloom of the verse in hand. To remove the obscurity of the verse would be to him an irreparable injury. Indeed, I see not how, in that event, sectarian preachers could longer conduct their calling. To them a Bible without this verse in it would certainly be a most defective thing, defective, too, in a sense injurious to what they deem the true essential feature of Christianity. To require a sectarian preacher to deliver a discourse on regeneration without allowing him to use this verse, would be as tantalizing to him as it would be to place a sumptuous dinner before a greedy epicurean and require him to go through all the motions of eating an elaborate dinner without allowing him to taste the food. The trial would be intolerable. Still, though I have the most perfect regard for the rights of these men, and, as I feel, due sympathy for their feelings, yet I deem that whatever of darkness may hang over the passage, unless certainly placed there by the divine hand, should be removed. This might mar some theories of regeneration, and diminish somewhat, in certain quarters, the number of discourses on

the topic, still we think the world would be upon the whole the gainer.

But though, as already hinted, we think the obscurity of the verse lies mainly, if not wholly, in our common translation of it, yet we feel that it is not free from difficulty even in the original. Men both great and learned have felt the same; and we wish to recognize the fact in the fullest sense. This will both require and justify us in proceeding with the utmost caution and modesty in the criticisms we have to offer in the premises.

In all cases of obscurity in a passage, the first question to be considered relates to the purity of the text. On this question in the present instance there is no ground for a diversity of opinion. The integrity and purity of the text stand unimpeached. This point, always so fundamental and so important, being thus settled, may at once be dismissed. The next question respects the translation of the text. That our received version of this is wrong I think one of the clearest propositions in the whole range of biblical criticism. I shall hence make no attempt to establish the proposition by the citation of learned authorities, whether in the form of different translations or the opinions of the great. With these many of my readers are already familiar; with others they could have but little weight. I shall hence at once proceed to translate the passage. In doing this I shall, as far as possible, adapt my remarks and reasonings to the humblest reader. My object is to be understood; then if in anything I am wrong it will be easy to point it out.

The word which in our common version is rendered wind, is in the Greek *pneuma*. The first and almost universal meaning of this word is spirit; and this is true of the word whether the remark be confined to classic or sacred writers. How often it occurs in the Septuagint I do not know, as I have no concordance to that work. I am hence unable to present the reader with an induction drawn from that valuable source, and which I have not a doubt would go far to confirm the conclusion which I expect to reach in this paper. One thing only I shall add, based on personal knowledge, that the Septuagint can warrant no conclusion which would conflict with the one herein set forth.

Pneuma occurs in our common Greek Testament, unless my counting be at fault, three hundred and eighty-six times. In three hundred and eighty-four times it is, in our received version, rendered either by the word spirit or the word ghost, and these have the same sense. Once in the book of Revelation, xiii., 15, it is rendered life without the semblance of authority, where it should clearly have been rendered simply a spirit. Only in John iii., 8, in the entire New Testament, is it rendered *wind*. Why it was so rendered, if the object was to make an independent and a faithful translation, no man living can

tell. But the fair presumption is that the object was not to make an independent translation, but merely to follow Tyndale and Cranmer. Otherwise it is difficult to see how we should ever have had our present version. To make this the more forcibly felt by the common reader I will detain him on the following case:

A competent school-teacher announces to his class of boys that on the next Monday each must bring with him a Greek New Testament; and that the class will proceed to read it through. Accordingly, on the day named each is present with his book as directed. The reading commences; and soon the word *pneuma* is met with. It is boldly and confidently rendered spirit. On the reading goes; often the word occurs; and every time it is uniformly rendered spirit, till a hundred times are reached. The boys have now not a doubt as to how the word is to be rendered. Another hundred times are passed, and still another; yet every time the word is rendered spirit. Eighty-five times more are passed, still the word is rendered spirit. But the eighty-sixth is reached; and now the class is checked, and authoritatively told that the word must be rendered *wind*. Now surely this can be justified by no ordinary reason; yet let me tell the reader that this is precisely what has been done without any reason. Indeed, I venture the assertion, that beyond the limits of the New Testament such an instance of translation can not be produced in universal literature. If it were demanded by some inexorable necessity in the nature of the case, or by any imperious verbal or circumstantial necessity, then certainly would it be allowable. But such is not the case. Indeed, so far as I can see, it has not even the vestige of ground to justify it. I hence deem it wholly false. *Pneuma should be rendered spirit, not wind*. The word thus rendered, and we translate the whole verse as follows:

The Spirit breathes where it sees fit, and you hear its voice, but know not whence it comes and where it goes; thus is begotten every one who is begotten by the Spirit.

On this passage arise three questions, namely, What act of the Spirit does the word breathe express? Is it true that we of this day know not whence the Spirit comes and where it goes, or is the clause applicable to us? And can the rendering, *thus is begotten every one*, be defended? These questions I shall now dispose of in the order in which they are here put.

1. What act of the Spirit does the word breathe express? Be it what it may, one thing is clear, in the act something proceeds from the Spirit which is *heard*. This word, then, suggests a probable answer to the question. The Holy Spirit, as far as known to man, never performs but one act in which anything is heard by him; and that is the act of speaking to him. The act of speaking, then, is most probably the act denoted by the word breathe. With this, moreover, agrees the

word *voice*. For the almost, if not universal rule governing this word is that, though a term expressing sound generally, yet whenever it expresses the voice of a person it is the voice of that person heard in the act of speaking. But in the case in hand it expresses the voice of a person, the Spirit. Hence, to a high degree of probability, it is the voice of the Spirit heard in the act of speaking. Joining these two circumstances with the *fact* that the Holy Spirit does speak to man, and that in this way we do hear its voice, and I feel the conclusion to be certain that the word breathe expresses an act of speaking.

But where and how does the Spirit speak to man? It speaks to him now only in the inspired word. It spoke anciently to him through the prophets; more recently it has spoken through God's Son; and still more recently through the apostles; but through all these now in the written word. In an unembodied form the Holy Spirit has never communicated a thought to a human mind or uttered a word in human ears. When in man it speaks through him, to him, for him, and in no other way. Hence the voice of the Spirit which we now hear is his articulate voice as found in the Bible.

2. Is it true that we of this day know not whence the Spirit comes and where it goes, or is the clause applicable to us? I answer: I think the clause not applicable to us of the present day, for the reason that in no sense intelligible to me can it be said that we know not whence the Spirit comes and where it goes. Indisputably it comes from God to the saints, and is sent in the name of Christ. But this, though true of us, is precisely what was not true of Nicodemus. We have information on the point which he had not. In his day, therefore, the clause was true of him, and hence applicable to him, but of us it is neither. As yet the Savior had taught nothing respecting the Spirit, the apostles had taught nothing, the New Testament was not written. That, therefore, was true of Nicodemus, at the time, which is not true of us, and which also ceased to be true of him, if he lived, as soon as the Spirit was sent. Hence, in construing the verse, we must construe it as all applicable to him, but as applicable to us only with the clause in hand omitted. In one view only can the clause be deemed applicable to us of the present. If the Spirit be conceived of as roaming up and down on the face of the earth, in some occult manner unmentioned in the Bible and unintelligible to man, then may we construe the clause of ourselves. In any other view it must be held as applying only to Nicodemus; and only when applied to him has it any appreciable meaning. The view of the clause here maintained relieves the verse in hand of at least half the confusion under which it usually labors. It is presented, not as indisputable, but as seeming to be necessary, and hence as freeing a passage of Scripture of no little difficulty.

3. Can this rendering, *thus is begotten every one*, be defended? The

question can not be confidently answered; and no impression is here sought to be made on the mind of the reader which facts will not fully warrant. In many cases, even when truth is on our side, it is best to be cautious and problematic, rather than certain; and the present we deem one of those cases. But, in the first place, it should be stated that the foregoing is not a translation *ad verbum*, as the old schoolmen used to phrase it, but a translation *ad sensum*; that is, it is an attempt merely to give the sense without pretending to represent each word in the original by some corresponding English word. This is often done in translating, but whether it is demanded in the present case is the question. Certainly something is demanded. This is obvious from a word-for-word translation, such as the following: *The Spirit breathes where it sees fit, and you hear its voice, but know not whence it comes and where it goes; thus is every one who is begotten by the Spirit.* The sense is here clearly incomplete. Hence involuntarily we ask the question: *How* is every one who is begotten by the Spirit? This question we would not ask were the sense of the passage full. But in order to render it full, and to leave no question to be asked, we must use one word more than is in the original. Are we at liberty to do this? Certainly it is often done in translating, but should it here be done? If not, then the passage is an eternal enigma. Now, though I would not express a decided opinion, I believe the extra word should be used. My reasons for so believing are concisely these: First, the sense of the verse is incomplete without the word. There is, therefore, a necessity for some word. Second, to supply the word *begotten* not only completes the sense, but gives a sense in strict accordance with what the Scriptures clearly teach elsewhere. In a doubtful case, these two reasons for a particular conclusion, with none against it, would generally be thought sufficient. I believe we may safely accept them as so in the present case.

I will now adduce a passage similar to the present one—similar in these three respects: that a word has to be supplied to complete the sense; that it is supplied from the passage itself; and that when supplied the resulting sense, is confirmed by other teachings of holy writ. The passage is the following:

"But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive. For the Holy Spirit was not yet *given*, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii., 39.)

In this verse we have the word *given*; yet in the original there is no word to correspond to it. The verse translated nakedly, or word for word, reads thus: But this he said respecting the Spirit which they should receive who believe in him; for the Holy Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified. Here the sense is obviously incomplete; nor is any translator deemed in the least blamable for supplying a word to complete it. But the word supplied should be the word *received*, not the word *given*, thus: "But this he said respect-

ing the Spirit which they should receive who believe in him; for the Holy Spirit was not yet *received*, because Jesus was not yet glorified." Here the sense is clear and good; and in order to render it so, we merely repeat a word found in the passage itself. The sense, moreover, is confirmed by other portions of the New Testament. Now the liberty which all take with this verse is the only liberty we ask in translating the verse in hand. That is, we only ask liberty to complete the sense, and this by repeating a word in the verse itself. This done, and the verse reads thus: "The Spirit breathes where it sees fit, and you hear its voice, but know not whence it comes and where it goes; thus is *begotten* every one who is begotten by the Spirit."

Let us now, for the sake of rendering the sense of the verse perfectly obvious to all, omit the clause "but know not whence it comes and where it goes." The verse will then read: "The Spirit breathes where it sees fit, and you hear its voice, thus is begotten every one who is begotten by the Spirit." How, then, is a person begotten by the Spirit? *By hearing its voice*. But where only is its voice now heard? In the word of truth. *Then a person is begotten by the Spirit by hearing the truth*. Such is the conclusion we at last reach. That it is correct no one need be told who remembers the following from James: "Of his own will begot he us *with the word of truth*;" and this from Peter: "Begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*." Thus, therefore, it appears that my conclusion is correct, whether the preceding translation and comments are or not. Here then, for the present, I shall end this part of my task.

Consequently, from all the preceding it appears that in being born of the Spirit, the human spirit is the subject of the change; the Holy Spirit the agent who effects it; and hearing the truth the means by which it is effected.

Only one question more remains to be answered, namely, When this change is effected in the human spirit, in what does it consist? The following from John (1st letter, 5th ch.), will supply us with the answer at once: "*Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been begotten of God*." From this passage one of two conclusions indisputably results: either to be begotten of God is to believe, or this includes that; since it is impossible to find a believer who is not begotten of God. I accept the view that to be begotten of God and to believe, are identical. Now that to be begotten of God, and to be begotten of the Spirit, are merely two different expressions for the same change, I shall take for granted. Hence to be begotten by the Spirit is to believe.

Finally, to be born of water is to be immersed; and to be begotten by the Spirit, to believe. Hence every one of whom these two facts can be affirmed is in the kingdom of God; every one of whom either one can be denied is out of it. If this conclusion be true, well may we exclaim: Lord, have mercy on the so-called Christian world I

REPLY TO THE QUESTION—SHOULD CHRISTIANS GO TO
WAR?

BRO. LARD:—I have read with interest your argument on the question: "Should Christians go to war?" I am about to raise an issue with you, but I do it with great respect for the humane and Christian sentiments which prompted your article. I accept your statement of the question, and agree with you that the primary question is: Can a Christian use force? In my review I will commence with the affirmative argument, which you state and answer toward the close of your article.

You quote Romans xiii., 1-3: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resists the power, resists the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." You say: "The argument based on this passage is concisely the following: All legitimate war is an act of the State and not of the individual. The passage in hand binds every Christian to be obedient to the State. Hence, if the State commands the Christian to engage in war, he is bound to obey."

Your quotation of Scripture authority and statement of the affirmative argument are both incomplete. You ought to have included the fourth verse in your quotation from Romans xiii.

Now let me state the affirmative argument: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resists the power, resists the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. (Romans xiii., 1-4.)"

Now, whatever this passage does not teach, it does teach plainly these truths:

1. Civil government is an ordinance of God—that it is God's will that communities of men shall be governed by laws.
2. That rulers have a legitimate work.
3. That the use of force by a government in the execution of just laws is sanctioned by the Almighty. "He beareth not the sword in vain; he is a terror to evil-doers."

Thus much, I suppose, you will admit. Indeed, the very idea of

government implies force. For what is a law without a penalty, or a penalty without the power to inflict it?

If these premises be true, then the conclusion is inevitable. With the divine sanction, a lawful civil government can use force to execute its laws against evil-doers. Here, arises the question: What force? Not simply the force that lies in the puny arm of the ruler; such an assumption is absurd. It must mean the physical force of the people put forth by their agents, few or many, as the necessity may demand. But, say you, a Christian can not be such an agent. Then no man can, for no man is allowed by the divine law to do wrong.

If a thing is right to be done, then a Christian may, under proper circumstances, do it. Christianity does not forbid a Christian from engaging in any lawful work or business of human life. Some circumstance may forbid him from many lawful callings; but if a thing to be done has a divine warrant, then to do it is not sinful.

You waive the question, "Is there any such thing as legitimate war?" My dear brother, you waive the main question. If there be such a thing as a divinely legitimate war, you would find it difficult to show that a Christian could not engage in it. If God gives 'a State, under certain circumstances, a right to wage war, then it clearly becomes the duty of its citizens to carry it on.

You say: "The moment the State commands the Christian to do anything contrary to Christianity, no matter what it may be, or how great the necessity for it, he is bound to disobey." (p. 242.) Certainly; but this begs the question. For if God gives the State authority to use force to execute its laws against evil-doers, such use of force is not contrary to Christianity, and your argument fails.

Let me put a case. Certain base, and wicked, and lawless men stir up a mob in a large city. Houses are burned and innocent lives are destroyed. A Christian brother is mayor, and he issues a proclamation calling on all able-bodied men to unite with the police force to resist the march of violence and the destruction of life and property. What is the duty of a Christian citizen? Not what he might be excused for doing in the excitement of the hour; but, what is his duty?

I hold that, according to the thirteenth of Romans, the mayor and other municipal authorities are allowed to use force; and that being the case, a Christian may join his fellow-citizens to resist the mob, and that in so doing he is not violating any divine command, but is simply an officer of the law, a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon them that do evil.

What is true in case of domestic violence could not be less true in the case of a wanton foreign invasion, whose object is the overthrow of the laws and the destruction of the homes of a people.

The argument might be made more elaborate, I have endeavored to make it plain. In answering your negative argument, I will have occasion still further to elucidate and illustrate the positions and arguments already advanced.

Your first negative argument is drawn from the source whence wars spring, and you quote James iv., 1: "Whence are wars and battles among you? Are they not hence from your lusts that war in your members."

You say, here lust is set down as the cause of all wars. Whether you are right in your interpretation of the passage or not, I will not question. Your premise is certainly true. Lust is the cause of all wars. "All wars are wrong." Granted. But the lust and wrong may be all on one side. There is terrible guilt somewhere in every war, the question is where. One party may be just and orderly, the other lustful and ambitious; then the crime is with the latter party.

It is true both parties in a war may be wrong; but it is a sufficient answer to your argument to show that one party alone may be wrong and must bear all the guilt. You find a thief in your room at night, and a conflict ensues. Whence the strife? Lust. But who is guilty of the lust and responsible for the strife, you, or the thief, or both? The answer is easy. The thief is the guilty party. In war, as in other strifes, there may be the unhallowed criminal urged on by lust, and the innocent victim, or intended victim.

2. "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." (John xviii., 36.) This is Christ's disclaimer of any rivalry between his kingdom and the kingdoms of the world. They have their mission,—his kingdom a different one. Christ rules over the heart, and takes cognizance of its most secret thoughts and intents; earthly rulers take cognizance of the outward actions. A man must actually take the life of his enemy before he can be lawfully convicted at a human tribunal, but in the kingdom of Christ he that hateth his brother is a murderer.

You say if ever there was an act that might be resisted it was the execution of Jesus. Yes; but while it was not the duty of his disciples by violence to rescue him, it was the duty of Pilate, and for that betrayal of his duty he is universally execrated. It was not the function of Peter to draw the sword to rescue the Master, it was the function of Pilate. If an officer of the law, or some military officer, comes to a prayer meeting to arrest Bro. Lard, it is not the duty of the brethren to shoot him, it is the duty of the government to protect Bro. Lard, if innocent.

The distinction between an earthly kingdom and the church is here declared; but the functions of an earthly government are not abrogated.

Under this head you say, by this declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world," "the Christian is taken completely out of the world." "His citizenship is changed." "If the Christian go to war, he must to that extent go out of the kingdom and back into the world." (p. 233.) These expressions seem to imply, if they do not plainly declare, that, in your estimation, when a man becomes a Christian he is no longer a citizen of any earthly kingdom. Not so thought Paul. While a citizen of the kingdom that is not of this world, he still claimed the immunities and protection due to a Roman citizen. "And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by: Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying: Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came and said unto him: Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered: With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said: But I was free-born." (Acts xxii., 25-28.)

In the twenty-third chapter of Acts we have an account of Paul's seeking and securing military protection from a Roman officer when a conspiracy was formed against his life. I am a citizen of the kingdom of God, but by that fact not less an American citizen, entitled to the protection of the laws and liable for a just share of the public burdens.

3. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." You ask: "If now the will of God were as perfectly done on earth as it is in heaven, does there live a Christian who believes we should ever have another war? Surely not." I say, too, surely not. Your fallacy here is like the fallacy of your preceding argument.

If the will of God were as perfectly done on earth as it is in heaven not another man would go to jail, but not another man would steal. If a man steals he is liable to go to jail—and the will of God is not done on earth as it is in heaven. But who is responsible? Not the officer of the law; but the thief.

4. Your fourth argument is drawn from the two following passages: "Then said Jesus to him: Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." (Matt. xxvi., 52.) Again: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed by the sword." (Rev. xiii., 10.)

The first passage (Matt. xxvi., 52,) you say must be taken in its most comprehensive sense. "It does not apply merely to men who take the sword for this purpose, but not to men who take it for that. It applies to all men who take the sword, whether in the kingdom of Christ or out of it, of to-day or to-morrow."

You argue: "It is wrong, universally wrong, to take the sword."

The passage is a strong one, but whatever it means it can not mean that all who take the sword shall literally perish by the sword, for Washington, Wellington, Scott, and thousands of others, have taken the sword and yet died naturally, in an old age, at home. It is a strong rebuke of Peter, but can not mean that it is wrong for lawful civil rulers to bear the sword, for they are invested with this power by the divine sanction. Your argument makes it wrong universally to bear the sword. So Paul did not argue.

The quotation from Revelations, I think, has no value in the argument. It is simply a prophecy of the fate of the beast that blasphemed the name of God and made war on the saints. With as much propriety and reason I might adduce Rev. xviii., 6, in support of the affirmative argument, where the people of God are commanded to reward Babylon even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she has filled, fill to her double." But I have long since learned not to take the strong and highly figurative utterances of the prophets as literal specific precepts.

5. The following supplies your fifth argument: "But I say to you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who spitefully use you and persecute you." (Matt. v., 44.) You argue that a Christian man can not love his enemy and at the same time take his life. Men sometimes are condemned to be hung for murder, and a humane man with tears executes the sentence of the law against the criminal, praying for him all the while.

To execute the law against a criminal does not necessarily involve malice and hatred. And whether war be ever right or not, I doubt not many a man has marched to battle sorrowfully and tenderly, from the profoundest conviction of duty, and without the slightest tinge of malice and hatred. True, in war thousands of comparatively innocent boys perish; but they are responsible who provoked the wars, not they who maintain law and public justice. Many wars might be prevented by arbitration. War is always a guilty thing. Your fallacy, and it runs through your whole article, is, having the guilty character of war admitted, to ascribe its guilt to all who engage in it; whereas one party may have all the guilt. A soldier must be an officer of the law; and if that is his business, he is no more culpable than the president, and governor, and legislators, and judges, and sheriffs. If a Christian may not be a soldier, he may not be a judge or juryman, and send thieves to the penitentiary and murderers to the gallows. If for the maintenance of public order, and the security of life and property, judges and juries are necessary, so are soldiers and public officers.

6. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do

to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." (Matt. vii., 12.) Your argument here is: "Would we now, in any case conceivable or possible, have an individual take our life? The answer is overwhelming—we would not."

Now, my dear brother, do you not see what havoc you make with all law by this loose interpretation of the golden rule *I*

This law is a rule of righteousness, and demands of us righteousness as the rule of our lives, and then as the measure by which we are to determine our duty to others. The rule of right which we would have others apply to us, we must apply to them. No man in any conceivable case would like to be confined in prison—therefore the jailer must open the prison and let the thief and murderer escape. A bloody rioter would not like to be arrested, and certainly the public officer, clothed with the authority of the law, would not like to be arrested; surely this is no reason why the rioter should be allowed to escape. We are to determine our duty by this law upon the hypothesis that we intend to do right and not wrong. If a man places himself in a guilty attitude, this law is not to shield his guilt. You find a man firing your house and are tempted to arrest him, when you argue: I would not like in any possible case to be arrested—therefore the man must be allowed to escape. If a man is a violator of the laws, and places himself in violent opposition to them, while this divine law will constrain our pity, it will not justly protect him from the consequences of his guilt.

I. Your seventh argument is a reiteration of the others. The reasoning in answer to your fifth argument is applicable here. To your argument, that a man who is under the influence of the spirit that induces peace can not at the same time engage in war by the sanction of that spirit, I reply: It is possible that a man may sometimes go to war because he loves peace and opposes lawless violence. Most men who engage in war, I admit, have a different spirit; so do most men who engage in business. I do not affirm that all men who engage in legitimate war are actuated by proper motives; but that it is possible some men who engage in war may be actuated by proper motives, and be free from hatred, malice, and revenge.

You may now ask for a single instance where one party to a war was clearly right and the other clearly wrong. A party of lawless adventurers, playing on the ignorance and passion of a portion of our people, gather a crowd of followers on our northern borders, and, with arms, music, and banners, march into Canada, to overthrow its laws and to despoil its people. Now of what possible use is a human government, if, under such circumstances, it may not drive back these lawless invaders and maintain the just authority of its laws? And if the government of Canada has the right to use force, there is nothing in Christianity forbidding the Christian people of Canada from form-

ing part of that force, else we would have the strong anomaly of Christianity forbidding what is right, just, and honorable; or forbidding what it allows.

How are we to determine when a war is right? By the light of God's word, and the facts in the case. My argument is closed. I would be sorry to think it would engender strife or encourage the spirit of war. I will be glad if it shall even incidentally throw any light on the vexed and grievous problem.

While I can not agree with you in argument, I am sure I do agree with you in the love of peace, and the desire to see men united in one great brotherhood, and submitting to the just authority of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

J. S.

THE ARTICLE OF J. S. — The spirit and courtesy of the preceding article are faultless. On this ground, therefore, it has our highest respect and warmest commendation. Nothing can be more lovely than to see Christian men discussing these exciting themes with the fine bearing which is everywhere apparent in the foregoing piece. Nothing but good can result from such discussions when thus conducted.

We think the article obviously too short. With many this will be a very pardonable fault. In the present case it is a matter for regret. The topic is too important to be treated with injurious brevity. Greater fullness in statement, and more elaborateness of argument were certainly both legitimate and necessary. We should have felt twice the number of pages neither a trespass on our space, nor a tax of our patience.

In argument, we confidently regard S.'s effort as strikingly inconclusive; though we are ready to own some of its parts quite sharp and well put. A formal reply to it we do not think necessary. It is to be viewed rather in the light of an objection to the piece to which it replies, than as in any sense amounting to a refutation. It is a handsome reply, and suggests some difficulties; but it leaves the argument against war, as to the Christian, untouched. It embodies about all that can be said on that side of the question. But that a Christian should ever go to war is certainly not herein shown. Indeed, this, we do not hesitate to say, will never be done. I regret that S. did not go more minutely into the discussion, and deal with the whole question on its merits. By this the indefensibility of his cause would only have been the more apparent. Some may be disposed to think that he could have carried his point had he said more. We feel sure he could not have done it. *It will never be shown that a Christian must in any case go to war.* So, at least, I think.

OUR RELATIONS TO THE INVISIBLE.

No mortal man can know how close and familiar are the relations which he sustains to the invisible world. Were his fleshly tabernacle dissolved but for a single moment, and were his spirit permitted to exercise its free and unrestrained powers, he would be startled by reason of his propinquity to persons and places commonly regarded as far remote from the regions of mortality. The general belief of mankind banishes the spirits of the departed, together with all beings and things of celestial growth, to some dreamy realm beyond the most distant star.

We are taught to look for God only above the blue empyrean, and to regard all the facts and interests pertaining to futurity as far, very far, removed from this sublunary sphere. While it is entirely true that our final home, associations, and employments are measurably shrouded in mystery, and that at best we can learn but little of the future in the present, still we are solemnly commanded to learn that little. I want to learn something of the land whither I am journeying. I desire, while in the flesh, to mold my manners in correspondence to those with whom I am destined to live forever. I desire not to step unbidden into the realms of the unknown, nor to mingle with the society of that dim and shadowy land, till the Master himself pronounces me ready. I have no disposition whatever to weigh anchor till I know that my frail bark will be safely convoyed into some peaceful harbor. I want not to go one minute before God's good time. No matter what may lie before me. No matter what of sickness, suffering, toil, penury. No matter whether in midlife, in the strength and glory of my matured faculties, I suddenly fall like a broken column; or whether in the evening of tranquil old age, with the ambitions of life all satisfied, it should please my Lord to call me; I want only to be ready. I can not speak lightly or flippantly of my departure from the present world. The hateful form of Death stands ever before me and casts a dark shadow on my life. It is not that I distrust the Savior; it is not that my faith in his sustaining grace for one instant wavers; but, nevertheless, I dread to grapple in mortal combat with that grim giant. The very thought, notwithstanding the power of the resurrection, makes me shudder. I know that, for the present, at least, he will conquer! My fingers are benumbed as I write this sentence: I know that Death will conquer!

Unblessed with the light of revelation, I can easily understand how a man should seek exemption from the sorrows of the present by violently invading the *sanctum sanctorum* of his own precious life. The philosophy of Plato and Cicero on the subject of suicide is not to

my mind wholly enigmatical. Spiritually, these ancient sages sat in the region and shadow of death; but to us, upon whose horizon the star of hope has risen, the case is vastly different.

"There's the respect,
That makes calamity of so long life;
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes,
When he himself might his quietus make
With a bare bodkin?—Who would fardels bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life;
But for the dread of something after death,—
The undiscover'd country, from whose bourne
No traveler returns,—puzzles the will;
And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
Than fly to others that we know not of?"

I desire then, I repeat, to be ready. Kind and merciful Father, stand by thy child in that terrible ordeal through which he knows he must shortly pass; and as his feet shall enter the cold, dark river, may he realize that the everlasting arms are beneath him, and that the eternal God is his refuge.!

But, as looking to this question of readiness, I want to familiarize my mind as much as possible with the invisible. As I can not look upon the things of the unseen with mortal eye—at least, ordinarily this can not be done, nor indeed is it at all necessary—let me look upon them with the eye of faith. Let me avail myself of such helps as have been thrown in my way. Let me seize upon everything in revelation, in nature, in art, that promises the slightest assistance in even the most partial elucidation of this fascinating theme. And there is deep necessity for this. We are too much engrossed with the earthly and sensual. We think too little and too superficially of the things which are at the present hidden from the most searching and penetrating earthly vision. There is great danger that the visible, and therefore temporal, will engross our whole attention. No doubt some man, representative of a large class, will read the heading of this article and instantly decide in his own mind that all which follows is but the fancy of an idle, impracticable, speculative dreamer, and so throw it aside without another thought or care. But, to my mind, there is not a more intensely practical question than that of my relations to another world; and if we reject the doctrine of any subject simply because the subject itself involves facts and consequences ulterior and invisible, then will we have but little remaining to us between heaven and earth. It may be safely affirmed that nothing now visible is eternal, or destined to endless existence. The things which are seen are temporal; this settles the question. A man does not hope for that which he can see; but if he hopes for that which he

can not see, then does he with patience wait for it. I am amazed to know to how great an extent we live by faith; to know how the principle of faith permeates all the ramifications of life; to know how largely we trust in the unseen. And yet how little is really thought and said on the subject! What *can* be seen? What *is* seen? Simply the outside of things—the shell, the husk, the gross external wrapping—that is all. We can not see the life, the real power, the principle of absolute and essential consequence, in anything. I have a companion. This companion I call my spirit, my life. This spirit has been living with me more than thirty years. Sleeping or waking, it has never for one moment left me. This spirit, the subjective I, has made my body the instrument of all that has ever been accomplished and attributed to the objective me. By a metonymy, men speak of the work, the potency, the agency, of the unseen, as the work, the potency, the agency, of the seen. This spirit dwells in what is called my body, but really it is the spirit's body. Sometimes it condescends to inform the objective me of its labors; sometimes it does not. It flies on restless wing. The body becomes weary; it seeks rest. Not so the spirit. All night long it is wakeful, watchful, and at work. I do not think that in all these thirty odd years my spirit has rested or slept for one second! And yet I have never seen it. Apparently it is capricious, and takes all manner of liberties with me. Sometimes it employs my bodily faculties; again it disdains to touch them. Indeed, I am distinctly conscious that at times the dull sluggish body is greatly in the way of the spirit; that the spirit can get on with its labors much better without it. The body has worn itself out, at times, in its vain efforts to accomplish that, with the spirit's aid, which when the body had sunk to sleep the spirit easily performed without it. Thus, when all the physical powers were inactive, the spirit, untiring in its labors, has found the solution of a mathematical problem, previously abandoned in despair. It has, in the night watches, turned to the page of ancient lore, and the passage in a dead tongue that in my waking moments seemed utterly dark and inexplicable became luminous under the spell of the spirit's power. But still, I repeat, I have never seen it.

Next, I will look at this physical universe in which I live. I see its frame-work. I behold the scaffolding of the temple erected by the fiat of Almighty God. But I see nothing more. Proud philosophy tells me this all. Infidelity tells me that all is mere matter; that my hope of eternal spiritual existence is only a vagary of my diseased brain. Atheism tells me that the world came by chance, and that there is no principle within, or connected with my own body, that will survive the tomb. Admit the atheistical argument in any degree, and then I am quite willing to rest in the conclusion arrived

at by one of the world's great thinkers: "*Nullus in microcosmo spiritus, nullus in microcosmo Deus.*" In one word, I will banish God from the universe; I will exclude the idea of spiritual existence, in any sense, from man; and extinguish the last flickering ray of light that now rests upon the darkness of the grave.

But I return directly to the question of the physical universe. I see not the secret forces, the hidden powers, that control and propel this magnificent machinery. There is a hand that moves the planets in their appointed orbits, and turns the seasons round; but this hand I never saw. I am convinced of the existence of a force in nature that I call electricity; I never saw it, but still I believe in its existence. I take this agent; I press it into my service; I establish a connection between it and my mind; and in a second's time I talk with my friend a thousand miles away. Even while I pen these lines it flashes across the ocean's bed, and talks to me from the capitals of the Old "World. We may possibly hear the rustle of its wings; with bated breath we may listen while it whispers its message; but we have never seen it. That which most engages the attention of the philosopher, that which throws its fascinating spell around him and binds him longest to his labors, is where the visible trenches closest upon the borders of the invisible. I take up a flower. There is something tangible in this thing which I hold in my hand. Here are roots, trunk, bark, leaves, etc. But here also are other things. Here are the stamen, the pollen, the pistil; here are the witching tintings of the petal; and now I pass the boundary line of the visible, and lo! the life of this flower breathes its pure fresh breath into my nostrils, and delights my olfactory organs with perfumes the most rare and exquisite. I look upon a musical instrument. I see the rich wood; I carefully inspect all the material which enter into its composition; my eye is pleased with the chaste veneering, with the elegant and elaborate carving; all this is both interesting and gratifying. But, hark! Those chords are swept by a master-hand; and shape, size, costliness, beauty, all are forgotten in the weird melodies that in turn enchant and soothe my spirit. Something unseen has appealed to the divinity that is within me, and my soul is satisfied. I cast my eyes upon a primeval wood. I see the stately monarchs of the forest as they lift their lofty trunks high above the earth. I feel my spirit awed and overwhelmed in the presence of the silent grandeur. But I know not that I am so much impressed with the grand and more rugged aspects of the scene, as I am with the delicate foliage, the wavy, undulating, pendulous leaves and branches, as they reach outward and upward to the dim borders of the invisible, and are lost to sight in the blue heavens above me. Moreover, what is earth—what those silvery orbs that sparkle in the dome of night, but the external and sensible development of ideas which existed" in the mind of the

invisible God anterior to their creation? No one can look upon these transcendent exhibitions of the Lord Almighty without speculating upon the higher dignity and glory of that throne which, notwithstanding all these outward illustrations of its majesty, is to our weak senses enshrouded in clouds and darkness. Now I hold that the study of the invisible, the things which are not seen, strengthens, expands, and exalts the intellectual and purely spiritual nature of man. While thus engaged the mind is insensibly elevated above the gross and perishable, and becomes more and more assimilated to the nature of those bright intelligences that circle round the throne of the Eternal. Thus poetry, painting, sculpture, and music are so many efforts of the spirit to embody in tangible form the unseen ideals imprisoned in their several hearts.

As a further and probably more striking example of our interest in, and the amazing proximity of our relations to, the creatures of the unseen world, let us briefly consider the question of abstract thought, or, more strictly speaking, that faculty of the mind we call thinking. Now what, let me inquire, in the graduated scale of being, distinguishes man from all other animals? It is not longevity, for many of them are longer lived than man. It is not strength, for many of them are stronger than he. It lies not in the component parts of their bodily organism, for these are similar to his own. In what, then, is found the difference? I answer, in thought. But what is thought? Who ever saw a thought? What does thought, or a thought, resemble? Here all are dumb. No one ever saw a thought. We have seen the embodiment of thought, but the thought itself, *i. e.*, the naked, abstract thought, we have not seen. And yet it is thought that moves the world! That subtle essence which we call thought has the power of embodying itself in various forms of beauty and utility, and thus it fills creation with praise at its achievements. It constructs the keel that plows the ocean from shore to shore. It hitches its car to the lightning of heaven, and traverses the globe in an instant. It but wills, and empires, laws, and civilization are born of the wilderness. It waves its magic wand, and the desert blossoms like the rose.

But let us inspect this phenomenon a little more narrowly. A partial analysis of thought, at least as our interests are directly and immediately affected by it, shows it to consist of two grand or leading departments. I shall call one of these departments the central, and the other the excursive. In this classification is embraced the idea, first, of the general tenor of each individual's thoughts; and, second, the excursive exercises of the thought faculty. Now we shall be affected differently as we are under the influence of the one or the other of these departments. The former may be regarded as the home thought of a man. For example: the miser may occasionally

think of government, social and intellectual progress, art, literature, and religion; he may sometimes think of angels and demons, of heaven and hell; but his usual current of thought, his central or home thought, is of his gold. The sinner may sometimes think of a suffering Savior; he may not unfrequently indulge thoughts of mercy, of pardon, of heaven; these are his excursive thoughts; they leave no ineffaceable impression upon his heart. But his usual current of thought, his central or home thought, is of the world and the things of the world. He thinks of the pleasures of sinful indulgence, the follies of this transitory life, and finally settles down upon a fixed and stubborn rejection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now the Christian may avail himself of any advantages offered by the department of excursive thought. This, no doubt, he will sometimes do. He will allow his mind to travel over the vast domains of earth, that he may store it with the treasures which he finds on the way. Like the bee in its busy toils, he may extract sweet from that which is bitter, as he ventures within the mysterious precincts of nature. He may descend into the subterranean passages of the globe, and there note the foot-prints of the centuries that have passed; or he may explore the paths of the sky beyond the morning star, and speak to us of new-born constellations on the utmost discoverable boundary of the awful expanse above us. The Christian, I say, may do, and the Christian has done, all this; but his home thought, the central thought of his heart, is concerning the salvation of his deathless spirit. From this anchor he never breaks. Though he traverse the labyrinth of the universe, this golden thread he ever holds in his hand.

But in all these excursive journeys the Christian has a fixed and definite object. To him all earthly knowledge is valueless, except as it strengthens his wing for his heavenly flight. This darling work of his heart has a tendency to centralize his thoughts and affections—to bring them to a focal point—to help him to some practical consummation. Without this centralizing, focalizing influence, life must necessarily prove in the end a most mortifying failure. Let me illustrate my meaning. Suppose you are leisurely strolling through a picture gallery. You are simply pleased with the general view which is presented. Perhaps you take no particular note of any one painting. You find your mind pleasantly excursive, flying from one picture to another till it sweeps the whole gallery. But you are suddenly informed that a certain picture there is a masterpiece of the celebrated Raphael. In a moment your wandering thoughts tend to the point of centralization, and that point is the painting of the great master. You are a connoisseur. You now examine with the utmost particularity all the minutiae of the picture, in order that you may acquire a knowledge of its artistic perfections. Thus the Christian. Though he may survey the glories of earth and sky, and invade the very arcana of nature her-

self, yet is he constantly reminded that all these things are the works of his Father—of Him whose word he peruses daily—of Him, with whom he holds constant communion—of Him who maketh the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice—of Him who binds the sweet influences of Pleiades, and looses the bands of Orion—of Him who brings forth Mazzaroth in his season, and guides Arcturus with his sons! The more our thoughts become centralized in the things of the invisible, the greater, the more earnest, will be our aspirations for heaven. One of our chief faults as Christians is manifested in the fact that we do not think enough, and with sufficient particularity, upon what is certainly ours.

Seated in that car is a young man, who, after an absence of many years, is returning to his native home. He looks out at a window upon the varied scenery presented, as in panorama, to his view, as he passes swiftly over the country. Nothing especially attracts his attention till a friend says to him: "That farm yonder has recently been purchased by your father, who intends it as a patrimony for you." How carefully he now examines the place as long as his rapidly retreating eye can descry the most distant hill-top. "It is a beautiful farm," he soliloquizes, "and I am rejoiced that my father has provided me with such an estate." But now he has passed entirely out of sight, and he calls up before his mental vision the hills, the meadows, the orchard, the mansion, everything. Why this new-born interest in that particular farm? A child can answer;—because he is the heir to it. It is his. So, my Christian brethren, is it not some consolation to us to know that, though poverty, toil, and affliction be our lot on earth, we shall one day inherit the stars? This world is mine. The millions of suns and planets that revolve in the shoreless depths of ether are mine. They belong to my Father, and I am heir to them. For all things are mine, and I am Christ's, and Christ is God's. It is heavenward we must look. It is the land of the unseen that must most deeply engage our life's best labors, and our heart's sweetest and holiest affections. This world, as such, has nothing but cruel, bitter disappointment. The story of the apples of Sodom is not entirely mythical. The legend of the golden fruit of Hesperides is not altogether fabulous. He whose soul's delight it is to revel in the sinful and delusive pleasures of earth, should remember that they are but the things, of a moment. That soon, very soon, they will pass away,

"Like a dream, that melts at early morn,
When the lark's anthem through the sky is borne:
Gone, like the wrecks that sink in ocean's spray;
And chill oblivion murmurs: 'Where are they?—'"

That young man, whose pleasure consists in horse-racing and gambling, will find neither blooded steeds nor race-courses, card-tables nor

faro-banks, in hell. That beautiful and attractive young lady, the divinity of whose worship is Terpsichore, will find no gay dancing in the gloomy halls of Tartarus. She whose ears are wont to be greeted with the sweetest symphonies of lute and harp will hear naught but the howl of demons and the eternal wail of lost spirits.

In this paper I set out with the proposition that we would be startled to know how close we sometimes, if not always, stand to persons and places invisible to fleshly eyes. Of the truth and reasonableness of this proposition, I think, we have the most abundant testimony in the Bible. In fact, what is the Bible but a grand record of the things of the unseen world? What is the Bible but a divine depository of facts concerning persons and places that no mortal eye has seen? But from the vast mass of evidence bearing directly upon the subject in hand, I will, for the sake of giving something like shape and system to my observations, select a very few passages as illustrative of our close and familiar relations to the invisible.

1. From the sixth chapter of the second book of Kings, I transcribe the following section: "Then the king of Syria warred against Israel, and took counsel with his servants, saying: In such and such a place shall be my camp. And the man of God [Elisha] sent unto the king of Israel, saying: Beware that thou pass not such a place; for thither the Syrians are come down. And the king of Israel sent to the place which the man of God told him and warned him of, and saved himself there, not once nor twice. Therefore, the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing; and he called his servants, and said to them: Will you not show me which of us is for the king of Israel? And one of his servants said: None, my lord, O king; but Elisha, the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber. And he said: Go and spy where he is, that I may send and fetch him. And it was told him, saying: Behold, he is in Dothan. Therefore sent he thither horses, and chariots, and a great host; and they came by night, and compassed the city about. And when the servant of the man of God was risen early, and gone forth, behold, an host compassed the city both with horses and chariots." And his servant said to him: Alas! my master, how shall we do? And he answered: Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said: Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw; and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." Now, in this passage there are several things very much to my purpose, a few of which I will notice. In the first place, the eyes of flesh are not the eyes with which, without special interposition, we see objects pertaining to the invisible world. This young man enjoyed the natural sense of sight. He walked out early in the morning, and beheld an innumerable host

of mailed warriors encamped around the city. These he saw. Filled with the most fearful apprehensions, he reports their apparently hopeless condition to his master. The venerable prophet, calm in that strength which the Lord God supplies, assures his servant that they have nothing to fear; that those who are for them are greater than those who are against them. How like mockery would this have sounded to the unbelieving, and to the man who knows nothing of our relations to the invisible! But now the prophet makes a prayer, a model prayer, a brief, pertinent, comprehensive prayer: "Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see." Now observe, the eyes of his body were open, and with them he saw the danger; therefore the prophet prays that the eyes of his mind may be opened, that with them he may see the protection, may see the invisible guard of heavenly beings which had been sent to encompass and defend them. His prayer is answered, and what is the result? Behold! the whole mountain is covered with horsemen and chariots of fire and warrior-angels that excel in strength. Of course, infidelity will set all this aside with a single dash of the pen as an optical illusion; and skepticism will prate of the age of miracles; but I take the words in their sober, legitimate sense, and with all my heart believe it was just as reported. Again: no one will pretend to deny that, in the event of a battle, the Syrian myriads would have been swept from the earth like chaff before a whirlwind. Here, then, standing right round the prophet and his servant, was physical force, invisible to mortal eyes, sufficient to annihilate a vast and well-appointed army. Once more: it argues nothing against our theory, that we can not see these supernal agencies; or that these agencies may have existed then, but not now. It is needless to observe that this is a mere begging of the question. What was true in this case—I mean what of supernatural agency—may be true, and doubtless is true, in ten thousand other cases. I hence dismiss my first direct scriptural argument as overwhelmingly sustaining the position for which I contend.

I will now, before I proceed further, avow it as my firm belief, that we are objects of interest to the inhabitants of the unseen world; that we are constantly attended by angelic beings; that our friends who have preceded us across the boundary line of time take cognizance of us; that sometimes some persons are permitted to see those bright ministers before death; and lastly, if God would but touch our eyes we would see shining hosts of saints and angels standing thickly all around us.

2. From the seventh chapter of Acts I will now cite another relevant passage of Scripture: "When they [the Jews] heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him [Stephen] with their teeth. But he, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on

the right hand of God. And he said: Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Now let it be borne in mind, that this was not a miracle in the common acceptance of that term. Neither was Elisha's vision of the horsemen and fiery chariots; and in this, as well as in other important features, this vision is analogous to that. Emphatically, both were visions. A miracle is to be seen by the masses; but the masses did not witness these visions. Miracles are intended to confirm and instruct, and not simply to display power. But here were wonderful displays of power that no one saw, that taught no one, that confirmed no one, save only the two men for whom they were immediately intended. And in each case the desired effect was produced, namely, confirmation, strengthening, assurance, in the hour of need.

Now I account for the vision under consideration in this way: Stephen was the first Christian who died a violent death. He was standing in the streets of Jerusalem, surrounded by a furious mob. They thirsted for his blood, and he knew it. The stones were flying thick and fast. Now an arm is broken; now a limb is shivered. He is down. He is trampled beneath their feet. The welkin rings with hellish shouts as they cry, on to the death! God saw that it was necessary to come, in an extraordinary manner, to the help of his servant. And while by the vision he attested the truth of Stephen's discourse, and indorsed his fiery invective against the wicked and rebellious Jews, he at the same time strengthened his purpose to remain firm to the end. But all this was lost to those who stood by; to Stephen only it meant something, and, let me add, it means something to all who live as Stephen lived, and die in the faith in which he died. The results of this vision, therefore, apart from Stephen, could only be remote and not direct. And in this way all the saints are assured that, as in the death of the first, so in the death of the last and all the disciples of our Lord, he would be with them to succor, and comfort, and bless. Jesus died without so much as a hand, human or divine, to support his drooping head. But not so with his saints. No Christian dies by whose bed the Savior does not stand, and over whose sinking body he does not bend. And while heart-strings are breaking, and nature in the mighty throes of death is dissolving, Jesus whispers: "Fear not, I am with thee, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." Blessed Father, my soul grows wild at the thought. This hope of unseen aid alone reconciles me to the thought of death. Leaning upon his arm I hope to pass through death's dark vale, and from the thick folds of the cloud that overhangs the grave to shout back the triumphant note: All is well I

3. It is high noon. I am passing along one of the crowded thoroughfares of a great city. Men are hurrying to and fro in their busy chase for wealth. I look into their hard, sharp, furrowed faces,

their eager, hungry, peering eyes, and I see not one evidence of human sympathy or love. Their hearts are as unfeeling as the flagged pavements on which they walk, and their visages are all seamed and scarred with the lines of care. In their hurry and confusion they have trodden under foot a poor beggar, who lies at the gate of a marble palace. His cry of pain attracts my attention, and wretched indeed is the object which I now behold. Poor, wan, emaciated—he lies upon the cold stones, partially covered with filthy garments. Through the gaping rents of these I discover festering, running, disgusting sores. His body is a putrid mass, ready to fall to pieces. Disease, and want, and neglect have done their cruel work. Not a living soul pauses an instant to inquire into his condition, or minister to his wants. Oh! ye godless, christless, compassionless, money-loving throng, the hour comes apace when ye will beg for a drop of water to quench the tormenting flames of hell! But now I observe that the dogs, more merciful than their human masters, stop and lick this beggar's sores. I mount the polished steps that lead up to the gilded halls of this rich man's home, and I say: "Hark ye, men; the angels of God are all around us!" They slacken their pace; they look at me; they look at one another; they exchange meaning glances; they speak in subdued tones; I catch the words "crazy," "madman," etc., and they pass on. Again I proclaim: "Hark ye, men; the angels of God, in shining ranks, are bending over this spot!" This is met with obscene jests, and laughter so loud that it makes the welkin ring. "Nevertheless, men; I tell ye the very atmosphere is redolent with the balms of heaven brought on the wings of angels!" Again they hoarsely shout, shake their heads, mutter something about the carelessness of the keepers of lunatics, and rush on to their marts and their coffers. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Now, though this scene, recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Luke, is depicted in parabolic language, it militates not one jot from the conclusion I wish to reach. The Savior, in parables no more than in sober matter-of-fact discourse, would suppose or describe something impossible or likely never to occur. But rather by parables he teaches us that which is really, literally true; that which is possible; that which is probable. He shows us here, incidentally, the close proximity of things not seen to things seen. To heighten the contrast, he supposes a case of the most revolting penury and disease; one which we would conclude as most unlikely to be attended by any special marks of the divine compassion; and he shows us the angels of God bearing away this same ransomed spirit to the realms of light. And if Lazarus, why not all the saints? Will not they need the assistance of attending angels as well as he? How often have we read and heard of dying persons who affirmed that they enjoyed heavenly vis-

ions! These things, however, are generally set aside as the vagaries of fevered brains, as the fond fancies of distorted imaginations. But is this view satisfying? To my mind, not at all. I believe in these celestial visitations. Let me appeal to that mother, who kept her weary, anxious vigils round the couch of her dying child. How tenderly, how anxiously, she watched it! Every throe, every convulsion, of the little sufferer was a barbed arrow through her own heart. But now the closing scene draws nigh. The storm of intense suffering subsides, and the pulseless calm of death ensues. A bright smile overspreads that placid face; the babe opens its eyes; it points upward; and with a bound it rushes to the embrace of the beckoning angels. Tell me not that attending messengers were not there, and that the radiance of their shining wings was not reflected from the face of the dying infant. Ah! well do I remember that cold, dark night when, with my stricken companion, I stood over my own noble blue-eyed boy—my first-born, and the darling of my heart. Can I ever forget the fierceness of the struggle that was to decide the fate of my child? Would to God that I could blot out the painful recollection forever! It was attended with but a single mitigating circumstance. Coming out of a convulsion that had held him in its iron grip for hours, till every feature was distorted, and every well-remembered lineament effaced, his face was suddenly wreathed with smiles, as when the sun bursts through the rifted cloud, and pointing upward, as he cast a lingering gaze on us, he left our embrace, till the resurrection morning. I fancied that I heard the rustle of wings that bore my child to the bosom of our Father and God. Bishop McKendree, one of the purest and best men that ever lived, affirmed that in the hour of death his room was full of angels. And why not? They came for him; and if it was deemed necessary by infinite love and mercy that a view of their presence should cheer his heart in the death-agony—why, it was simply as he said—he saw them.

4. A last argument, in this paper, I base upon words collated from the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. In the first chapter, angels being the subject, he holds the following language: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to those who shall inherit salvation?" Again: in the twelfth chapter, he labors to encourage the afflicted Hebrew Christians by pointing out to them the superior advantages of Christianity over Judaism. This he does, in part, in the manner following: "You have come to Mount Zion, and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels." Now here, in the first place, it is positively and without qualification asserted, that all the angels are ministering spirits, *leitourgika pneumata*, and that they are sent forth. In the second place, it is well known that angels did occasionally appear to the patriarchs and prophets, but were not so much regarded as the guardi-

ans and attendants of the humble and lowly. But here Paul affirms that Christians have come to an innumerable company of angels. This is true not only of the prophet and priest, but of all the heirs of salvation. Blessed be God, we are not, after all, alone in this vale of sorrows! Were the thin veil of this bodily tabernacle rent, we could no doubt look into the mysterious realms of the invisible, and be able to hold communion with its beatified inhabitants. They are, unquestionably, much nearer to us than we imagine; but, for the present at least, it pleases infinite wisdom to debar us from sensible fellowship with them. I account for the fact of these celestial visions being granted only in the hour of death, because then the work of faith is done. Now we walk by faith; not by sight. The apostle Paul says that we are encompassed by a great cloud of witnesses. The necessary inference is, from the connection in which this declaration stands, that as the populations of whole cities and districts of country would crowd the amphitheatres as spectators of the Olympic games, even so the ancient worthies who have passed into the domains of immortality are interested witnesses of the race we are running.

In concomitance with, and growing out of our relations to, the invisible, there is a question of practical duty which I wish to enforce, while hastening to a conclusion.

1. *The Word of God.*—Life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel. The more we know of the Bible, the more learned will we be in the things of the invisible. It contains God's answer to all the questions of real interest to man's higher or spiritual nature. In the ratio in which we neglect the Bible will we lose our interest in the things which are not seen and eternal. But on the other hand, as we make ourselves masters of its precious contents, will we find our love for the invisible and imperishable increasing. Hence, the man who habitually disregards the Scriptures is a godless, worldly-minded man. The Bible is the only book that has to do expressly with the future and unseen. All outside of this volume is the merest, baldest conjecture. The world to-day is without one single spiritual thought or idea for which it is not indebted to the Word of God. Herein is the mind of God revealed; "for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Without the Word of God we can know nothing certainly of the future, nothing of the invisible, nothing of that which concerns us most.

"Fancy, hope, and conscience could not prove
A future state, without the Word of God.
This is hope's charter; this gives fancy power,
And this arms conscience with authority.
This partly lifts the veil, which else had hung
Before our eyes, concealing from our view
The spirit land."

2. *Faith.*—" Now faith is the sure confidence with respect to things *hoped for, a firm persuason with respect to things not seen.*" Observe the words which I have emphasized. There is nothing too high or too hard for faith. I mean faith as it respects our relations to God, and based upon his promises to the human family. By faith we turn away from the visible and perishable, and fix our ardent gaze upon the invisible and eternal. By faith we are satisfied that God is omnipotent; that he is able to do far more than the most fertile imagination can possibly conceive. By faith we humbly bow before him, and unflinchingly commit our most sacred and eternal interests to his sleepless care. We believe he will fulfill all his promises; that he will ultimately redeem our poor bodies from the bondage of corruption, and crown our spirits with everlasting joy. All this rests on faith. Without this faith my soul is as hopeless as a world without a God, as dark as a night without a star.

" However deep be the mysterious word,
 However dark, she disbelieves it not:
 When reason would examine, faith obeys,
 And, 'it is written,' answers every doubt.

" As evening's pale and solitary star
 But brightens while the darkness gathers round;
 So faith, unmoved amid surrounding storms,
 Is fairest seen in darkness most profound."

3. *Prayer.*—It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of prayer. What is it but holding communion with the infinite and eternal? Talking with our Father about those things which he will accomplish for us. The child, communing with his parent concerning his future inheritance. Prayer opens the door to unspeakable pleasures and beatific visions. While thus in humble sincerity bowing before the Father the light of his countenance is reflected upon us, and the future bliss of the saints is measurably revealed. In prayer, as a divinely appointed agency, is found real eloquence—eloquence as a power,—eloquence that moves. It is a species of eloquence that attracts and holds the ear of the great God himself,—

" While angels in their songs rejoice,
 And cry: Behold, he prays!"

I never feel so sure that God hears anything I utter, as when I try to pray.

I have stood upon a jutting crag of a mountain; clouds and darkness shut out the light, though I knew it was day. Above, beneath, around me,—all was veiled in gloomy shadows. It was dangerous to move from my position upon the rock; and so I calmly, and patiently waited. Presently the sun began his journey through the heavens. The struggling scarlet shafts of light penetrated the overhanging clouds; the darkness receded like the retiring waves from the ocean-rock; the zephyrs, born of the womb of the morning, lent

their gentle aid; when, lo! the mists and clouds were lifted from before my eyes, and there lay smiling at my feet a vale of enchanting beauty! Instead of dark abysmal regions, I discovered the abode of peace and plenty. So I have thought that faithful, earnest prayer often dissipates the gloom that rests upon the weary path of the wilderness; and dimly, at least, affords a passing glimpse of the promised land. The mists roll from the valley of our spiritual Canaan, and by faith we behold the fertile plains and flowery slopes of our heavenly home. It is divinely true that "they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint." Let us not be afraid of wearying God by reason of our frequent importunities at the throne of grace. Giving does not impoverish him; withholding does not enrich him.

"Man's plea to man is, that he never more
Will beg, and that he never begged before;
Man's plea to God is, that he did obtain
A former suit, and therefore sues again.
How good a God we serve, that when we sue,
Makes his old gifts the examples of his new!"

Finally, my Christian brethren, take the shield of faith, wherewith you shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God; and, praying always, with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance; look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." W.

W.'s ARTICLE. — Few Christians will read the foregoing without recognizing in it trains of thought and feeling which many a time have passed through their own minds. To some, they may not seem suited to the severe and sober gravity of a Quarterly. From all such we beg politely to dissent. We like the spirit's airy ramble when it goes in quest of what it shall hereafter be, and of the realities which truth and hope bid it expect. True, it may not be well to make life consist of glorious dreams, nor does W. do it; neither should we think it wise to fill our paper with little else, but, then, we propose nothing of the kind.

The visible implies the invisible; and these touch each other. If not, what lies between? Then there is a world dwelt in by spirits, angels and human spirits, and that we are related to this none can deny. Is it wrong to approach the mete of that world, and thrust your hand into the darkness which lies on it, and "feel after" those who occupy it till we come? I can not think it. I commend W.'s piece to the reading of every saint.

THE SUPPORT OF AGED PREACHERS.

MY regret is very sincere that any necessity should exist among us, as a people, to call attention to the subject here announced. This regret springs from two causes: first, that our aged preachers should ever be the subject of the least neglect; second, that a sense of simple justice should call me to discuss any question of dollars and cents in connection with their names. To the two preceding may be added still a third cause, namely, the known small effect my piece is to have in remedying the evil complained of. Still, if I can succeed in calling attention to even any extent to the subject, especially if I can succeed in exciting such an interest therein as shall end in relief being extended to any of the worthy and venerable men in whose behalf I write, then shall I feel more than repaid for the little work here done.

Of all the labor bestowed on the human family, none possesses for them the high value which the labor of the preacher possesses, yet none is so poorly repaid as is his. Why is this? Can the combined wisdom of the world furnish a satisfactory answer? It can not. Will Christians ever be able to acquit themselves before God for the fact? Never. Here is clearly a wrong, a great wrong,—a wrong which to-day is crying in the ears of the Judge,—a wrong whose voice will not be hushed, and which I pray my brethren not to slight. I mean, of course, the deep wrong of undervaluing the labors of the devoted preachers of God, and of making them a consequent inadequate return. Better for a man that he should never have been worth a cent, than to receive the labors of these men and to withhold from them the reward which is due. Will my brethren bear with me while, in kindly mood, I hold with them some talk on the topic?

Pause one moment, courteous Christian brother, for it is to you I write, and not to the captious, covetous faultfinder, and inquire who you are and what. You call yourself a Christian. That is an honor indeed. I am thankful for it, and thankful that it is yours. What now would you be willing to accept in exchange for it? Could gold in any amount, or gems of any value, induce you to barter it? Do you not rather feel half insulted by the question? No; you would not part from that honor. You have seen the guilty, hopeless man approach his end. You have stood by him and seen him die, have pressed the cup of cool water to his lips and wiped the death-drop from his brow; you have heard him warn others not to live his life, have heard his deep bitter groans; you have seen him part from his sobbing wife still clinging to him in the death-struggle; and you have seen him take leave of his children, John and James and Sallie; have seen him raise his thin

lean hand and point with bony fingers to his sinful life, and warn them not to follow it; have heard his last hoarse whisper, "I am gone, I am lost;"—all this you have seen. You have then turned aside from that horrid scene, and walked the yard with folded arms and mused, and drawn contrasts. "I am thankful I am a Christian," you have said; nay, you have done more than say it, you have *felt* it—that is better still. What now would be your price on your interest in Christ, your hope in the better life? I well know your embarrassment, and shall not press you for a reply. But, then, you were once not a Christian; you were once a sinner as hopeless as the wretched man whose pulseless body you have just straightened in the bed To whom now are you indebted for the difference? "To Christ," you promptly say. So you are. But does your indebtedness end here? Do you owe nothing to the preacher who in tears wept over you while calling you to Christ, —who warned you of hell, pointed out to you the path of life, and urged you in all the warmth of his heart to walk therein? Do you owe nothing to him? Would you ever have been a Christian without him? Never. Yet you have made him no adequate return I Or do you think him entitled to nothing? Why? Did those five long anxious years he spent in college cost him no money? Or do you think the sweat of his brow and the work of his brain less entitled to a return than those of a lawyer? Surely not. Yet were that lawyer to speak for you one hour a day for ten days, what amount would you expect him to demand? Would you think of offering him what you gave your preacher for labor equally hard? For that amount of work you would expect your lawyer to charge at least two hundred dollars. Not one in fifty would do it for less than twice that sum. Yet at the close of an equal amount of labor you gave your preacher not so much as ten. Yet the preacher wrought to save your soul from hell,—the lawyer to save you the price of a mule colt. Honest brother in Christ, does this strike you as right? In your soul do you not feel that there is here a want of equitable balance.

Again: you call in your doctor and thus say to him: "Doctor, we are to have, in a few weeks, a meeting conducted by our laborious and estimable Bro. A. We anticipate a happy time; and without some relief to these gouty feet I shall be wholly unable to attend. If in your power, do give me some relief." Twice a day that doctor now attends you for a week. His best skill and best remedies are brought to your aid. At the end of the week you are better, decidedly better, able quite to attend meeting. For all this you are duly thankful, as is fitting you should be. The bill is now produced. It is twenty dollars. With not a murmur it is paid. This is right. Meeting now begins, and you attend. You are delighted, comforted, made happy. At the end of many a discourse you vow you would not have missed that for ten dollars. On the meeting goes. Your

faith grows daily stronger, your hopes grow daily brighter. It is now Friday. For seven days that faithful preacher has been spending on you the wealth of his mind and the devout prayers of his heart. His cheek is pale, eye anxious, and frame tremulous. His throat is sore, and voice hoarse with hacking cough; he is clearly working himself into an early grave. But he has just closed a fine speech with a noble appeal to the sinner to obey Christ. Hardly has the song commenced; and there comes that lovely daughter of yours to confess her faith. You are overwhelmed with joy. "The happiest moment of my life," you silently say. That child is soon a Christian. Never did your happiness run so high. Still on the meeting goes, and still other good is achieved. You chide yourself for past neglects, thank God for the present, and resolve on nobler deeds for the future. But the meeting is now ended, gloriously ended. Long years to come will reap happy fruits from it. But look at that preacher. He is jaded, worn down. Three weeks will not restore those wasted energies, and restore those shattered nerves. You are now approached and asked to aid him. Of course you are willing. "How much ought I to *give*?" is your very cautious question. "Whatever you see fit," is the humane reply of that considerate deacon. You now recount the long list of your losses for the last five years; then you have just had your house repaired, that cost five hundred; you yet owe for those mules; have just paid the doctor twenty. Really you are not able to "*give*" anything; but, then, it is not right that the preacher should labor for nothing. You open your pocket-book. There lies a fifty, not thought of; a twenty, passed; a ten, turned; a five, you pause; a two, you take it out; a one, you add it. "Well, I suppose I can *give* that. With this you send that poor laboring man home;—home, did I say? No; not home. He owns no home; you do, he does not. You boast three hundred broad fertile acres; he has none. You live in a comfortable house; he has none. You own twenty horses; he has one. But then you have "*given*" him three dollars! That you have, and he is gone with it; and you are a happy man, and your wife is a happy woman, and your daughter is a happy child; and for all this you have "*given*" three dollars 1 *Cheap!*

The reformation for which we plead is the grandest achievement of the century in which we live. Our wonder is that in so short a time it should ever have reached the degree of perfection it has obviously attained. That in its origin no errors should have been committed is something none had reason to expect. We are thankful these errors were so few; and still more thankful that we live to see them at least partially corrected. Among the errors with which we set out was that of inveighing against "the hireling system," as we were pleased to phrase it. This was unfortunate, and to-day we are still reaping the bitter fruits of it. On it were said many hard

and erroneous things in the *Christian Baptist*—the finest work of the noble brain that wrought it. While that brain was still with us and at work, we were delicate and regardful in the matter of dissenting; but now that it is at rest, it is neither unkind nor undutiful to wish it had left undone some things it did: While it became right in the matter of which we speak before it ceased to work, still it was never enabled to remedy wholly the tendency of those early masculine utterances against "the hireling system." Where so much was done so well, we can hardly find it in our heart to dissent even from that which was done amiss. Yet justice to the truth and to the faithful preacher in a matter which deeply concerns him demands the regret and the dissent here expressed. We heartily wish the tone of the *Christian Baptist* had been different in regard to the remuneration of preachers. Had such been the case, many of the inconveniences we now feel we should never have felt. In nothing can men be so readily seduced into wrong as in withholding in pecuniary matters that which is due, especially where the amount due is to come in the form of a voluntary offering. We administer directly to a man's covetousness, that enormous sin of the church, when we tell him that the preacher is entitled to nothing for his labor, and that it is his duty to bestow it without fee. Not only so, we quiet his conscience and fix him in the evil habit of not giving; and once thoroughly fixed in this habit, we will never cure him. Of all the sins of earth covetousness is the most incurable. Hence, whatever administers to it must be looked upon as of the nature of a grave evil. In this light, therefore, we feel compelled to view some of the teachings to which we have just alluded. And it is a well-known fact, well known to preachers at least, that many men claiming to be Christiana will avail themselves of any excuse to retain their money in a case where the law does not compel them to pay it out. Hence, if a man of commanding influence utter aught even seemingly against remunerating the preacher, such men seize on it and urge it as a justification of their own conduct. They know perfectly that their conduct is wrong; but then they must have an apology for it, and this utterance serves this purpose. Nothing can be more mortifying than such a course.

We still have with us many of the preachers who wrought first in the cause which is now so near our hearts. To them we owe a debt we shall never be enabled to pay. We owe to them ourselves, in the fine language of Paul, not to mention inferior things. But for them we had never been what we are. Had not they many a time in bitter want labored in the word, where, now should we have been? Either living in sin in the world, or what is little better, living in the crimes of sectarianism. These men are now old and infirm. Age has in a great measure disqualified them to preach the gospel. The ready mind they

still retain, but the physical ability is gone. Of course, they are now unfitted to make a living by the common pursuits of life. They are poor, as a general thing, very poor, few of them being able to own even the humblest home. Is it right to neglect them now? Surely, brethren, you know how to answer this question. Is it not enough to have neglected them in time gone. Not enough to have allowed them to spend the prime and vigor of life without making them the return which heaven, if not men, knows them to be so justly entitled to? Had this return been made, no necessity would now exist to write in their interest. Had they been requited as they should, each, besides giving his children the necessary education, would now in the close of life be in possession of a snug little home, with enough laid up in store to ease out the last days of life. Would we spend our best days and our strength for the good of others, and then die in want? If not, let us remember to do to others as we would be done by. In no other event can we expect the reward from God. Let us, then, see to it that these aged servants of Christ have their wants, all their wants, fully cared for.

First, let churches everywhere evince a noble interest in their behalf. This can be done generally with mutual profit in both cases, and always with mutual pleasure. Let the churches be considerate, and invite these aged men to visit them and preach for them. Their life-long experience in matters pertaining to the kingdom should give their counsels uncommon weight. By this means they will be made to feel respected in their declining years, and this of itself to a man who has spent his life before the public is no mean pleasure. Nothing so pains these men as neglect. They feel it to be a deep injustice, and hence are overwhelmed by it. Besides, a few days' service from them will afford churches a fine opportunity to remember them for good. It is much more delicate and Christian to seem to repay a man for labor done, than to wound him by thrusting money in his hand as a pauper, and hence as an object of charity. Suppose a church of a hundred members to invite one of these brethren to spend a week with them. During that time he can speak for them several times. At the end of the week let each member give him a dollar. To the church this is nothing; to him it is a great matter. His aged heart is lightened now, and the prospect of want is gone for a while. Let each church in the land resolve that at least once every year it will do itself the honor here indicated. This would render many an infirm preacher's home the scene of perpetual comfort and thankfulness, which is now the abode of never-departing gloom and sadness.

Second, let private brethren make it their constant duty to visit these time-worn servants, and inquire, if need be, into their wants. I know brethren often feel this to be indelicate, and hence shrink from it. But is it not far more indelicate to allow these men to want, than, in the spirit of brotherly love and Christian freedom, to ask after their

welfare? I have not much respect for that Christian man's refinement who allows me to spend a winter wanting bread and wanting fuel, rather than, through delicacy, ask me if I need these things. I fancy that the breeding which leaves an aged preacher to want rather than learn his state by a generous and fraternal question is a commodity which does not stand very high in God's esteem. If, therefore, brethren have any delicacy in these matters, let me assure them that they can do nothing more graceful than to get rid of it at once.

Third, let the younger preachers, who are now the active workers in the field, take it on themselves, as a duty they will not neglect, to speak of these aged men and have their wants attended to. It will be a small labor to keep their names constantly before the brethren, and to insist that they shall not be neglected. A more benevolent work can never be done. Thus the strong will be made to bear the infirmities of the weak; and so many men will not feel it a duty to decline the life of the preacher through fear of suffering when they get old. As it now is, no prospect awaits the aged preacher but one of certain want. No wonder that so few men shrink from it.

But we did not propose, when we sat down, an essay on the present subject. A few hints was all we designed. We earnestly trust that more may not be necessary, that our brethren will generously heed these few words, and that here an evil among us will end.

A YEAR'S LABOR.—The first of September, 1865, now just one year ago, I held my first meeting, after returning from Canada, with the congregation at Bridgeport, Ky. Since that time one full year has passed; and a more laborious one I never spent. On looking at my journal I find that during this time I have held twenty-two protracted meetings, averaging ten days each. On each of these days two discourses were preached; that is, during the year, I have preached two hundred and twenty days, and delivered four hundred and forty discourses. The immediate result of this labor has been two hundred and ninety immersions. To this let the reader add the necessary writing for the *Quarterly*, correcting four hundred and forty-eight large pages of printer's proof, traveling fifteen hundred miles mostly in a buggy, a large correspondence, heavy domestic duties, and he will have some conception of what a single preacher goes through in one year. But through all this toil the Lord has been with me; and now, by his blessing, am I ready for another year not less laborious than the past.

If every preacher in our ranks will send me a summary of his labors for the year 1867, inclusive, I will condense them into one report and give the general statistical result, somewhat in the form of the preceding. I can imagine nothing in the form of news that would be more interesting. Will preachers give this hint their constant attention?

A NEW TRANSLATION,

BASED ON REVISED TEXTS.

JOHN craves leave again of the editor of the *Quarterly* to trouble its readers, if trouble they deem it, with another sample of his modest work. He wishes the work were more worthy of his attention, but it is the best he has to offer. Of course, he will not here be understood as speaking of the matter which he presents, but only of the manner. The matter he hopes is not his; the manner is, and he is more than willing to admit that it abounds in blemishes. These, however, have all escaped his notice; otherwise they would not herewith appear.

These translations are based on the most popular, and, as is believed, the best texts known at present to the learned world. It is doubted whether anything more trustworthy will make its appearance in the present generation. Indeed, till new material for revising the text of the New Testament is discovered, it is difficult to see how much improvement can be made on these works. They are each the product of an independent mind; and the result of a life devoted to the peculiar labor which they contain.

Heretofore nearly, if not all, translations have been defective in one or both of two respects: they have either been based on imperfect texts, or they have not followed with sufficient closeness the revised ones. Either the revised texts should be shown to be inferior to the older ones, or they should be rigidly adhered to. This is self-evident. John follows exactly and scrupulously the revised. He believed them to be immeasurably better than our received text, as it is termed. This text, as is well known, is chiefly the work of a single mind, and was prepared at a time when the subject of textual criticism was yet in its infancy. That it should have retained many errors is matter for no surprise. Hundreds of years have elapsed since it first made its appearance. Since that time textual criticism has been reduced to a science. Besides, the material for revising the text of the New Testament has, in the mean time, accumulated to an extent of which the ordinary reader has but little conception. In addition to this, we now have men whose whole lives are devoted to this particular department of learning. That they should acquire great skill in their art is precisely what every one, at all acquainted with the dexterity which the division of labor will lead to, would naturally expect. In a question of the kind we are now considering, their judgment is as far superior to the judgment of a common scholar as is that of a lawyer, in a question of jurisprudence, to the opinion

of a common farmer. We consequently greatly need a translation based on their last and most mature works. These works, I should add, are not yet quite completed. They are all completed as far as to Acts of Apostles. One only is completed throughout; and this will probably be still further improved in a few places.

They do not, it is proper to notify the reader, all agree in every case in which they differ from the received text; but then their agreement is little less than wonderful. Where they differ among themselves, which is very seldom, of course a choice has to be made. In this case John follows the same rule which guides the textual critic in deciding among several conflicting readings, where manuscript authorities are about equally balanced. The more difficult reading, or that from which or to which an alteration is the least likely to have been made, is the one generally preferred. This is the rule which guides John.

In comparing, therefore, the following translations with our common version, the reader must bear in mind that he is not always comparing one translation with another of the same text, but in some cases different translations of different texts. Otherwise he will here find differences from our common version for which he could not account.

Some of these translations will, at first reading, sound very awkward, and will appear defective in smoothness. As a sample take the following: "And why do you see the mote in your brother's eye, but notice not the beam in your eye? Or how will you say to your brother; Let me take the mote out of your eye; and, lo, a beam is in your eye." It is hard to become reconciled to this. We strongly want to read the passage thus: And why do you see the mote in your brother's eye, but notice not the beam in your *own* eye? But for this word *own*, although it appears in almost every translation ancient and modern, there is no authority whatever. The sense does not demand it; hence it should be omitted. Again: Or how will you say to your brother: Let me take the mote out of your eye; and, lo, a beam is in your *own* eye. But here again we are wrong. There is no necessity for the word *own*. If the reader will only reflect a little here, and notice his own propensity, he may possibly discover how many interpolations crept originally into the sacred text.

Again: we find it very difficult to adopt a strictly modern form of speech in direct addresses, especially to the Father and the Savior. We feel it to be far too familiar to say Our Savior, who have done this; or, Our Father, who are in heaven. We want to say, who hast, and who art. But this is a silly weakness which we should at once determine to overcome. Let us speak to these august Beings as did the apostles. Then we shall not err. They had no two forms of speech—one for men, the other for God; neither should we. Let us

first make our translation accurate and modern; and habit will soon endear it to us.

VI.

See that you do not your righteousness before men, to be seen by them. If not, you have no reward from your Father who is in heaven. When then you give alms, trumpet it not before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may be glorified by men. I tell you truly, they have their reward. But when you give alms let not your left hand know what your right does, that your alms may be in secret, and your Father, who sees in secret, himself shall repay you.

And when you pray, be not as the hypocrites; for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and at the corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men. I tell you truly, they have their reward. But when you pray, go into your closet, and, having shut your door, pray to your Father who is in secret, and your Father, who sees in secret, shall repay you. But when praying, use not many idle words as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard by their much speaking. Be not then like them; for your Father knows what you have need of, before you ask him. Thus, then, pray you: Our Father who are in heaven, hallowed be your name; your kingdom come; your will be done, as in heaven, also on earth; give us to-day the bread we need; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into trial, but keep us from evil. For if you forgive men their offenses, your heavenly Father will forgive you also; but if you forgive not men, neither will your Father forgive your offenses.

And when you fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad look; for they alter their faces, that they may appear to men as fasting. I tell you truly, they have their reward. But when you fast, anoint your head, and wash your face, that you may not appear to men as fasting, but to your Father who is in secret, and your Father, who sees in secret, shall repay you.

Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys, and where thieves break not in, nor steal. For where your treasure is, there your heart will also be.

The lamp of the body is the eye. If, then, your eye be good, your whole body will be in light; but if your eye be bad, your whole body will be in darkness. If, then, the light which is in you is darkness, how great is the darkness!

No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will cling to one and neglect the other. You can not serve God and riches. For this reason I say to you, be not anx-

ious for your life, what you shall eat and what you shall drink; nor for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life better than food, and the body than clothing? Look at the birds of heaven; they sow not, nor reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feeds them. Are not you much better than they? And who of you by being anxious can add to his life a single span? And why be anxious for clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, nor spin. Yet! tell you that not even Solomon in all his glory was clothed like one of them. If, then, God so clothes an herb of the field, which to-day is and to-morrow is thrown into an oven, will he not much more clothe you, you of little belief? Be not anxious then, saying: What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or what shall we wear? For after all these things the nations seek; for your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added for you. Be not, then, anxious for to-morrow, for to-morrow will be anxious for itself; enough for the day is its evil.

VII.

Judge not, that you may not be judged. For with whatever judgment you judge, you shall be judged; and with whatever measure you measure, it shall be measured to you. And why do you see the mote in your brother's eye, but notice not the beam in your eye? Or how will you say to your brother: Let me take the mote out of your eye; and, lo, a beam is in your eye. Hypocrite, first take the beam out of your eye; and then shall you see clearly to take the mote out of your brother's eye.

Give not that which is holy to dogs, nor throw your pearls before hogs, lest they trample them down with their feet, and turn and tear you. Ask, and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you. For every one who asks, receives; and he who seeks, finds: and to him who knocks, it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son ask of him bread, will give him a stone; or who, if he also ask a fish, will give him a serpent? If then you, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them who ask him? All things, then, which you would that men should do to you, so also do you to them; for this is the law and the prophets. Enter in through the narrow gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way which leads into ruin, and many are they who go in through it; because narrow is the gate, and narrow the way which leads into life, and few are they who find it. But beware of false prophets, who come to you in the garb of sheep, but within are greedy wolves. By their fruit you shall know them. Do men gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles?

Thus every good tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree can not bear bad fruit; nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. Every tree which bears not good fruit is to be cut down and thrown into the fire. So then by their fruits you shall know them.

Not every one who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father in heaven. Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name cast out demons, and in your name do many miracles? And then will! confess to them:! never knew you; depart from me you who work iniquity.

Every one, then, who hears these words of mine, and does them,! will I
And the rain fell, and the rivers ran, and the winds blew, and they beat against that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And every one who hears these words of mine, and does them not, shall be likened to a foolish man who built his house upon the sand. And the rain fell, and the rivers ran, and the winds blew, and they beat against that house, and it fell, and great was its fall.

And it happened when Jesus had ended these words that the crowds were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes.

VIII.

And when he had come down from the mountain, great crowds followed him. And, lo, a leper coming up, worshiped him, saying: Sir, if you will, you can cleanse me. And stretching out his hand, he touched him, saying:! will; be cleansed. And at once his leprosy was cleansed. And Jesus said to him: Take heed, tell no one; but go, show yourself to the priest, and offer the gift which Moses commanded for a testimony to them. And when he had entered into Capernaum, a centurion came to him, beseeching him, and saying: Sir, my servant is lying in the house palsied, suffering greatly. He said to him:! will go and cure him. But the centurion answering, said: Sir,! am not fit that you should come under my roof; but speak only a word, and my servant will be well. For! am a man under authority, having soldiers under me; and! say to this one, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he comes; and to my servant, Do this, and he does it. And Jesus, on hearing this, wondered, and said to them who followed:! tell you truly, in no one in Israel have! found so great belief. But! tell you, that many will come from the east and the west, and shall lie down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the sons of the kingdom shall be cast out into the darkness which is without. There will there be weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said to the cen-

turion: Go; as you have believed, be it to you. And the servant was cured in that hour.

And Jesus, on going into Peter's house, saw his wife's mother lying, and having a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her; and she rose and waited on him.

And when evening came, they brought to him many who had demons, and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all who were sick, that what was spoken through Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying: He took our weaknesses and carried our diseases.

But Jesus, seeing large crowds about him, ordered to go to the other side. And a scribe came up and said to him: Teacher, I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him: The foxes have dens, and the birds of heaven roosts; but the Son of man has not where he can lay his head. And another of the disciples said to him: Lord, let me first go and bury my father. But Jesus, said to him: Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead.

And when he had gone into the boat, his disciples followed him. And, lo, a great storm rose on the lake, so that the boat was covered with the waves; but he was asleep. And they came and waked him, saying: Lord, save, we are lost. And he said to them: Why are you afraid, you of little belief? Then rising, he rebuked the winds and the lake; and there was a great calm. And the men wondered, saying: What kind of man is this, that both the winds and the lake obey him?

And when he had come to the other side, into the country of the Gadarenes, two men, who had demons, met him, coming out of the tombs, very fierce, so that no one was able to pass by that way. And, lo, they cried out, saying: What will you do with us, Son of God? Have you come here to torment us before the time?

Now there was far from them a drove of many hogs feeding. And the demons begged him, saying: If you cast us out, send us into the drove of hogs. And he said to them: Go. And on going out, they went into the hogs; and, lo, the whole drove rushed down the bank into the lake, and died in the water. And their feeders fled, and went into the town, and told everything, and the case of those who had the demons. And, lo, the whole town came out to meet Jesus; and when they saw him, they begged that he would go away from their country.

CHAPTER IX.

And going into the boat, he crossed over, and came into his own town. And, lo, they brought to him a palsied man lying on a bed. And Jesus, seeing their belief, said to the palsied man: Take courage, son, your sins are forgiven. And, lo, some of the scribes said in themselves: He blasphemeth. And Jesus, seeing their thoughts, said:

Why do you think evil in your hearts? For which is easier to say, Your sins are forgiven, or to say, Rise and walk? But that you may know that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins, then he said to the palsied man: Rise, take your bed, and go into your house. And he rose and went into his house. And when the crowds saw it, they feared, and glorified God, the giver of such power to men.

And as Jesus passed on from that place, he saw a man, called Matthew, sitting in the tax-office, and he said to him: Follow me. And he rose and followed him. And it happened that while he was at table in the house, lo, many tax-gatherers and sinners came and placed themselves at table with Jesus and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw it, they said to his disciples: Why does your teacher eat with the tax-gatherers and sinners? But Jesus hearing them, said: The well need not a physician, but the sick. But go learn what this is:! wish mercy, and not sacrifice. For! came to call not the righteous, but sinners.

Then came to him the disciples of John, saying: Why do we and the Pharisees fast often; but your disciples fast not? And Jesus said to them: Can the children of the bridal chamber fast as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them; and then shall they fast. And no one puts a patch of new cloth upon an old garment, for its patch takes from the garment, and a worse rent is made. Nor do they put new wine into old skins; if so, the skins burst, and the wine is spilt, and the skins are lost. But they put new wine into new skins, and both are saved.

While he was saying these things to them, lo, a ruler came in and paid him honor, saying: My daughter has just died; but come, lay your hand upon her, and she will live. And Jesus rising, followed him, and his disciples. And, lo, a woman, afflicted with a flow of blood twelve years, came up behind and touched the edge of his garment. For she said in herself: If! can only touch his garment,! shall be cured. An age,-daughter, your belief has cured you. And the woman was cured from that hour. A"nd Jesus, on coming into the ruler's house, and seeing the pipers and the crowd making a noise, said: Go away, for the girl is not dead, but asleep. And they laughed at him. But when the crowd had been put out, he went in and took hold of her hand, and the girl arose. And the report of this went out into all that land.

And as Jesus passed along from that place, two blind men followed him, crying and saying: Pity us, Son of David. And when he had gone into the house, the blind men came to him, and Jesus said to them: Do you believe that! can do this? They said to him: Yes, Sir. Then he touched their eyes, **saying: According to your belief,**

be it to you. And their eyes were opened. And Jesus charged them strictly, saying: Take heed, let no one know it. But on going out they made him known in all that land. And when they came out, lo, they brought to him a dumb man, who had a demon. And when the demon was cast out, the dumb man spoke. And the crowd wondered, saying: Never was it thus seen in Israel. But the Pharisees said: By the prince of the demons he casts out the demons.

And Jesus went round to all their towns and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease, and every sickness. And on seeing the crowds, he was moved with pity for them; because they were troubled and scattered as sheep not having a shepherd. Then he said to his disciples: The harvest is great, but the workmen few. Pray, then, the Lord of the harvest to send out workmen into his harvest.

X.

And calling up his twelve disciples, he gave them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and cure every disease, and every sickness.

Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: first, Simon, called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew the tax-gatherer; James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbeus; Simon the Canaite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him. These twelve Jesus sent out, having charged them, saying: Go into no road of the nations, and enter not into a city of the Samaritans. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and as you go, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse lepers, cast out demons; freely you have received, freely give. Provide no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your belts; no bag for the road; not two coats, nor sandals, nor staffs; for the workman is worthy of his food. And into whatever town or village you may go, learn who in it is worthy, and there stay till you go out. And as you enter the house, greet it; and if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whoever receives you not, nor hears your words, as you go out of that house or town, shake the dust from your feet.! tell you truly, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorra in the day of judgment than for that town.

Lo,! send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be, then, wise as the serpents were, and pure as the doves are. Beware of men; for they will deliver you up to courts, and will whip you in their synagogues. And you will also be led before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony to them and to the nations. But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what you shall speak; for it shall

be given you in that hour what you shall say; for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaks in you. And brother will deliver up brother to death; and father, child; and children will rise against parents, and kill them; and you will be hated by all because of my name. But he who holds out to the end, he shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this town, flee into another; for! tell you truly, you will not get through the towns of Israel before the Son of man will come.

No disciple is above his teacher, nor servant above his master. It is enough for the disciple to be as his teacher, and the servant as his master. If they have called the owner of the house Beelzebul, how much more his family. Be not then afraid of them; for nothing is hid which shall not be brought to light; and secret, which shall not be known. What! tell you in the dark, speak in the light; and what you hear in the ear, preach on the houses. And fear not them who kill the body, but can not kill the soul; but rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two small birds sold for a cent? And not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father. But even the hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, then; you are of more value than many small birds. Every one, then, who owns me before men, him! also will own before my Father who is in heaven; but whoever denies me before men, him! also will deny before my Father who is in heaven. Think not that! came to send peace on the earth;! came not to send peace, but a sword. For! came mother, and a bride against her mother-in-law; and a man's enemies shall be his family. He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; and he who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. He who finds his life shall lose it; and he who loses his life for my sake shall find it.

He who receives you receives me; and he who receives me receives him who sent me. He who receives a prophet in a prophet's name, shall receive a prophet's reward; and he who receives a just man in a just man's name, shall receive a just man's reward. And whoever shall give to one of these little ones only a cup of cool water to drink, in a disciple's name, I tell you truly, he shall not lose his reward.

XI.

And it happened, when Jesus ended charging his twelve disciples, that he left that place to teach and preach in their cities. Now John, having heard in prison of the works of Christ, sent by his disciples, and said to him: Are you he who is to come, or must we look for another. And Jesus answering, said to them: Go, tell John what you hear and see; the blind see, and the lame walk; lepers are cleansed,

and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised; and to the poor the gospel is preached; and blest is he who is not made to stumble by me.

And when these were gone, Jesus began to say to the crowds concerning John: What did you go out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind? But what did you go out to see? A man dressed in soft clothing? Lo, they who wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. But what did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes; I tell you, and something more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written: Lo, I send my messenger before your face, and he shall prepare your way before you. I tell you truly, among those born of women there has not risen a greater than John the immerser; yet he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the immerser till now the kingdom of heaven is rushed to, and the eager seize it. For all the prophets and the law prophesied till John; and if you will receive it, he is the Elias who was to come. He who has ears, let him hear. But to what shall I compare this race? It is like children sitting in the public places, who call to their mates, and say: We have piped for you, and you did not dance; we have mourned, and you did not beat. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said: He has a demon. The Son of man has come eating and drinking, and they say: Lo, a glutton, and a wine-drinker, a friend of tax-gatherers and sinners. And the wisdom was justified by its children.

Then he began to chide the towns in which most of his miracles were done, because they repented not. Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the miracles which have been done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, long ago would they have repented in sackcloth and ashes. But I tell you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And you, Capernaum, which were lifted up to heaven, shall be brought down to the Unseen; for if the miracles which have been done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained to this day. But I tell you, it shall be easier for Sodom in the day of judgment than for you.

At that time Jesus answering, said: I confess to you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you hid these things from the wise and knowing, and have revealed them to babes; yes, Father, that so it pleased you. All things are given to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does any one know the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son pleases to reveal him.

Come to me all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart; and you shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light.

XII.

At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath through the fields; and his disciples were hungry; and they began to pull the ears of grain and eat them. And the Pharisees saw it, and said to him: Lo, your disciples do what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath. But he said to them: Have you not read what David did when he was hungry, and those with him; how he went into the house of God, and ate the loaves of the presence, which it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those with him, but for the priests only? Or have you not read in the law, that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple violate the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I tell you that one greater than the temple is here. But had you known what this is: I wish mercy and not sacrifice, you would not have condemned the innocent. For the Son of man is lord of the Sabbath.

And leaving that place he went into their synagogue. And, lo, a man was there who had a withered hand. And they asked him, saying: Is it lawful to cure on the Sabbath? that they might accuse him. But he said to them: Is there a man of you who has one sheep; and should this fall into a pit on the Sabbath, would he not lay hold on it and pull it out? How much better, now, is a man than a sheep? So then it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath. Then he said to the man: Stretch out your hand. And he stretched it out; and it was restored sound as the other. Then the Pharisees went out and took counsel against him, how they might destroy him. But Jesus knowing it, left that place. And great crowds followed him, and he cured them all, and charged them that they should not make him known, that the word spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying: Lo, my child whom I have chosen; my beloved in whom my soul delights. I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall declare judgment to the nations. He shall not contend nor cry out; nor shall any one hear his voice in the streets. A crushed reed he will not break, and a smoking wick he will not put out, till he send out judgment to victory. And in his name shall the nations trust.

Then was brought to him a man blind and dumb, who had a demon; and he cured him, so that the blind and dumb spoke and saw. And all the crowds were amazed, and said: Is this the Son of David? But the Pharisees hearing it, said: He casts not out demons, except by Beelzebul, ruler of the demons. But he, knowing their thoughts, said to them: Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to ruin; and every town or house divided against itself will not stand. Now if Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself; how, then, shall his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebul cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? Hence they shall be your judges. But if I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. Or how can any one enter

into the house of the strong, and seize his goods, unless he first bind the strong, and then he shall rob his house. He who is not with me, is against me; and he who gathers not with me, scatters.

Hence, I tell you, all sin and evil speech shall be forgiven men; but evil speech against the Spirit shall not be forgiven men. And if any one speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but he who speaks against the Holy Spirit, him it shall not be forgiven, neither in this age, nor in the one to come.

Either make the tree good and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad. For by the fruit the tree is known. Race of vipers, how can you, being evil, speak good things? For out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaks. The good man out of his good treasure, gives out good things; and the bad man, out of his bad treasure, gives out bad things. But I tell you that every idle word which men shall speak, for it they shall give an account in the day of judgment. For by your words you shall be justified; and by your words you shall be condemned.

Then some of the Scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying: Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you. But he, answering, said to them: An evil and adulterous race asks a sign; and no sign shall be given it, except the sign of Jonah the prophet. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

The Ninevites shall stand up in the judgment with this race, and condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, lo, something more than Jonah is here. The queen of the South shall stand up in the judgment with this race, and condemn it; because she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, lo, something more than Solomon is here.

When an unclean spirit comes out of a man, it wanders through dry places seeking rest, and finds none. Then it says: I will return into my house, whence I came out. And on coming, it finds it empty, swept, and ready. Then it goes and takes with it seven other spirits, more wicked than itself; and they go in, and live there. Now the last state of that man is worse than the first. Thus also shall it be with this wicked race.

While he was "yet speaking to the crowds, lo, his mother and brothers stood without, wishing to speak to him. And some one said to him: See, your mother and brothers stand without, wishing to speak to you. But he, answering, said to him who told him: Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? And stretching out his hand over his disciples, he said: Lo, my mother and my brothers. For whoever does the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

ALTHOUGH I head this article with the words, "The Influence of the Holy Spirit," I do not approve of their use, as they do not convey to my mind any scriptural conception of the powers, relations, or acts of the Holy Spirit. I use them merely to show that this investigation is of kin to the essays heretofore published in the *Quarterly* under that head. We might as well say, "The Influence of God," or "The Influence of Christ," as "The Influence of the Holy Spirit." In the former cases it does not sound appropriately; and in the latter, except for sectarian and unscriptural usage, it would sound to our ears quite as uncouth and inappropriate.

The delusions on the subject of "The Work of the Holy Spirit" are remarkable when viewed in the light of the Spirit's communications. I assume at the outset that we know nothing, and can not know anything, about spiritual and divine things without the aid of the Spirit; but how are we to obtain that aid?—where is it to be sought for?—and what is it?—are questions which I propose to consider. I find that in creation the Spirit of God is said to have "moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. i., 2); and the first reference we have of the Spirit in relation to man is, "the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man" (Gen. vi., 3); and immediately Noah was chosen as one "who found grace in the eyes of the Lord," because he was "a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." (Gen. vi., 8, 9.) "He was a proclaimer of righteousness" (2 Peter ii., 5,) when God "brought the flood upon the world of the ungodly." Noah, therefore, strove with them in his proclamations "of righteousness," but they heeded him not, "when the patience of God once waited, in the days of Noah, while an ark was preparing, in which few, that is, eight souls, were effectually saved through water." (1 Peter iii., 20.)

We read of the patriarchs having communications from God through angels, visions, voices, etc., but always in relation to some great work of a national or family character, or in relation to some important events in the future, as described by the apostle Peter: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scriptures is of private impulse; for never, at any time, was prophecy brought by the will of man, but the holy men of God spoke, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Peter i., 20, 21.)

And as Paul says to the Hebrews: "God, who in ancient times spoke often in various ways to the fathers by the prophets," has in these last days spoken to us by a Son." (Heb. i., 1.) We read of

the Spirit of God being on the prophets, but never upon the multitude, during the Jewish Dispensation. The "Law was given by Moses," and the prophets by the Spirit expounded, explained, and called back the wanderers from the law to it again, so that they might receive the blessings promised to "the obedient." Those who had the Spirit, too, under the Jewish Dispensation, had the power to work miracles, as "a testimony" to those to whom they were sent that God was with them, as in the cases of Moses, Elijah, etc.

In Nehemiah ix., 20-30, it is said: "Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them," and "yet many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by thy Spirit in the prophets; yet would they not give ear," which fact is referred to by Stephen, "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit," in his address to the sanhedrim: "Oh I stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ear, you always resist the Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do you." (Acts vii., 51.) They resisted the words which he spake, as their fathers resisted the words of the prophets, and would not give ear. Sufficient is now before the reader to show that the Spirit was given to the prophets to aid in the extraordinary work they had to perform, and that it was only in the reception of and obedience to their words, that the people "yielded to the influence of the Spirit." But one here interposes and says: Quite true; but that is just one of the leading differences between the old and the new dispensations. For it was prophesied of old, that when the Messiah should come, God should "pour out a portion of (his) my Spirit upon all flesh." (Acts ii, 17.)

Let us examine the facts. The Spirit descended upon Jesus, at his immersion by John, "in a bodily form like a dove." (Luke iii., 22.) It was given to him "without measure." During his personal administration on earth the powers of Christ were not given to any but for special purposes, as in the call and sending out, in the first instance, of the twelve: "And having called to him the twelve disciples, he gave them power to expel unclean spirits, and to cure diseases and maladies of every kind. And as you go proclaim, saying: The reign of heaven approaches. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, and expel demons; freely you have received, freely give." (Matt. x., 1-8.) And to the seventy he said: "And whatever city you enter, if they receive you, eat such things as are set before you; cure the sick, and say to them: The reign of God comes upon you." (Luke x., 8.) "And the seventy returned with joy, saying: Master, even the demons are subject to us through your name. He said unto them: I beheld Satan fall like lightning from heaven. Lo, I empower you to tread on serpents and scorpions, and all the might of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you." (Luke x., 17.)

They did not receive the Spirit generally, as the twelve did on

the day of Pentecost, or as Cornelius and his household received it in fulfillment of the prophecy of John the Immerser, when he said: "I, indeed, immerse in water, but One mightier than I comes * * * he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit and fire." (Luke iii., 16.) And as the Savior said after his resurrection: "For John indeed immersed in water, but you shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit, within a few days." (Acts i., 5.) We also find in his charge to the apostles: "Go throughout all the world, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation. He who shall believe and be immersed shall be saved; but he who shall not believe shall be condemned. And these miraculous powers shall attend the believers. In my name they shall expel demons, they shall speak languages unknown to them before, they shall handle serpents with safety, and if they drink poison it shall not hurt them. They shall cure the sick by laying hands upon them." (Mark xvi., 15.)

We proceed, then, to the fulfillment of these promises. On the Pentecostal day, after the resurrection of Jesus, the apostles "were all unanimously assembled in the same place," and there appeared to them tongues resembling fire, distinctly separate, and it rested upon each of them, and they began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Acts ii., 3.) It is sufficient to observe with respect to this "immersion of the Holy Spirit" on the apostles—as promised to them "within a few days" after Christ departed from them, and which they were "charged not to depart from Jerusalem" (Acts i., 4) until they should receive, that it could not have been given to the multitude, because Peter said to them (v. 38): "Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Christ Jesus, in order to the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" if it had already been given, the apostle would not have promised it in the future; but the words spoken by Peter were the words spoken by the Holy Spirit, and I may here say they are the most important words ever uttered through the mouth of man, and the man who rejects them resists the Holy Spirit; and can have no hope for the life that now is or that which is to come.

This, then, was the first "immersion of the Holy Spirit," and the second and last recorded was like unto it. "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon all who were hearing the word; and they of the circumcision who believed, as many as came with Peter, were astonished that the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Gentiles also, for they heard them speaking in divers languages and glorifying God." (Acts x., 44.) The apostle Peter, when rehearsing this matter to the apostles at Jerusalem, said: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell upon them, even as upon us at the beginning; and I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said: John immersed in water, but you shall be im-

merged in the Holy Spirit. Since, therefore, God gave to them the same gift as he did to us, who had believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I should be able to obstruct God?" (Acts xi., 16.)

These are the only "immersions of the Holy Spirit," of which the Scriptures give us any account, on the Jews and Gentiles—all flesh—not Jews only, but under the gospel Gentiles also were to be partakers of the blessings of the gospel, and it seemed to require this miraculous intervention of God to convince even the apostles of the fulfillment of this promise as declared by Peter on the Pentecost: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." (Acts ii., 16.) That these are the only "immersions" spoken of or promised in the Scriptures we have only to refer to one fact,—that God was the immerser in both cases, there was no intermediate agent in either case; it was the direct gift of God, "the same gift as he gave to us," the apostle says.

I have only to refer to some other facts to show the conclusiveness of this view, and that the promise given on Pentecost was not to be perpetuated. Phillip preached the gospel in Samaria, and it is said: "When they gave credit to Philip declaring the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were immersed, both men and women." (Acts viii.) Peter and John came down from Jerusalem, and they "prayed with them that they might receive the Holy Spirit (for he was not yet fallen on any of them; only they were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then they laid hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit." (Acts viii., 15.) So also in the case of the disciples of John, Paul found at Ephesus; he said to them: "Have you on your believing received the Holy Spirit? And they replied to him: No. * * * And hearing this they were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus; and Paul laying his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied. And they were in all about twelve men." (Acts xix., 2-5.)

Here we observe that the Samaritans and Ephesians believed, and were immersed and "saved," or had the "remission of their sins," and yet had not the Holy Spirit, which they assuredly would have had if it had been intended to perpetuate to all generations of believers "the gift of the Holy Spirit." They received the power to speak with "tongues" as had been promised by the "laying his (the apostle's) hands" upon them, and this power of speaking with tongues, or in divers languages, seems always to have accompanied the "gifts of the Holy Spirit," or to have been one of the "gifts" of the Holy Spirit, for the Corinthians had it, as the apostle says: "And to another divers kinds of foreign tongues." (1 Cor. xii., 10.) Yet they were to cease, for he says: "Love never fails, but whether prophecies they will be out of use, or foreign languages they shall

cease." (1 Cor. xiii., 8.) Hence these gifts of the Holy Spirit were to cease.

Having thus passed in brief review the whole Bible, down to the epistles, the result appears to be:

1. That the Spirit was given to the prophets during the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations, and that through the prophets the people received the knowledge of the Lord.

2. That during Christ's personal ministry the Spirit's powers were only given to chosen persons for special purposes, as to the twelve and to the seventy, otherwise it would not have been necessary to have given them again to the "twelve" on the day of Pentecost.

3. That the immersion of the Holy Spirit was promised during the previous period, and was fulfilled on two occasions that we read of, on the apostles on the day of Pentecost, and Cornelius and his household when Peter preached to them.

4. That all other gifts of the Holy Spirit were given through "laying" on of the hands of the apostles, and not in any other way that we have any account of.

5. That many disciples were made, or many persons believed, reformed, and were immersed, who had not the Holy Spirit until the apostles laid their hands on them, as in the case of the Samaritans and Ephesians.

6. That the promise of Peter on the Pentecost, "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," was not general or perpetual; but was to cease with the other miraculous gifts given during the apostles' personal administration, the same as the "miraculous powers" promised that were to "attend the believers."

7. That there is no account of any other gifts or blessings of the Spirit, abstract influences, spiritual impressions, spiritual contact, spiritual operations, or witness of the Spirit, received or enjoyed in any other way than those specified, either before sinners believed the gospel or afterward, except the words which the "holy apostles" spoke and wrote as the Spirit moved them, which brought "comfort" and consolation to the souls of those who were believers in Christ.

With these facts and conclusions before us, I will ask the reader to consider with me another point pressed with great earnestness upon the attention of sinners by the "orthodox" teachers of religion, and that is the question of "abstract spiritual influences" striving with the sinner to induce faith, or to bestow faith and accomplish the "conversion" of the sinner. I read that Peter and the other apostles said on a certain occasion: "It is necessary to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers has raised up Jesus whom you slew, hanging him on a tree; him has God exalted at his right hand, a Prince and a Savior, to give reformation to Israel, and remission of sins; and we are his witnesses of these things, and the Holy Spirit

also, whom God has given to them who submit to his government." (Acts v., 30.) God has given the Spirit to a certain class, of whom we have numerous instances, those who "submit to his government." A similar result, at least to some extent, is produced now that was then produced in the sanhedrim, when the priests and rulers were told these things, if a person should maintain what the apostles then said: "And when they heard this they were enraged, and consulted to put them to death." (Acts v., 33.) And Paul says to the Galatians: "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. iv., 6.)

And to the Ephesians, he says: "In whom (Christ) you also trusted, having heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also having believed, you were sealed with the Spirit of promise (the Holy Spirit) who is an earnest of our inheritance, for the redemption of the purchase, to the praise of his glory." (Eph. i., 13.) See Acts six., 1-1, for the history of this sealing, and the manner in which it was done: "And Paul laying his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied." Jesus said to his "apostles." "If you love me keep my commandments, and I will entreat the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, to continue with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive." (John xiv., 15.) "I tell you these things while I remain with you. But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things, and remind you of all that I have told you." (v. 25.) Clearly showing that it was to be limited in its operations, to the apostles in the first instance, and, as the facts show, to those upon whom they "laid their hands." It was not as universal a promise as the forgiveness of sins even, and certainly not a promise to any who did not "submit to the government" of God. The Holy Spirit was given to the apostles, not only to "advocate" for them, but also for another purpose,—to testify that they "spoke the words of God." "They, however, staid there a considerable time, speaking boldly for the Lord; who gave attestation to the word of his grace, and granted signs and miracles to be done by their hands." (Acts xiv., 3.) In Peter's address (Acts ii., 22,) he thus explains the object of the miracles which were done by Jesus: "Israelites, hear these words: Jesus the Nazarene, a man recommended to you by God by powerful operations, and wonders and signs, which God wrought by him in the midst of you, as you yourselves also know." So the apostle Paul says to the Hebrews: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which, beginning to be spoken by the Lord, was confirmed to us by them who heard him, God also bearing witness, both by signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and distribution of the Holy Spirit, according to his own pleasure." (Hebrews ii., 3.)

Now what were the "powerful operations" by which God "recommended" Jesus to the faith of the world, that the world might believe on him? Was it not, as John expresses it, "Many other miracles Jesus likewise performed in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book; but these are recorded, that you may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life through his name." (John xi., 30.) Is not the concentrated testimony of intelligences supernal and infernal; divine and human; angels and demons; things animate and inanimate; sun, earth, water, storms, trees; men dead and alive; life and death; prophets and apostles; miracles, signs, and wonders; history, sacred and profane; friends and enemies; rulers and the ruled; priests and people; good men and bad men; monumental institutions, such as immersion and the breaking of the loaf; the persecutors and the martyrs; and the love, mercy, goodness, and compassion of the Father; the life, suffering, death, burial, and resurrection of the Son; the words, gifts, signs, and miracles of the Holy Spirit;—is not, I say, this accumulated and unparalleled combination of testimony sufficient to induce faith in a sinner? If it is not, then there is no power or influence in heaven, earth, or hell that will or can?

If the reader admits all as written, he may still respond: The "disciple of the Lord" now has the Spirit, or enjoys the "comfort" of the Holy Spirit after he becomes such, though the sinner or disobedient person may not. True, he does; but is it in any of the forms specified? Certainly not; for, if so, the evidence would be seen; the partakers of the Spirit could "speak with tongues" and "prophecy," for these were the invariable results, as we have seen, of the "gifts of the Holy Spirit" in the instances recorded. How, then, it will be asked, do you explain such passages as, "What! do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God?" (1 Cor. vi., 19.) I look at them with the facts recorded concerning the congregation at Corinth, and what is found? Why, that the congregation had "spiritual gifts!" (1 Cor. xii., 1.) "And to each is given this manifestation of the Spirit, for the advantage of all. (Or, as it has been rendered, "The gifts whereby the Spirit becomes manifest, are given to each for the profit of all.") For to one indeed is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit; and to another faith by the same Spirit; and to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; and to another the operation of powers; and to another prophecy; and to another discerning of spirits; and to another divers kinds of foreign tongues; and to another the interpretation of foreign tongues. Now all these do the one and the same Spirit effectually work, distributing to each respectively as he pleases." (1 Cor. xii., 7-12.) Surely, with these "diversities of gifts," it must be conceded

that they were the "temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you." So I read with the facts (Acts xix.) what Paul says to the Ephesians: "Now, then, you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, having been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner-stone, by which the whole building, being fitly compacted together, rises into a holy temple of the Lord; in which you also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit. (Eph ii., 19.)

What is the difference between the expression "temple of the Lord" and "temple of the Holy Spirit?" How does the Lord "dwell" in the "temple?" And how does the Spirit "dwell I?" And we also read: "What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God; as God has said: Assuredly I will dwell among them, and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they will be to me a people." (2 Cor. vi., 16.) "Therefore he who despises, despises not man, but God, who has certainly given to us his Holy Spirit." (1 Thess. iv., 8.) "The form of wholesome words, which you have heard from me, hold fast with the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus. The good deposit guard by the Holy Spirit who dwells in us." (2 Tim. i., 13.) We have the "temple of God," "of the Lord," and "of the Holy Spirit." Are not these expressions substantial equivalents? The Christians, then, as the temple of Jerusalem had been, were the "temple" of God, an "habitation of God through the Spirit," dwelling in them in the "miraculous powers" given to them whereby the Spirit became manifest.

There is another class of passages; such as, "Born of water and of the Spirit;" "of his own will he begat us by the word of truth." (James i., 18.) "Wherefore, having purified your souls by obeying the truth through the Spirit, to unfeigned brotherly love, love one another from a pure heart fervently, having been regenerated, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of the living God which remains." (1 Peter i., 22.) "He saved us through the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Titus iii., 5.) All being equivalent to the saying of Christ: "He who shall believe and be immersed, shall be saved." (Mark xiv., 16.)

The words of God, spoken by the Spirit through the apostles, believed "with the heart unto righteousness," is the renewing of the Holy Spirit; the reviving of the life of man to righteousness and holiness; is that begetting so frequently spoken of in the Scriptures; and the "bath of regeneration," or immersion in water, or emerging from the womb of waters, is that bringing forth, or birth, or being born again, also so frequently referred to, and which is only explicable by these facts.

The leading scriptures, often referred to, to support the fancies of

"religions men" as to spiritual influences, scarcely bear the construction put upon them when examined in the light which the facts throw upon them. The Holy Spirit was promised by God through the prophets, and the promise was fulfilled, "distributing to each respectively as he pleases." Do not let imagination carry you beyond the facts, and you will have no difficulty. The Spirit breathes (or speaks) when he pleases, and you hear the report of him, but know not whence he comes or whither he goes; so is every one (begotten) who is born of the Spirit." (John iii., 5.) So is every one begotten; that is, by hearing the report or words of the Spirit. "So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." (Rom. x., 17.) Why should the word translated "wind" in the common version be so translated in this instance, when in every other place—over two hundred times—in the Scriptures, but one, it is translated "Spirit" as it is translated above, and makes sense which it never did as translated in the common version, and which no person ever understood, although many fancied they did.

I am indebted to the editor of the *Quarterly* for the foregoing exposition of the celebrated sayings of Christ to Nicodemus, and it is the only one that appears to me satisfactory, and in consonance with facts, and facts are stubborn things with me. Any exposition of any Scripture that does not give full effect to the force of all the facts relating to the same subject is wanting in accuracy, and is certainly doubtful, if not positively erroneous. It is this principle of giving the facts all the influence they ought to have that has led to the thoughts suggested in these pages.

Another, and probably more frequently quoted passage is, "Also the Spirit bears witness, together with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii., 16.) Or, as it is in the common version, "bears witness with our spirit." The usual construction is as if it read, bears witness to our spirit or unto our spirit.) What does the passage state? That the Holy Spirit does witness, or is a witness, "together with our spirit;" another witness—to what fact "that we are the children of God." Two witnesses to one fact: "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established." The Holy Spirit "testified" in the holy apostles and prophets what God required of men to do to make them his adopted children. The first witness thus speaks: The spirit of man knows when he does what God commands. "He who believes on the Son of God has the testimony in himself." (John, v., 10.) And the second witness then accords with the first, or agrees "that we are the children of God."

Or, to illustrate, the Spirit of God says to believers in the gospel, "Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." (Acts ii., 38.) Now the believer's spirit knows when "he submits to the government" of God, or obeys

these commands; and when he does his sins are remitted, he is saved a child of God.

In *Life and Epistles of Paul*, by Conybeare and Howson, this passage is thus translated: "The Spirit itself joins in testimony with the witness of our own spirit, to prove that we are the children of God."

Another class of passages invariably referred to in this connection is illustrated in the instances where it is said, "I will put my laws into their mind, and inscribe them in their hearts." (Heb. viii., 10.) And I will put into them a new heart and "a new spirit." (Ezek. xi., 19.) "Whose heart the Lord opened to attend to the things which were spoken by Paul." (Acts xvi., 14.) "No man can come to me, unless the Father who has sent me draw him. (John vi, 44.) The simple question to consider is, How are these things done? Is it necessarily implied in each of the expressions that a miracle must be wrought to accomplish the thing spoken of? Certainly not. What then? Not that they are fulfilled literally, and that a heart is taken out of the man—as the rib of Adam—and a new one put in its place; but that the aims, the purposes, the prospects are changed, are made new by the authority, the love, the mercy, the arguments, the blessings, and the denunciations of God, as revealed in the words of the prophets in old times, and of his Son and apostles in the times present. All any one has to do to ascertain how these things are done is to read the facts recorded in connection with them, and see what was said and done, and it will almost always appear that the manner of their performance is explained, as well as the facts related.

At the first, the Spirit, to identify the "saved," dwelt in them in wonderful forms and in a miraculous manner, as the "glory of the Lord" dwelt in the temple to identify it as "God's temple." (2 Chron. vii., 2; Exod. xl., 34.) We have in them our models, and are to follow in their footsteps as directed by the Spirit, and "by well doing" to seek glory, honor, immortality, and eternal life; and "save ourselves" from the punishment of those who will "not obey the truth, but unrighteousness;" who will not obey the gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; who shall suffer a just punishment, "an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power; in that day, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all the believers." (2 Thess. i., 8.)

The mere fact of a person saying that he has "the Spirit," without any evidences or gifts "whereby the Spirit becomes manifest," is of no avail with me. Is it not a peculiar fact, that the men who most vehemently insist that they have "the Spirit" are the very ones who, of all others, most strenuously resist the Spirit, in disobeying the commands of the Spirit through the apostles.

Is it not better, then, to believe the spirit we know of than the

spirit we do not know of; men professing now to have the Spirit of God will tell us we can be saved in a way different from that of which the Spirit in the apostles told us. Which are we to believe? I would believe the apostles, at all events until the present claimants for my faith show their authority by their works, "signs and miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit." A man will tell me now that he has the Spirit, who never obeyed the gospel, and who will deride and scoff at the commands of the Spirit; all I have to say to such a man is, that he has a spirit different from the apostles, or the first Christians, theirs I know is from God, his I know is from some other source. A man will tell me, who is a Churchman, or a Presbyterian, a Methodist, a Baptist, a Quaker, a Mennonist, or a Tunker, that he has the Spirit; each and all claim to be made what they are by the Spirit. Now I know the Spirit of God never made any of the above; for if it were possible to think so, and that he joined them to the different sects named, it is different teaching from that which Paul spoke by the Spirit, when he told them: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who make separations and occasions of falling, contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they who are such do not see the Lord Jesus, but their own belly; and by flattery and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Rom. xvi., 17.) And to the Corinthians: "Now, brethren, I beseech you by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you, but that you be perfectly united in the same mind, and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. i., 10.)

The spirit that brings a "convert" here to the Catholic trunk, and there to a Church of England branch, or to a Presbyterian branch, or a Methodist branch, or a Baptist branch, as the case may be, can not be the same spirit that spoke in Him "who spoke as never man spoke," and who prayed that they all who believed on him through the apostle's word "may be one; as thou Father art in me and I in thee, they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (John xvii., 21.) A "revivalist" acting this course, giving one convert to the Catholics, another to the Church of England, another to the Methodists, etc., would scarcely be tolerated; he would be regarded as one having no settled principles, and as such would be looked upon with suspicion. The Spirit of God leads sinners through the gospel, which is "the power of God unto salvation," to believe, reform, and be immersed "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." When they are thus saved, they are "separated" (Acts xix., 8), and congregated together to "observe all things" whatsoever Jesus had commanded the apostles to teach them: To remember him in his ordinances, to worship and to build each other up in the faith, and love, and hope of the gospel.

I read the apostle Paul in his discussions on the "gifts of the Spirit" in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters, also in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians, and other allusions throughout the Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and other books of the Bible, and taking all together, I am led to conclude with the apostle Paul, that: "Love never fails, but whether prophecies, they will be out of use; or foreign languages, they shall cease; or knowledge, it shall have an end. For we know only in part, and prophesy in part; but when perfection is come, then what is in part will be done away." (1 Cor. xiii., 8.) And as he said to the Ephesians (iv., 13), the gifts which Christ gave were given "till we all come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." And, then, when this was accomplished the apostles could say, he could show a "more excellent way," and that "now abide (continue or remain) faith, hope, and love, these three; but the greatest of these is love." Are Christians on this account left "without God and without hope in the world," to be "of all men most miserable?" Certainly not. For "whosoever will confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he in God. And we have known and believed the love which God has to us. God is love, wherefore he who abides in love, abides in God, and God in him." (1 John iv., 15.) So also Paul prayed for the Ephesians, (iii., 17): "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith," and "be filled with all the fullness of God." So to the Colossians (i., 27,) God has made known "the riches of the glory of this secret among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." And so also the apostle further enjoins them: "Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly." (Col. iii., 16.) We have also that prayer of the apostle in the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, xiii., 14: "The power of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all." We can have the love of God, by keeping his commandments; the favor of Christ, by believing on him and obeying his institutions and walking worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called; and the communion of the Holy Spirit, by letting his words dwell in us richly; and be filled with all the wisdom of God, contemplating on all his relations, and accepting all his communications in the "love of the truth," that we may be saved, and having these declared to us "we may have fellowship with the apostles; and their fellowship truly is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ; and if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses us from all sin." (1 John i., 3, 1.)

In general terms, the position we take on this subject is this: the facts recorded in the New Testament complement the words relating

to Christiana being an habitation of God through the Spirit, and the words are the reflex of the facts, and they are all consistent when construed together, and not so when separated.* But now abide or continue faith, hope, and love. Faith in God and in our Lord Jesus Christ will keep us in the love of God, and keeping his commandments and the life of the glory of God will keep us in patient waiting for the appearance of the Jacob's God and our Savior Jesus Christ. "And every one that has this hope in him, purifies himself, even as he is pure. (1 John iii., 3.)

BETA

POSTPONED BAPTISMS.—I am now in receipt of a letter from a brother calling my attention to the subject of postponed baptisms, and requesting me to notice it at an early day. I do not think it necessary to elaborate the subject in a separate article written specially for that purpose; yet I by no means deem the subject an unimportant one. Obedience to no command of Jesus Christ can be postponed beyond a reasonable length of time with either innocence or safety. In all matters pertaining to the salvation of the soul we should be profoundly earnest. Not even the semblance of a slight or of carelessness should appear in our conduct. Not that we should be in indecent haste, if such a thing be possible; but we should certainly be prompt. To postpone an act of obedience to the will of Christ, when it is perfectly within our power to perform it, is virtually to pronounce the act in the eye of the world a thing of no account. Christians should never seem to do this. The world can find excuses enough for its disobedience; it should hence never be allowed to plead the carelessness of Christians. We hold that baptism to a believing penitent is for the remission of his sins, and that his sins are not remitted till he is baptized. How, now, in the teeth of this tenet, can we postpone the act? Surely, where anything of the kind is done, it must be from a thoughtlessness highly culpable. Can we plead with the sinner that the remission of his sin is his first great want; and then, when he shows himself ready to accept it, treat the means thereof as matters which can be idly delayed? Consistently we can not, I am sure. Let the evangelist see to it, that not even one hour needlessly elapses between the confession and the baptism. If he errs at all, let it be on the safe side; let him rather seem to be too hasty than too slow.

* There are no facta now to which the words are applicable, and the application of the words to a state of facts different from that to which they were at first applied is a misapplication, and necessarily erroneous.

THE CONFESSION OF THE EUNUCH—IS IT GENUINE?

It is well known, perhaps, to all my readers, that the New Testament did not emanate from the hands of the inspired penmen in the form in which we now have it. It at the first existed only in the form of the separate books which at present compose it. These books could be circulated only as each was copied by hand. That each copy, no matter how carefully and scrupulously made, would contain more or less errors is simply to admit that copyists, like other men, are fallible. Especially would these errors multiply where copies were made from copies, and not from originals. Each copy would, of course, propagate the errors of the copy from which it was made, and to these add its own. Thus when a copy became some ten or more times removed from the original, it would unavoidably abound in errors. As long as the originals existed, and were accessible, these errors could, by comparison with them, be corrected. But in the course of time the originals must disappear; and despite of the most faultless willingness to be obedient to the providences of God, if such it be in the present case, how deeply we regret the fact. Why is it that we have not been permitted to look upon those venerable originals, each written "by mine own hand," as Paul would say? That it is all right as it is, I shall be too dutiful to question; but why would a different case have been wrong? To this question we can have no answer save a conjectural one, and this would be satisfactory to none. These originals were either the property of private individuals or of churches; and even in the latter case they would have to be confided to the keeping of individuals. From individuals they would pass to individuals, and from careful to careless hands. Add to this their constant use and constant handling by the hundreds who would want to read them and copy them, and we have no difficulty in accounting for their disappearance from the earth. Copies alone were then left. From these again copies were made. Now from these copies of copies we compile our present Greek New Testament. That it should be free from defects would certainly fall nothing below the miraculous. In some instances it can not be denied that these errors are of a very grave nature; in all cases, of course, they are important; but in a vast majority of cases it is a happy circumstance that they either do not vary the sense at all, or vary it so slightly that no perceptible injury can accrue therefrom.

To remove these errors wholly from the sacred page, or as nearly so as possible, is the especial object of what is termed textual criticism. Of all the forms of criticism known to the literary world this is beyond question the most important,—the most important because

a form of criticism which assumes to deal with matters of no less moment than the very Bible which is to be our guide from earth to the presence of God. It is, therefore, a work for no profane or idle hand. To prosecute it successfully, talent, learning, leisure, and a judgment wonderfully clear and well-balanced are all necessary. Nor even where all these are possessed, especially by the same individual, should we rely too confidently on the results they give us. To afford us the highest confidence we should have in any given case the concurring judgment of several independent and competent minds. Only in this case can we feel satisfied.

At no former period in the history of textual criticism were its deliverances entitled to the credit which they can at the present so justly claim. Indeed, the time is little more than past since it rose to the dignity of a science. At present, however, it claims this honor. Its mature decisions may now, therefore, be looked upon as about final. Not that they are yet to be accepted in every case as absolutely so, but only as the very next thing to final. Hence a passage, heretofore held as Scripture, but now by the concurrent agreement of the best textual critics pronounced not Scripture, may safely be looked upon as spurious. And however much it may remodel either our faith or our practice or both to part from such condemned passage, it is a weakness not to do it.

Among the passages condemned is the 37th verse of the 8th chapter of Acts. It reads in our common version thus: "And Philip said: If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, and said: I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This verse has been, from the publication of our received text to the present, suspected by a large majority of critics as spurious; while by many it has been all the time confidently pronounced so. It is now, with hardly one respectable dissenting voice, held to be no part of original holy writ. To give it up will affect us as a people more than it will any other religious body; and naturally so. For heretofore, as now, we have taken the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as containing the matter of both our faith and practice. Hence, to part from a passage which has hitherto currently passed as a part of the word of God, and which for that reason has of course had its effect in determining either what we hold or do, must naturally be felt by us to be no light affair. The question of giving it up should be by us first thoroughly canvassed; and then only when it is obvious that the verse can not be defended should it be parted from, and our teaching modified, if need be, accordingly. Into the investigation no passion should be allowed to enter. Only as long as we keep calm, and conduct it under the influence of neither prejudice nor partiality, may we expect our results to be entitled to respect.

The following extracts will give the reader the judgment in the case

of the soundest critics of the day. This judgment is not likely soon, if ever, to be reversed. We cite first from Tregelles: "In discussions on baptism, we still sometimes find those who cite Acts viii., 31: 'And Philip said: If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, and said: I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' This is done apparently in entire unconsciousness that no part of this verse is recognized in critical texts, or indeed (what would weigh more with some) in the first printed edition."

Such is the decision of a man whose judgment in the case will perhaps carry more weight than that of any other witness living or dead. In this decision two facts are stated, which deserve to be singled out and rendered specially prominent:

1. That the first *printed* Greek New Testament, which was completed June 10, 1514, omitted the verse in question. To this fact, however, can be attached no great importance, as this edition of the Greek New Testament has never stood very high as an authority.

2. "*That no part of this verse is recognized in critical texts.*" If so, then must the verse be recognized as wholly false; and hence it should be universally repudiated. That this is now the judgment not only of Dr. Tregelles, but also of critics who, if not as eminent as he, yet stand but very little below him in skill and reliability, it is idle to deny or to attempt to conceal from the people.

From the same author I cite also the following: "And this verse, (Acts viii., 31), little as is its claim to be considered part of Holy Scripture, was inserted by Erasmus, as being supposed to have been incorrectly omitted in his MSS.; and from his edition, this and similar passages have been perpetuated, just as if they were undoubtedly genuine. In such cases, we repeatedly find the Complutensian editors, in spite of their reverence for the Vulgate, give the Greek as they found it in their copies; although from their mode of editing they must have been very well aware of the difference between it and the Latin by the side; where, in fact, they fill up the Greek column in such a manner as to make the variation conspicuous. In such places, if the Complutensian text had ever acquired a place in common use, the many who now uphold what they read, traditionally, just because they are accustomed to it, would have been as strenuous in repudiating words as spurious, as they now are in defending them as genuine."

On this extract but little comment is necessary; still a few of its facts deserve to be individualized and rendered more conspicuous, and at least one, which it assumes the reader to be acquainted with, to be more distinctly stated.

1. Then let the reader bear in mind that the fourth edition of Erasmus, of the Greek New Testament, published in 1521, is substantially the same as the text we now term the received text.

2. That Erasmus inserted the verse in question in his edition, either

from the margin of some Greek MS., which is the more likely, or that he first translated it into Greek from "the Vulgate and then inserted it; and that in this way it has come to form a part of our present Greek Testament.

3. That had the Complutensian edition of the Greek New Testament been generally received, instead of that of Erasmus, we should seldom, perhaps never, have heard of this verse. In that case we should have been shocked with any attempt to induce us to receive it as genuine, whereas we are now pained at the thought of having to part from it.

Such are the facts and conclusions from the premises thus far before us. I shall next insert a note from T. S. Green, altering it only in this particular, that I will give the names of the manuscripts to which he refers instead of the letters commonly used to denote them. Mr. Green says:

"This entire verse (Acts viii., 37) is wanting in the Alexandrine MS., in the Vatican, in that of Ephraem, in the MS. Harleianus, in that of Wolf, marked B, and in more than sixty others; the Codex Amiatinus of the Hieronymian Latin *pr. man.*, the Peshito, Coptic, Sahidic, AETHiopic, etc.

"The passage also exhibits that mark of spuriousness, shiftings of shape. Thus, for instance, its best authority E. (the Codex Basileensis), instead of ἔλασιν has σωθήση, and for πιστεύω . . . ἤριστόν, reads πιστεύω εἰς τόν Χ. τόν υἱ. τοῦ Ο.

"The whole is undoubtedly an artificial supplement, where the unstudied brevity of the narrative had left the appearance of unconditional administration of the rite."

Such is the judgment of one of the most competent scholars now living in the kingdom of Great Britain. How far this judgment can be accepted as final the reader must decide for himself. When, however, a verse, as in the present case, is wanting in most of the best MSS.; and where its form is constantly varied even in the inferior ones which contain it, the presumption against it becomes very strong. Again: if the original manuscript of Luke had contained it, the strong probability is that it would never have been, as an entire verse, omitted, for the simple reason that no sufficient reason can be discovered for omitting it. But allowing that the original did not contain it, and at once we can see that a temptation would arise to insert it; since without it the text is somehow felt to be naked and incomplete. This circumstance, whenever strong manuscript authority concurs with it, is allowed to have great weight against a reading.

My next authority is that of Dr. Alford. Of the verse he says: "The authorities against this verse are too strong to permit its insertion. It appears to have been one of those remarkable additions to the text of the Acts, common in D (which is here deficient) and its cognates; few of which, however, have found their way into the

received text. This was made very early, as Irenaeus has it. The MSS. which contain it vary exceedingly; another strong mark of spuriousness in a disputed passage. Dr. Wordsw. retains it, citing Bornemann as doing the same; but it is Bornemann's principle that all these insertions of D and its cognates formed part of the original text; so that his authority goes for nothing. Dr. W. also states that it is found in the Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate, which *it is not*, except as a correction by a second hand."

The revised text of the Greek Testament by Dr. Alford is to-day perhaps the most popular one in Great Britain. It may not possibly stand so high as that of Dr. Tregelles, when the text of the latter is completed; but at present none stands higher. His judgment, therefore, in the case in hand, will be held as entitled to uncommon weight; and this judgment is, that we are not permitted to insert the verse as part of the divine text.

To the foregoing authorities might be added very many others, but without increasing much the trustworthiness of our final conclusion. With these authorities standing so confidently against the verse in question, it will, it must be confessed, be difficult to defend it. Indeed, until they are successfully impeached, or their opinion in some other way set aside, this can not be done. The verse will have to stand as condemned. I, of course, do not say that this will indisputably be the final judgment of the critical world, but at present there seems the least possible doubt of it.

But now, as an offset to the foregoing, it has to be added that many MSS. contain the verse. These, however, although some of them stand high, are not considered the most reliable. Besides they differ in the case in hand greatly one from another. Moreover they are generally among the more recent MSS., and for this additional reason are allowed to carry the less weight. Of course, the farther a MS. is removed from the sacred original, the more numerous are its chances in a given case to be wrong.

But further, that the verse in question was inserted, if spurious, at a very early day is evinced by this, that Irenaeus quotes it. It is thus shown to antedate even the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament extant. That this is a highly important fact, in arguing the genuineness of a passage is cheerfully admitted; still, in no case can it be accepted as conclusive, when overwhelmingly outweighed, as in the case in hand, by manuscript authority. It still appears, therefore, that we shall be compelled to abandon the passage.

However, on the fact that the passage was inserted at a day so very early has been based an argument curiously defensive of the practice the passage teaches, which it may be well to notice. This very early insertion of the passage, it is argued, even allowing it not to be genuine, and its use by Irenaeus, shows, at least, that it was at

that day the custom to take the confession of persons before baptizing them. But this argument is defective in two respects, either of which is fatal to it. For in the first place, if the practice was not apostolic, then the practice is just as likely to have risen from the passage as the passage from the practice. In that case, one or the other was an invention, and the other grew out of it; and certainly it was quite as easy to invent the passage without the practice, as to originate the practice without the passage. Which antedated the other can never be shown in this way; but I should strongly incline to the side of the passage. But in the second place, even allowing the practice to have existed then, and it is by no means thereby shown to be right; for even in that early day, practices are known to have existed which were not apostolic. That a practice existed in the Church of Christ, at a day so very close to that of the apostles, certainly raises a presumption that it *may* have originated with them, but nothing more. Only when a practice is clearly enjoined in the New Testament can we confidently say it was apostolic.

But granting that the passage must be abandoned as spurious, and for this conclusion, we, as a people, may begin to prepare ourselves, for to this, in my opinion, will we ultimately be driven, and how is it to affect our practice? In the first place, I do not see that it is to affect our practice at all; it will only affect our mode of defending our practice. This effect it may have; but it can have no other; at least I shall not now grant that it can have any other.

Clearly it can not affect the confession as a fact, neither the thing confessed. That Jesus is the Christ is the great radical truth of the Bible. He who believes not this will be damned. This, then, must be believed by all in order to salvation; and this truth is the thing confessed, or the matter of the confession. Of course, this truth stands as the keystone in the great doctrinal arch of Christianity, no matter what becomes of the verse in hand. No degree nor kind of criticism, nor any extent of expurgation of the New Testament, will ever eradicate from its sacred page this truth, the very basis of its existence. Hence the matter of the confession is forever secured. On this score, therefore, no solicitude need be felt.

Nor can any danger accrue to the confession as a fact. This rests on a foundation unreachd by criticism except to confirm it. The Savior says: "Every one, then, who confesses me before men, him I too will confess before my Father who is in heaven. But whoever denies me before men, him I too will deny before my Father who is in heaven." The same sentiment is reiterated in Luke, and in very similar words. Again, Paul says: "The word is nigh you, in your mouth and in your heart, that is, the word of belief, which we preach; for if you will confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you shall be

saved; for in heart men believe into justification, and with the mouth confess into salvation." These passages stand on no uncertain ground; and on these stands the confession as a fact. It is hence absolutely safe. But to the same effect Paul still further speaks in his first letter to Timothy, thus: "Fight the good fight of belief; lay hold on everlasting life into which you were called; and you confessed the good confession before many witnesses." In this passage the apostle tells us, as a historic fact, that Timothy actually made the good confession before many witnesses. It hence not only secures the confession as a fact, but possesses for us all the force of a precedent, determining us to the same act.

But now comes the important and difficult question on these premises: What is the nature or character of the confession here secured? Is it a single confession made once and never repeated again, or is it the continued acknowledgment of Christ through the whole life of the saint? Is it, in other words, herein taught that we are at all times and under all circumstances to own Christ, and never deny him? Or that the confession consists in and is exhausted by a single act, not to be a second time repeated? These are now the questions for our thought.

That we are at all times and under all circumstances to confess Christ, and never deny him, is by all Christians admitted. This much the Scriptures cited certainly teach, but whether more or not is the question. By us, as a people, the word confess is understood to have two meanings, differing only in this, that the one includes a single act, the other the same act often recurring. To the former we uniformly and almost exclusively apply the word confess, and the phrase good confession; that is, we apply them to the single act, and not to the recurring act.

When a person presents himself to take his first formal step in becoming a Christian, we require him to confess with his mouth the belief of his heart in Jesus as the Christ, and hold that in this act his first formal step consists. In defense of this procedure, and as justifying it, we often, indeed generally, cite the language of the Savior: "Every one, then, who confesses me before men, him I too will confess before my Father who is in heaven." Have we been right in this use of the passage? I am free to confess my doubt of it. That the passage may and does include this single formal act I shall not deny, but that this single act is what the Savior had in his mind when he uttered the passage is with me far from being clear. I strongly incline to the opinion that the confession to which the Savior refers is the constantly recurring confession of him, and not the single act. Of course the single act is embraced, as being the first of the series; but, then, I do not see that special and prominent reference to this was designed. I much incline to think that the reference in the passage is

to Christians as such, and not to sinners; and that about all we can prove by it is that the Christian is under every circumstance to confess Christ and never to deny him. That the passage teaches that the penitent is, before baptism and as a prerequisite to it, to stand up and formally confess his faith in Christ, is to me not apparent. That the passage includes this confession, as already said, I am willing to grant; but that we must demand the act of the believer as a duty, and this in virtue of the passage, is what I do not see.

But heretofore we have had no difficulty on this score. In Acts viii., 37, we have had a precedent authoritative and final. Here the confession was made,—made, too, by a sinner,—made before baptism,—made before it because required before it, and required before it as a prerequisite to it. This rendered our procedure in all like cases necessary, and left it clear. There remained to us neither alternative nor discretion. We must follow our precedent to the letter. Guided by it, therefore, we have uniformly done as Philip did, that is, we have required the sinner formally, before we would immerse him, to confess his faith in Christ. To this act we have almost exclusively applied the phrase good confession. For this our procedure we have neither sought nor required sanction beyond our precedent, while we have felt sure, and so feel still, that we gave to the act we required the right name. But now it seems that our precedent is about to be taken from us. No longer, then, can we plead its authority. What must be the effect? Is our procedure to undergo no change? If not, how can it be shown still to stand on scriptural ground? These are not light questions; and I confess that to me they are not wholly free from difficulty.

Heretofore our motto, as a people, has been: We will hold nothing, we will do nothing, for which we can not plead a thus says the Lord, or an approved precedent. Is this our motto wrong? I can not think it. Yet is our future conduct, in no sense, to be embarrassed by it? We shall see.

A man presents himself before me, and demands immersion at my hands. At this I rejoice. But before I will immerse him I require him to confess with his lips his faith in Christ. Now that he is to believe I do not allow to be questionable. This point, then, we at once dismiss as secured and settled forever. But I require him to *confess* his belief. Grant now that, in obedience to the Savior's language, I may require this, and this much at least I believe may be fairly granted; and still my procedure is not all secured. An opponent stands up and says to me: "You require this man to confess his belief in Christ *before* you will immerse him? For this have you either a thus says the Lord, or an approved precedent?" Could I successfully answer this question? It is not clear that I could. Belief with the heart, as a fact, is secured without Acts viii., 37; con-

fession with the mouth, as a fact, is secured without it; but without it *the time* of the confession can not be determined. I know not a single passage from which it can be made out. At this let not my brethren be startled. If the verse in question be not Scripture, let us abandon it; and still in the end we, as a people, shall be the gainers. The loss of it may affect no others so much as it will us, but at last none will be so much benefited. This is my firm belief. Hence to part from it, if I must, shall not cost me even one regret. The result may be, not that we shall alter our practice, nor yet abandon our motto; but that to the latter we may have to make a slight addition. This I have long felt to be a necessity; for it is clear to me that the motto is not sufficiently comprehensive. Procedure in a given case may be as authoritatively determined by *necessary implication* as by either a thus says the Lord, or by an approved precedent. In this respect, I think, our motto has been slightly at fault. Hence in the end we may have a little to modify it. If so, this is about all the change that will have to be effected.

But is it so that, abandoning the verse in hand, the *lime* of the confession can be made out from no other passage in the Bible? It is not only so, but it can never be shown that any one ever made the confession *as a prerequisite* to immersion, unless the fact is necessarily implied; and on this latter point I shall not take a position just now.

1. It is simply certain that the Savior's language, as now already quoted, does not *require* us to take the penitent's confession prior to immersing him. Not that such confession would then be out of place, and in certain contingencies it might be necessary; but only that by the language we can not in every case, and under all circumstances, exact it.

2. Nor can more be gathered from the passage in Romans. Here confession with the mouth is certainly inculcated, and that, too, as necessary to salvation. And this I deem must be held as true whether the salvation be that of the sinner or that of the saint. In neither case is salvation attainable unless Christ be owned. But, then, is this confession, in the case of the sinner, to be made immediately precedent to immersion, and as a prerequisite to it? In both cases, that is, in the case both of the saint and the sinner, it has to be made in order to salvation, and hence, of course, before it. But in the case of the sinner, the only salvation it can be necessary to is remission of sins. Hence, in order to this, it must be made. But, then, is it to be made before immersion? This the passage does not settle. All we can now say is, that both the confession and immersion precede remission; but whether immersion precedes the confession, or the confession immersion, is by this passage not determined.

3. A passage in Timothy, already cited, involving the confession, is thought by some to be more decisive; but whether correctly or not is

not clear. It reads thus, slightly altered from the preceding rendering: "Make the good fight of belief, lay hold on everlasting life into which you were called, and you made the good confession before many witnesses." Two past events are here named: first, the call of Timothy into everlasting life, which call consisted simply in his hearing the gospel; and second, the making of the good confession. But when had this good confession been made? Had it been made before his immersion? This is neither asserted nor necessarily implied. But it will be said, the act of making the good confession is closely connected in the narrative with the call into everlasting life; and since this preceded immersion, so must the other. This is not conclusive. True, the two events are narrated together, but there is nothing in the form of the narrative compelling us to conclude that they happened together. They may, for aught that appears to the contrary, have stood wide apart. This passage, consequently, merely secures the confession as a fact, but without determining the precise time when it is to be first made.

How, then, shall the time of the confession be determined? If not by implication in the facts and circumstances attending remission of sins, then am I free to confess to a difficulty in the case. First, it is perfectly clear that the confession must succeed belief, for belief in Christ is the very thing confessed; hence, of course, it can not precede this. Second, according to the passage from Romans it must in every case of salvation, and hence, of course, in that of the sinner, be made before salvation, since it is into salvation. But the salvation of the sinner consists in the remission of his sins. Hence, from these facts, we locate the confession, when first made, after belief and before remission. But where between them? This is the difficult question. Indeed, by a thus says the Lord, or an approved precedent, it can not be answered at all.

Certainly *the most natural* place for the confession is immediately subsequent to belief. When a man believes a thing, obviously then is the time to own it, especially where it is made his duty to own it. Again, it is my certain duty to immerse the believer, and equally my duty not to immerse the unbeliever. I must then know that the person whom I immerse is a believer. This I can never know unless he avow it. But this avowal, when made as an act enabling me to immerse him, is his confession, and is obviously the immediately precedent act to immersion. Here, then, after belief and immediately before immersion do we fix the time of the confession. This conclusion I believe to be fully warranted by the premises from which it is drawn; and shall hence act on it with entire confidence in its soundness. It may be, however, that a still further investigation of the subject is necessary. Should any brother so think, the pages of the *Quarterly* are open to his well-written article. To us, as a people, the subject

is comparatively new; and it is by no means claimed that it is here exhausted. Hence more on it may be a necessity. We shall be happy to receive aid from any source which may contribute to set the issue raised at rest.

OUR FUTURE.—It is, no doubt, best for an editor, as a general rule, to make but few promises; as in case of failure he will at least have the consolation of knowing that he has broken but few pledges. Still, with proper reservations and qualifications, it may be well now and then to drop a hint as to our future course. This will have the effect to assure brethren, and to confine their expectations within such limits as to enable us to meet them.

First, then, ever since the *Quarterly* was commenced many excellent brethren have insisted that each number contains too many long articles. Not that they would have all its articles short, but that they would not have so many long ones. Upon the whole I incline to think this judgment a sound one, and feel disposed, in a measure, to conform the *Quarterly* to it. The change I think of making, then, is this: to insert in each number not more than three lengthy articles, and the rest short ones. This will introduce a greater variety of matter, and better adapted in most cases to the popular mind. We hope thus to render the *Quarterly* not less acceptable to its present friends, but to adapt it to a larger number of readers than it now has, and in this way increase its circulation.

Second. We have been thinking for some time of furnishing in each number a summary of all the news we get through exchanges, and in other ways, touching the progress of the great work in which we toil. This summary will aim to contain the general statistics of our churches in all the States and Territories of our country, as far as they can be learned. We hope to make this an interesting feature of the *Quarterly* in the future. We shall feel deeply obliged to all our preachers for the aid necessary to carry out this suggestion. We wish to make reports especially as to the progress of the truth, and the standing and condition of our churches. The whole work of the evangelic field will be in place here.

DRAPER'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE.

THIS is, in many respects, a most extraordinary work. The great amount of labor necessarily bestowed by the author, and the vast amount of light thrown upon the intellectual struggles of the past, demand the gratitude of the age for which he has labored. With a power of intellect seldom surpassed, he has grappled with the most difficult problems of science and philosophy peculiar to any age.

The historic illustrations of the work are graphic and of peculiar interest. The style is elegant and attractive in the highest degree. In short, we have here presented the intellectual efforts of every age, in a manner at once condensed and yet most deeply interesting. How sad, then, that such a work should be marred by the blighting influence of skepticism I—that such an intellect should be obscured by the dark clouds of infidelity! When we contemplate the intellectual strength of Gibbon, Hume, and Draper, and remember what they have done for science and literature, we can not but weep to think that the weight of their names has been given against our holy religion.

But we do not intend to class the author of "The Development" in the same infidel category with the two great historians named. The infidelity of the latter is open and manly in its declarations, while that of the former, since presented under the garb of religion, is only the more vile and insidious in itself. While he professes to reverence God as the source of all power and authority, and speaks of Jesus as the Savior of the world, he leaves nature and the human intellect to accomplish by their innate power the great drama of creation, providence, and redemption. God is, but has nothing to do. He sits upon the throne of the universe, wrapped in the gloom of his own solitude; while what the author terms "law," with godlike energy, brings forth worlds from nebulous chaos, and peoples them with ten thousand forms of life. God is hurled from the throne of his power, and nature takes his place. The pantheism of India and Greece, exhumed from the moldering ruins of the past, is clothed in the more refined conceptions of the nineteenth century, and presented to the world as the religion of Christ, purified by the intellectual struggles of ages. Jesus the Christ died to redeem the world from mental darkness and moral turpitude, yet the intellectual efforts of nations are guided by the inevitable destiny of fate. The power of the gospel to regenerate humanity is tacitly admitted, while hundreds of pages are written to prove that intellectual development is accomplished by the unaided energies of the mind, guided by laws as inevitable as fate itself.

If the author has clothed himself with the semblance of religion, the

more insidiously to impose his skepticism upon society, he deserves the contempt of every good man; but if in his love for the exact sciences he has pushed his investigations further than sound reason would sanction, and thus become lost in the meshes of skepticism, he deserves the pity of mankind.

In the present paper we make no effort to review Dr. Draper's work; for, if we have the ability, we have not now the time for the accomplishment of that task. We simply propose to defend the religion of Christ from the consequences arising from one or two conclusions arrived at in this book: 1. The doctrine of creation by law. 2. The exclusion of providence, or the immediate agency of God, from the government of the world.

Before proceeding to the consideration of these questions, we want it distinctly understood that we entertain none of that prejudice against science which the author so successfully combats. We were neither brought up under the Byzantine system, nor are we in the least degree under its baneful influence. We are among those who recognize divine harmony in all that God has said and done. The same God who made the heavens and the earth revealed himself perfectly in the person of his Son Jesus the Christ. We read his wisdom in the wonderful mechanism of man and in the stupendous glory of the universe. We behold his power in the grandeur of the tempest, the raging of the sea, the flashing of the lightning, and the terror of the earthquake. We see his goodness in the wonderful adaptation of his creatures, to all the circumstances by which they are surrounded. From the warbling of the birds to the "music of the spheres," one harmonious hymn of praise ascends to our great Creator. Let there, then, be no war between the Christian and the philosopher. The same spirit that burned Bruno at the stake for affirming the rotation of the earth on its axis would, if encouraged, condemn the chemist and geologist of the present day to the same unhappy fate. The indignant soul, remembering the sufferings of this illustrious proto-martyr to scientific truth, and of his no less distinguished compatriot, Galileo, pours out its anathemas upon that grand instrument of evil, the Roman hierarchy.

There can be no conflict between true science and religion. Hence, when Galileo demonstrated by an induction of facts the rotation of the earth upon its axis, men of intelligence abandoned at once the geocentric theory of the earth, and upon examination found, to their astonishment, that the Bible had taught nothing upon the subject; but in making a revelation for man at an earlier age, had simply adopted the common expressions of that day without stopping to expose their errors, but leaving these to be unfolded by the future developments of science. So, also, when inductive science developed the fact that no matter had been, or could be, annihilated; that the world was more than six, thousand years old; and that the Noachian deluge did

net extend over the entire globe, men of intellect abandoned their preconceived notions.

That the contest was long and fearful we shall not deny. On the one hand, the papal authority endeavored to crush out the first smugglings of infant science; on the other, the infidel laid hold of scientific truth to invalidate the claims of Christianity. Both being alike hostile to divine truth, it suffered much. The inquiring mind was alienated from Christ; and religion was abandoned, as fit only for the ignorant and superstitious. The most inveterate hatred was engendered between the philosopher and the Christian. The onward march of science was rapid, and but for a few such spirits as Newton, Clarke, Smith, Miller, and Hitchcock, the triumph of skepticism would have been perfect, and England and America would, like Germany and France, have been curtailed by the night of infidelity. These master-spirits, profoundly impressed with the conviction that God was the author of both nature and revelation, recognized the fact that his word, rightly interpreted, could not be in conflict with the true developments of science. This principle once settled, the task was easy. The object of revelation is to make known to man his origin, early history, and future destiny; to reveal God as the Creator, Ruler, Preserver, and Redeemer of humanity; in short, to reveal Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the great work of creation, providence, and redemption. The Bible has not for its object the revelation of scientific truth; hence, in every incidental allusion to physical phenomena, the commonly received language of the day is adopted without any effort to determine its correctness. Indeed, it would have been no revelation at all upon any other principle. They did not understand scientific facts as now developed, and hence any allusion to them in their present form would have been utterly unintelligible to them. Thus we read of the rising and setting of the sun, and that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still. So, even now, we speak of the rising and setting of the sun, but to us this language is simply relative; then it was thought to be literally true, and any other mode of expression would have been inadmissible.

The Bible affirms that the waters of the flood covered the whole world. To that people they did, for to them the southern part of Asia constituted the whole world; they knew of no other world.

The church made the Bible to teach that the earth was but six thousand years old; geology demonstrates it to be of great age,—to have existed, perhaps, for millions of years before man was created.

In the first verse of the Bible we are told that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," in the second verse, "that the earth was without form and void." How long a time intervened between "the beginning," when God created the world from nothing, and the time when it is said to have been "without form and void,"

the Bible does not say; for aught we know to the contrary it may have been myriads of years, nor is this close connecting of events far distant apart uncommon in the writings of the Old Testament. In the five literal days following this period God renovated the earth, peopled the seas with their present inhabitants, created all the trees that now grow upon the earth, and all the animals that now live on its face. On the sixth day he made man, and placed him over all the works of his hand. With all these facts the science of geology is strangely and beautifully in harmony. Thus the conflict has ended. Truth has triumphed, and science, instead of being the enemy of Christianity, has become her most constant and faithful handmaid. The infidel, overwhelmed by the power of truth, has retired from the contest. The Christian may now calmly survey the field, and exclaim with the Psalmist: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament displays his handiwork."

But let us pause and inquire what has been gained. Are we still, after the lapse of three hundred and fifty years, in the midst of Cimmerian darkness? Are we yet to be mystified by the speculations of the dogmatist, or has not the sun of inductive science arisen in all his full-orbed splendor? The following conclusions we conceive to be infallibly established:

1. There can be no discrepancy between scientific truth and revelation.

2. Dogmatism has been dethroned in science and in religion, and inductive science has taken its place. The mere *ipse dixit* has ceased to be regarded, and no hypothesis is received as true unless it gives a satisfactory explanation of every case of the given phenomenon induced.

3. The dogmatic declarations of skeptics, however plausibly presented and in whatever garb attired, can not affect the divine authenticity of revelation.

4. Every objection to Christianity made from a scientific standpoint must be based upon a proposition established by an overwhelming induction of facts. To these established principles, then, we shall most strictly hold the author of "The Development."

Of the doctrine of creation by law, the author says: "The nebulous hypothesis requires us to admit that all the ponderable material now constituting the various bodies of the solar system once extended in a rarefied or nebulous and rotating condition beyond the confines of the most distant planet. That postulate granted, the structure and present condition of the system may be mathematically deduced. * * * It was the actual telescopic observation of such objects that led Herschel to the nebular hypothesis." But what is this "nebular hypothesis?" Says our author: "For as the vast rotating spheroid lost its heat by radiation it contracted, and its velocity of rotation neces-

sarily increased; and thus were left behind from its equatorial zone, by reason of the centrifugal force, rotating rings, the same result occurring periodically again and again. These rings must lie all in one plane. They might break, collapsing into one rotating spheroid, a planet, or into many asteroids, or maintain the ring-like form. From the larger of these secondary spheroids other rings might be thrown off, as from the parent mass; these in their turn breaking and becoming spheroids constitute satellites, whose movements correspond to those of their primaries. We might, indeed, advance a step further, and show how, by the radiation of heat from a motionless nebula, a movement of rotation in a determinate direction might be engendered, and that upon these principles, the existence of a nebulous matter admitted and the present laws and forces of nature regarded as having been unchanged, the manner of origin of the solar system might be deduced, and all those singular facts previously alluded to explained."

Such is the theory of creation by law. On this subject the Bible speaks as follows: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." "All things were made by him, and without him not one thing was made that now exists." "For by him were all things created, things in heaven and things in earth, visible and invisible." Now how vast a difference between the positive declarations of these Scriptures and the guessing, doubting suppositions of the author! The one attributes to God immediately the vast works of creation; the other endeavors to remove him as far as possible from that work. The central thought of the one is God—the Creator; the other loses sight of him in the vain effort to defy his laws. But why should I invite the attention of the author of "The Development" to the word of God? The silence maintained throughout the six hundred pages of this volume, in reference to the authority of the sacred oracles, is ominous, to say the least.

That an honest theist may adopt this theory is, to my mind, a proposition that is barely possible; at least the theory does no honor to the living God. If God be a gloomy, secluded being, situated perhaps in the centre of the universe, with ten thousand deified laws around him in space, to which he has delegated all his power, is he any longer the God of the Christian? If his laws are not the uniform expression of his controlling presence in the government of the universe, what becomes of his omnipresence? If he has delegated all power to his laws, what of his omnipotence? If he has left the future interest of his creatures to the inevitable destiny of inexorable law, what of his infinite care and love for humanity? In short, with no further demand for goodness, wisdom, or power than that which nature herself exerts, what necessity remains for the existence of God? Such is the consummation of this philanthropic (?) effort to emancipate

mind from the bondage of the author's age of faith—cold, cheerless atheism; the blackness of darkness forever. Surely this age owes him a debt of gratitude which it can never repay, and Christian fathers should be in haste to commit to his training the hopeful sons of America. Alas! that the minds of the youth of our country who aspire to the honors of the medical profession should be poisoned by the insidious sophistries of this covert, and therefore most dangerous, enemy of the faith. I can respect a bold and fearless adversary; but ask me not to respect the man who in the darkness of the night would stab in the back the unsuspecting traveler.

But to the consideration of this nebulous hypothesis. Upon what does it rest—an induction of known philosophical phenomena? No, not upon one single established fact; but upon the following suppositions: 1. That nebulous matter exists in space. 2. That by refrigeration a rotary motion may be given to this nebulous matter. 3. That by centrifugal force outer rings of these nebula? may be thrown off, and that these rings might form spherical bodies.

Nor are we alone in our estimate of the basis upon which this hypothesis rests. Says the distinguished author of *Modern Atheism*: "For let it be considered first of all, that the theory proceeds on the assumption of the existence, and wide diffusion of a nebulous fluid, of whose reality there is no actual proof; secondly, that it necessarily requires, also, the supposed existence of certain favorable conditions; and, thirdly, the operation of certain invariable laws; and it will be manifest at once that it is purely hypothetical throughout, and that it includes a variety of topics which never have been, and never can be, made the subjects of experimental verification."

But the very basis of the theory, weak as it is, has been swept away in the onward march of science. Many of the nebulae of the elder Herschel have been demonstrated, by the younger Herschel and his illustrious companions, to be, simply clusters of far-distant stars. All have not yet been determined, but as telescopic power has increased many of these nebula have been resolved into stars, while others have been discovered; leading irresistibly to the conclusion that, if we had power sufficient, all would be resolved into clusters of stars, while other fields of nebulae would be discovered in the immeasurable distances of space. Sir John Herschel declares, as the result of his observation, that "we have every reason to believe, at least in the generality of cases, that a nebula is nothing more than a cluster of stars." Says Sir David Brewster: "The very first application of Lord Rosse's telescopes to the heavens overturned the hypothesis; and with such unequivocal facts as that instrument has brought to light, we regard it as a most unwarrantable assumption to suppose that there are in the heavenly spaces any masses of matter different from solid bodies composing planetary systems." And now, as if to com-

plete the demolition of this baseless theory, Hitchcock tells us that "the ablest mechanics are unable to see how a rotary motion should be produced in nebulous matter by refrigeration; or, if this be assumed, how the successive portions, detached by superior centrifugal force, should form spherical masses."

Such is the means adopted by the skeptic to overturn the faith of the Christian. But we would scarce suppose that so precise a writer would indulge his fancy to so great an extent;—that one so fond of the exact sciences should rest his grandest conception, that for which he has toiled through five hundred pages, upon the "baseless fabric of a vision;"—that one who could hurl such thunderbolts of wrath at patristic assumptions should, in valiant opposition to revealed truth, out-Herod Herod himself in his baseless assumptions. The attack of the author upon religion has been insidious we grant, but none the less potent on account thereof. Had it been bold and manly, like that of his illustrious master, M. Comte, we should not have feared its influence; then the most unsuspecting reader would have discovered the author's design; as it is, we esteem his work as most dangerous and infamous in its character. That the infidelity of the theory may be manifest, let us hear M. Comte, the author of the hypothesis. He says: "To minds unacquainted with the study of the heavenly bodies, astronomy has still the reputation of being a science eminently religious, as if the famous verse, '*Coeli enarrant gloriam Dei*' ('The heavens declare the glory of God') had preserved all its force." Again: "At present, to minds that have been early familiarized with the true astronomical philosophy, the heavens declare no other glory than that of Hipparchus, Kepler, Newton, and all those who have contributed to the establishment of their laws." Such is the legitimate fruits of the theory, and we are fully persuaded that the author of "The Development" was well acquainted with its consequences.

But the author's boldest advance toward skepticism is yet to be seen. Not satisfied with the creation by law of inanimate worlds, he takes one step further, and makes law to people those worlds with animate and intelligent beings. After spending twenty-five years in an effort to comprehend the intellectual condition of the world for the past three millenniums of its history, the author, though familiar with the various forms of skepticism prevalent throughout that long lapse of time, and though surrounded by the Christian civilization of the nineteenth century, permits himself, at one moment, to be led into the absurdities of pantheism, and in the next sinks himself into the groveling depths of materialism. Let us hear him: "There have been, and are every instant, interstitial deaths of all the constituent portions (of the human body), and an unceasing removal of those that have performed their duty. Instead of departing portions, new ones have been introduced, interstitial births and organizations perpetually

taking place. In physiology it becomes no longer a question that all this proceeds in a determined way, under the operation of principles that are fixed, of laws that are invariable. The alchemists introduced no poetic fiction when they spoke of the microcosm, asserting that the system of man is emblematical of the system of the world. The intercalation of a new organic molecule in a living being answers to the introduction of a new form in the universal organic series. It requires as much power to call into existence a living molecule as to produce a living being. Both are accomplished upon the same principle, and that principle is not an incessant intervention of a supernatural kind, but the operation of an unvariable law. Physical agents, working through physical laws, remove in organisms such molecules as have accomplished their work, and create new ones; and physical agents, working through physical laws, control the extinction and creation of forms in the universe of life. The difference is only in the time. What is accomplished in the one case in the twinkling of an eye, in the other may demand the lapse of a thousand centuries." Again: "The doctrine of the transmutation of species has met with no little resistance. They who have refused to receive it as one of the truths of nature have perhaps not given full weight to physiological evidence. * * * Two modes have been presented, by which we may conceive of the influence of physical agents upon organic forms. Their long persistent action upon the individual may give rise to modification, developing one part, stunting another; and such variations, being transmitted in an hereditary way, may become firmly fixed at last. * * * Or, in the second place, we might refer them to an intrinsic force of development imparted to each form, which reached in due season its maximum, and then declined and died."

The author's theory, as above elicited, resolves itself into the doctrine of spontaneous generation and transmutation of species. That all animal and vegetable life is the result of creation by law, and that the lesser plants and animals thus created were transmuted through successive forms into more and more perfect manifestations of organic life. Thus the simple monad, "born of electricity and albumen," ascends through successive forms of life, until "the human similitude at last appears in the character of the monkey; the monkey rises into the baboon, the baboon is exalted to the orang-outang; and the chimpanzee, with a more human toe and shorter arms, gives birth to man."

Nothing but the fatal nightmare of materialism, which seems to have overwhelmed the mental faculties of so many eminent physiologists of the age, could have led the author into such consummate folly and madness. Certainly a proposition so monstrous and absurd will be found based upon a grand induction of facts. But alas for the author, he can not find in nature one single fact upon which to rest

his theory. He says: "The intercalation of a new organic molecule in a living being answers to the introduction of a new form in the universal organic series. It requires as much power to call into existence a living molecule, as to produce a living being." Did it require no more intellectual power to make a watch, than to regulate its machinery when put together? Is there no difference in the intellectual power of a Morse, and that of the boy of thirteen who sits and plies his fingers that he may receive the wondrous revelations of the immortal telegraph? The author is an eminent anatomist and physiologist, does he see no difference in the machinery of an organism by which its life is perpetuated, and that infinite wisdom which created and arranged its complicate parts / Did the same blind law which propels the blood through the human system create that most wonderful and complicate system of arteries and veins by which the end is accomplished? The same fixed law that eliminates (not creates) a molecule of phosphorus and deposits it in the bone of my little finger, create man, the most complicate machinery of his body, his moral faculties and intellectual endowments / But in pity I forbear. Infinitely more credulity must it require to believe so monstrous a lie, than to believe that God created man and made him what he is.

Passing from this unsupported assertion, two long and labored arguments are presented in the effort to sustain the author's theory: first, that the development of organic life has been progressive from a lower to a higher grade continually; second, that there has been a progressive nervous development in the animal series in accordance therewith. I need not say that the second proposition depends for its truth upon the first, and must necessarily stand or fall with it We might grant, as in one point we do, a progressive development in the organic series; but has the author thereby proved or adduced one single instance of spontaneous production or transmutation of species? Would it not be more in harmony with philosophy and reason to say that an all-wise God had, from time to time, created new species adapted to the improved condition of the earth's surface. The author's theory might be entertained if he could point us to one single well-attested case of spontaneous creation or transmutation. Certainly, the keen eye of the naturalist would have detected one instance of spontaneous production during the six thousand years of the world's history; and among the ten thousand species of plants and animals, one instance of transmutation. It would be peculiarly interesting to see his orang-outang-ship gradually transmuting himself by his own inherent power into his lordship; to see him stand up before the world in attestation of the fact that by one single leap he had bounded through the African (not of American descent), and now stood side by side with the author of "The Development," his equal in every respect. But this is an age of peculiar proclivities and affinities, and

we shall leave the doctor between the negro and the monkey to follow the bent of his inclinations.

But our author will tell us that the time is not sufficient to develop such facts as we demand. Cuvier's doctrine of the permanence of species, if his observations are restricted to periods not exceeding human history, may, perhaps, be maintained; but in view of the limitless progress of time, his doctrine proved incapable of defense. Does the geologist ask of the architect his opinion whether there have been up-liftings and down-sinkings of the earth? The question is unfortunate for the author. When he shall find one instance of spontaneous generation, or transmutation of species, we will adduce a hundred geological facts of the kind of which he speaks. Had he one tithe of the evidence that the architect may adduce, he might speak with confidence of his theory. You Buck and Lyell have shown that the coast, for a distance of one thousand miles on the shores of the Baltic, has risen recently from one hundred to two hundred feet. Such elevations have also taken place in Scotland, England, Wales, and America. In the southern part of Sweden there has been a loss of several feet of land. Dr. Hitchcock says of the Temple of Jupiter Serapis: "There has been an interesting subsidence and elevation of land at Pazuola, near Naples, as exhibited by the ruins of an ancient temple. The temple was originally built at the level of the sea for the convenience of sea-baths. Subsequently the ground subsided, and a lake was formed in the interior of the temple, in which incrustations were formed from a hot spring as high as four feet six inches. Then the sea brought in ashes and sand to the height of seven feet, * * * The subsidence continued to the height of nineteen feet above the pavement. For a time the sea remained quiet, but finally arose until the pavement is now on a level with the sea." Within the historic period a large number of islands have arisen from the sea to a height varying from three hundred to three thousand feet. Some of these have subsided, but many remain to this day,—such as Delos, Rhodes, the Cyclades, Isola, Nueva, and many others. There has been time sufficient within the historic period for the elevation and depression of continents, for the formation of vast islands, for cities to fossilize; but not time enough to transmute the lichen into the fungus or mushroom. Was the author ignorant of these facts, or did he suppose his readers a set of fools whom he could dupe at pleasure?

But if there is not time enough within the historic period, I would ask the author if among the fossils of the anti-historic period one instance of spontaneous generation or transmutation has yet been discovered; yet the permanency of species is as well marked among the fossils as among living plants and animals. The author, conscious of his inability to sustain himself by historic facts, "like the owl on stealthy wing," glides away in the darkness of the past, but, to his

astonishment, is there met by ten thousand silent but living witnesses of his folly and madness. The "footprints" of the Creator are everywhere impressed upon the face of nature.

As the advocates of creation by law leave the certain phenomena of the planets and fixed stars, and hide themselves amid the mist of imaginary nebulous matter, so the friends of spontaneous generation, leaving the world of life with which man is acquainted, hide themselves in the dark domain of infusorial life, and then bring forward their guesses and conjectures in opposition to the teachings of science and revelation. But as the increasing strength of the telescope has dissipated the nebulous matter in space, so the increasing power of the microscope is developing the birth and life of animalculae to be in accordance with all higher forms of life. This, the last hiding-place of the skeptic, is being fast explored. Other infinitesimal forms of life may be discovered, but the microscopic developments of the past lead inevitably to the conclusion that the conditions of life have always been and always will be the same. The plant from the seed, the animal from the ovum, and the permanency of species is the verdict of the scientific world. Says Prof. Hitchcock: "The researches of Ehrenberg have cleared up the difficulties of their origination in the ordinary modes of reproduction in nearly every instance, and the advocates of the law hypothesis have been fairly driven from this stronghold of their argument." Prof. Owen says of these animalcules: "Thus, each leaves, by the last act of life, the means of perpetuating and diffusing its species by thousands of fertile germs." These inconceivably light ova are lifted by the wind and scattered in every direction, thus "perpetuating and diffusing" their respective genera, families, and species. By the same diffusion of ova through the atmosphere, we explain the pretended generations of insects belonging to the acari family, by passing galvanic currents through a solution of silicate or ferro-cyanate of potassa. When the infusion was first boiled, and the instrument so arranged as to admit the atmosphere only through sulphuric acid, no infusoria appeared during two months, but in the same boiled infusion they appeared within a day or two when exposed to the open air. Thus, in the one case the ova were destroyed by the sulphuric acid; and in the other case, being deposited from the atmosphere, were in a day or two born into life. Not one single exception to these laws has yet been made out, and you may rest assured that the keenest investigations of the skeptic have been given to the effort. From these facts we draw the following incontestable conclusions:

Since, by common consent, there was a time when animal life did not exist on the globe, and since in every form of life induced from living or fossil species the *egg* comes from the animal, and *vice versa*, there must have been a time when neither existed; and since no in-

stance of spontaneous generation has ever been discovered, animals could only have come into existence by the creative fiat of Almighty God. The Mosaic record, then, is the most philosophic and the only rational presentation of the case. "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living thing that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind. And God blessed them, and said: Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

Again: this theory requires us to believe that animal life, in every species, has been a continual progression from animals of a lower type to those of a more exalted character. That as the condition of the earth improved, animals of a higher grade were generated from time to time by force of this improved condition. Now that the general type of life has been a progression we shall not deny. Thus, as we ascend, we pass successively through the periods of fishes, reptiles, birds, and mammals. To sustain the author's theory, this progressive development must extend to every class, genus, and species. But when we take one of the great classes of animals, for instance, that of the fishes, we frequently find the very opposite to be true. Many of the earliest fishes are of the very highest type in that class, which could not be if the doctrine of spontaneous generation, and transmutation of species were true.

Sir Roderick Murchison has given us some most interesting cases of this kind; and on the same subject Prof. Sedgwick testifies thus: "All our most ancient fossil fishes belong to a high organic type, and the very oldest species that are well determined fall naturally into an order of fishes which Owen and Miller place, not at the bottom, but at the top of the whole class." Hugh Miller not only adds testimony to the above facts, but goes a step further, and declares "that the progress of this race has, as a whole, been downward rather than upward. This may be especially affirmed of reptiles as a class. How vast the difference between the fearful monsters of the oolitic period and the highest type of reptiles in succeeding formations! How great the contrast between the ichthyosaurus, with the head of a lizard, vertebrae of a fish, sternum of an ornithorhynchus, and paddles of a whale, with an eye to serve at once as a telescope and microscope, and "that degraded race that now goeth upon its belly." We conclude, then, that the highest types, having come first into existence, could not have sprung at once from the simple monad, and that therefore the theory is false.

Again: there have been certain epochs in the geological periods of the past, when through natural convulsions, the entire race of living beings has been swept from the face of the earth, and its place sup-

plied by a new race entire. The most eminent geologists tell us that many such epochs have transpired. Deshayes declared that, "in surveying the entire series of animal fossil remains, he had discovered five great groups so completely independent that no species whatever is found in more than one of them." A later naturalist, M. D'Orbigny, affirms that: "A first creation took place in the Silurian stage; after that was annihilated by some geological cause, and after some considerable time a second creation took place in the Devonian stage; and successively twenty-seven times have new creations repopulated all the earth with plants and animals, following each time some geological disturbance, which had totally destroyed living nature." Need I ask, after these facts have been developed, if there is any room for either spontaneous generation or transmutation of species? But, finally, man himself stands before us an ever-present monument of God's immediate agency in creation! To affirm that the most magnificently splendid and complicate structure of his organism is the effect of unintelligent force is the most perfect madness. It is a matter of profound astonishment to me that the author of "The Development," acquainted as he is with the anatomy of man, could for one moment entertain the idea. If there is a structure in the universe which is indicative of design, the organism of man certainly is; but blind law can design nothing.

There are more animals of high organization now on the earth than ever before, and nearly all of them appeared long after the fossil animals of the latest rocks had been swept from its face. Not a single fossil man has been found; but, in harmony with revelation, geology makes him to appear simultaneously with the last animals created, and that, too, after the higher forms of life, previously existing, had universally perished. But granting that man's physical frame might be the result of spontaneous generation, what shall we say when we contemplate his social and intellectual powers? Only the grossest materialism and the most stupid folly can dream for a moment that these are the result of brute force, the emanation of nervous development. The author's pretended reverence for God amounts to nothing, when he would make the soul nothing but the outward manifestation of the material composing the brain. We conclude, then, that no sane man, who is honest, can for a moment doubt that the creation of man, at least, is a miracle. As a whole, "The Development" is unworthy of the author, and a dishonor to the age in which he lives.

But this paper is already too long, and we must conclude. What, then, is the result? Has religion lost anything by the investigation; or has one single laurel been taken from the brow of science? We think not! May we not say, in truth, that science is the twin sister of religion? We learn in God's holy word that he is ever near us, and that his providential care is ever around us; we read on every page

of science of his constant watchfulness over his works in ages past, and of his miraculous power displayed upon ten thousand silent plains before human voice ever hymned his praise. Nature lends no aid to the skeptic, nor will she permit that the dark mantle of infidelity be thrown over her fair face. From all her resplendent forms of beauty the wisdom, power, and goodness of God are forever beaming forth.

In conclusion, one word to the friends of Christianity. Let not your foolish prejudices arraign you against scientific truth. If creation, providence, and redemption are all the work of God, no scientific truth can ever controvert his revealed will. If the speaker would illustrate the truths of Christianity by the facts of science, let no feeling of malice, envy, or ignorance induce to drop one word of rebuke. How contracted the spirit that does not see in nature's ten thousand forms of beauty and majesty the power and wisdom of God! When I gaze upon the little flower, and see with what tender care the Creator has enveloped the germ of life within the protecting folds of both calyx and corolla I bless his holy name, and in the depths of my soul realize that He who cares for the little flower, which blooms and perishes in an hour, will surely care and provide for his immortal creatures. When winter's cheerless form approaches, and I see Him gently lead the sparrow to the more genial clime of the sunny south, I can but feel that his hand is ever near to guide me through the dreary winter of life. When at spring-time I behold all nature coming forth from the grave of winter, I look forward with rapture to that hour when the resurrected body shall ascend in triumph to the skies. The sweet murmuring of the gentle stream, the warbling of the birds, and the wild music of the forest transport us to the home of the blest, where strains of celestial music shall swell the anthems of praise to God forever.

When I regard the creatures of his hand, the denizens of earth in ages past, and see how he ever adapted them to conditions then existing, I realize that there has been no waste of creative energy; and my soul wings its flight to other worlds, and gazes with wildest rapture upon the exalted hosts that people those distant spheres. When I sweep the telescope athwart the heavens, and as I gaze with wild delight, listen to the music of the spheres, by faith I behold the Christian's home, and in imagination listen to the harps of the redeemed host; and as the sweet notes sooth my soul, oppressed with the woes and sorrows of humanity, I sigh for home, and shout: Come, Lord Jesus, quickly come!

B.

A TRIP TO MISSOURI.

"ENOUGH critical matter for the present number of the *Quarterly*," says the editor; "give me an article of lighter character." Well, sir, you shall have some reflections on what I saw and heard while on a recent summer trip to poor, afflicted, distracted Missouri. If the tale is well told, I know it will interest you; for Missouri is the home of your childhood, the scene of your early struggles in the cause of Christ, and the centre of your fondest recollections. When you and I were co-workers in that part of the Master's vineyard, how happy and strong and fraternal a band of fellow-laborers stood around us. Alas! that band is now broken, and its members scattered far and wide over a troubled country. If the day should come when our pilgrim paths shall meet once more in the old home, how sweet and refreshing will be that reunion. God grant that the hand of death may not break the number, nor the arts of Satan check the flow of fraternal love, until some such day shall dawn upon us!

But I must hasten on my trip. Passed the hurry and clatter and danger of more than four hundred miles by rail, here I stand on the bank of the Mississippi, in full view of our State's great metropolis. Saint Louis! How that very name, with its Saint and its Louis, smacks of Catholics and Frenchmen; of saints, and images, and crosses, and priests, and nuns, and convents! And behold, here they all are in most fearful abundance. Looking across the broad river which lies at your feet, those cross-tipped spires that gleam in the sunshine from every part of the city,—from Bremen, four miles to the right, and Carondelet, four miles to the left, and from all the intervening space,—at once declare how firmly the great "mother of harlots" is seated upon this city of waters. When you cross the river and pass along the streets, the same mournful fact is impressed upon you by frequent companies of nuns and priests and theological students, all in coarse black raiment, and walking the streets with downcast eyes. Here and there, too, you meet processions of little orphan children in quaint uniforms, led on by a group of white-bonneted Sisters of Charity. As you gaze upon those innocent little faces, already assuming the staid expression of their ghostly-looking teachers, you are pained and mortified to think that they are nearly all children of Protestant parents. These large orphan asylums, and those immense convent buildings with extensive grounds inclosed by high brick walls, are all receptacles for Protestant children, where they are received, not only into the instruction of priests and nuns, but into the pales of the Romish Church. No one can blame those little orphans, nor their poor dead parents, who,

with aching hearts, bequeathed them to the charity of the world, for the hapless fate into which they have fallen. Poor little creatures! If there is any class of those who worship images and never learn the true gospel, on whom our heavenly Father will have mercy, he will surely look in pity on you;—for who are so helpless, and so little accountable for the character stamped upon them?

But what shall we say of those rich and powerful Protestants who gaze upon this scene of ruin from day to day, and stretch out no hand to help the orphan to a better fate? Here are princely merchants and manufacturers of all the wares of trade, whose palatial residences and marble houses of business astound the poor countryman, who pauses on the street to gaze and wonder. How many orphan asylums do they build, or how many rooms in their long rows of tenement houses do they open to the homeless orphans of the men whose toil and sweat have given them their wealth? Is it because of their poverty that Protestants, instead of providing both creature comforts and religious instruction to the orphans of their own people, must turn them over to the care and religion of the Catholic? No; so far is it from this, that the despicable policy of trade has made many of them rich tributaries to the funds of Rome. They pay this tribute, not only in gold and silver, but also in the bodies and souls of their own children. Having failed to keep the poor orphan out of the hands of the priest, they add to this the greater sin of filling these dens of nunnery with their own little girls, and pay richly for their instruction in Romish idolatry. Will not some one yet find a pen that can sting the consciences of such men, and a tongue that can lash them into some appreciation of duty to their children and their God? If a change for the better does not come soon, and I greatly fear it will not, the religion of Rome will inevitably become the prevailing religion of this land. Scarcely a month of the whole year passes by that the city papers of St. Louis do not announce the laying of the corner-stone of some new Catholic church, or school, or convent. The silver cornet band of some German with unpronounceable name is announced to lead the Sunday afternoon procession, while the Rt. Rev. Father in God Bishop so and so is to lay the corner-stone, and the Rev. Fathers O' this and Me that, in numbers to make you think all Ireland will be there, are to assist in the solemnities.

And what are the Protestant parties doing to resist this mighty tide of popery? Well, first, we have here Episcopalianism. Imported from England, like many a worthless wanderer from that old island who claims kin with some of the nobility there, it struts about and puts on airs, the vainest cock in all the barn-yard, the veriest religious humbug in all the land. Hating Catholicism most, because of the close resemblance between the two, and denouncing it while imitating it, this boastful little affair serves only as a side entrance to

the great Catholic show. Here on one street she is building a vast irregular pile of brick and stone, that a common man might gaze upon for a week without concluding that it was intended for a church, and yet she dubs it "Christ's Church." No one at all acquainted with the simplicity of the religion of Christ would ever suspect him of owning such a church as that. I would say that the ownership is doubtful. On another street she has a structure which she much more appropriately calls "Saint George's Church." Nobody knows who Saint George is, or whether there ever was such a saint as George, or whether the said George is the rightful proprietor of said church; but all this is in good keeping with a church of which the New Testament saints knew nothing, and whose highest boast is that she came from England, whose patron saint is the aforesaid George of doubtful history. I am in favor of the name. Let every Episcopal Church be called "St. George's Church."

Hopeless of opposition to Rome from this quarter, we look around upon the other Protestant sects with almost as little to cheer us. Here is Presbyterianism, divided into Old School and New School, and more recently divided again on a political line, into radical and conservative; here are Methodism South and Methodism North, forgetful of the Devil and Catholicism in their fierce war against each other; and there are the Baptists, almost equally divided and equally impotent. All these, compared with the city's increase, are standing still, or receding, while Catholicism is moving right on.

I have not forgotten the small company of Disciples who have been for many years trying to establish primitive Christianity in the midst of the confusion and conflict of this great city. But their prospects are by no means cheering, when viewed as a movement for the overthrow of Catholicism. The Christian congregation, throughout its entire history, has had a hard struggle to maintain a comfortable existence, and has made no serious impression on the public mind. Sometimes, indeed, it has yielded to sectarian influences, and has aimed to imitate some of the very corruptions which it is her mission to oppose and to banish from religious society. She is not alone in this; for where is the church in a large city which has not done the same? "Will our city churches tell us something about the habits of their members in reference to dancing, theatre-going, card-playing, and billiards? Or is this a theme which they would rather withhold from public discussion? "Well, enough is known to make some thoughtful men doubt whether it is possible, in this generation, to maintain a church of pure primitive order in a large city. At any rate, it has not yet been 60 nearly done as to throw a serious obstacle in the way of Romanism. Whence, then, is the successful opposition to come? This is a question which the writer confesses himself unable to answer. He sees no prospect of preventing a

triumph of Catholicism in America, and has no hope of a successful reaction against prevailing tendencies in that direction, until the people shall have felt the pressure of the hand which is now so gently twining its snaky fingers around their throats. They will not believe from the bloody experience of the past; they must have a bloody experience of their own to open their eyes. This is a gloomy prediction. God grant that it be not fulfilled I

Such thoughts make it sad to linger in St. Louis, and our sadness is increased by the remembrance that nearly all the cities of the whole land are, in this respect, more or less like St. Louis. Even many villages and country places are repeating the same fearful story.

We leave the scene which has inspired these thoughts, and seek the rural districts, where a purer faith as yet holds sway, and the cause of Christ is gaining triumphs day by day. The line of the Pacific Railroad marks our course for near three hundred miles. Be not startled at this distance; for this road of but yesterday has pushed its way entirely across the broad State of Missouri, and far into Kansas, on its journey to the Pacific coast. It bears us over the face of broad prairies, and through young cities that have sprung up to their own astonishment along its way, and where our watchful and faithful preachers have already planted churches of the primitive order. Even as we pass along, the voices of T. M. Allen and G. W. Longan, two noble yoke-fellows in the work of faith, have scarcely died away in the towns of Sedalia and Dresden, each of which is now the seat of a Christian church.

We leave the cars at Warrensburg, and pass on by stage thirty-five miles to Lexington. Here we see on every hand the sad traces of the war. You large building on the river bluff, pierced in every direction by cannon-balls, and surrounded by crumbling earth-works, is the Masonic College. That other large structure, without sash in the windows and not a door left hanging, the fencing all gone and outbuildings torn away, is the Baptist Female College, once a flourishing institution. On the river bank are mills and factories and warehouses in ruins, and in other parts of the town the lone chimneys that appear tell of dwellings burned with all their contents, while dismay sat pale upon the faces of all the city. The siege of Lexington, with its three long days of cannonading, was the first introduction of earnest war into the heart of our State. I well remember how I listened to the sound of that artillery, ten miles distant, and shuddered at the thought that each dull heavy explosion was the knell of some departing soul, most likely departing into endless night. The scars of that terrible battle which are still visible on the face of the city, are a fair index to the moral desolation which followed.

On the eve of our civil war, no church in Missouri was enjoying a

more happy and apparently permanent prosperity than that at Lexington. With an eldership of tried experience, a membership of marked liberality, and the energetic labors of Bro. T. P. Haley, than whom there is no more popular preacher, they seemed in a fair way to gain complete ascendancy over the community. But the war brought financial embarrassment, turned away the minds of the people from religious matters, alienated the affection, often, of life-long friends, and compelled the loved preacher to seek another field of gospel labor, or turn to secular pursuits. In sorrow he left them, and in sorrow the few faithful consented to his departure. The contest grew fiercer; pillage, highway robbery, and murder became the order of the day, till even quiet men grew wild with rage, and lost all care for restraints that once controlled them. Many of the disciples apostatized, some died on the field of battle, and some sought more peaceful homes in other States. Such was the general history of affairs in the greater portion of the State. The fires of resentment that were kindled have not yet been altogether smothered, nor will anything less effective than pure Christian love be able to quench them.

Through all this dark period, to their honor be it said, the congregation at Lexington has not ceased to maintain the ordinances and the order of the Lord's house. Such fidelity gives the best assurance that there is an unquenchable fire of devotion in their midst which will yet, no doubt, soften and melt away all the hardness that remains. There seems to be a general anxiety for harmony; and where this desire exists, harmony must at length prevail. The brethren are seeking diligently for a preacher to teach and admonish them, and to hold forth the gospel in their community. If they are speedily successful in this, we may expect very soon to hear of good news among them, and to witness again the restoring power of our holy faith. How many cities and churches of sad Missouri are represented by what we have said of Lexington? We have written these things to encourage them all. Let them thank God that matters are no worse; and with a determined spirit begin anew, at every necessary sacrifice, their former efforts to maintain the cause.

A short pause at Lexington, only long enough to spend one night and address a hastily collected congregation; then across the Missouri River into Ray County. Here, in a rural district, I found a degree of religious life and perseverance that was truly refreshing. A little church has existed for several years at a school-house near the residence of Bro. William Riffe, who is an elder and the chief speaker. Though without preaching most of the time during the war, they kept up their regular Lord's day worship. Some three miles away, at another school-house, a portion of the congregation, with Bro. T. J. Porter as a leader, have a Sunday school every Sunday morning and a

neighborhood prayer meeting at night, besides going to church at the usual hour in the day. In the prayer meeting, the young men of the community are learning to read, and pray, and speak in public, while the whole neighborhood is receiving instruction and edification. Our thoughtful men everywhere are now feeling a deep interest in the question, how our cause is to be supplied with the immense and increasing number of preachers which are demanded. Right here, in these social meetings of the church, is the source whence this supply must come. In our zeal for colleges, and especially for Bible instruction in colleges (which, by-the-by, is far less intense than it should be), let us not expect of them what they can not furnish, and what they do not propose to furnish. It is not dreamed of by the men who are building up and conducting these institutions, that they will manufacture preachers to order. Their business is to educate preachers, not to make them. They must be made by the churches; that is, the churches must inspire their young men with a desire to preach, call their talents into exercise and prove that they can preach, and then depend upon schools and colleges only to furnish them what additional education they need in order to make their talents available. The colleges, and especially the churches adjacent to the colleges, can assist in this primary work by infusing into the students, as far as possible, the disposition to consecrate themselves to the Lord, so that some who enter the college halls without the purpose of preaching, and even without Christian character, may be turned to the Lord, and directed to the Lord's work. This is the way in which the writer of this article was made a Christian, and afterward induced to become a preacher. But the college professors have only one young man under their influence for such work, where the churches have hundreds and even thousands. Even if all the young men who enter our colleges were to become preachers, the demand would still be only in a small degree supplied. All the young men of every church must be induced to take what part they can in social worship. This will develop their latent talents, and inspire many of them with a desire for still greater usefulness. Some will have the heart and the mind to become preachers of the word, and the others will supply the church with elders and deacons. Let the reader, who is a preacher, look back and see if he was not led to become a preacher in this way. Let all the observant remember what they have observed, and see if nearly all preachers are not developed in the same way. This is the experience of the churches; and what is better, it is the method of the primitive gospel age. Here, then, is a plain path of duty for all the churches. Call out your young men, and induce them to take part in your worship. Appoint meetings especially for this purpose, young men's prayer meetings, or small neighborhood prayer meetings, where beginners will not be abashed by the presence of an audience. Train

them in these meetings until they acquire experience and confidence enough to edify your larger assemblies. When one develops talents to justify it, call him out to preach the word abroad; and if he needs more education to give him efficiency, send him to the school which will furnish it to him in the shortest time and at the least expense. Am I speaking anything new in all this? I am only putting into the form of words that which has already been the practice of every congregation that has contributed to our present supply of preachers. All we need, in order to the fullest supply, is just to increase our diligence in this same work, which as yet we have only begun. You preachers and elders, all over the land, see to it that this work is not neglected, and prepare to render a joyous account of your stewardship in this respect.

Not only is this the way to make preachers, but it is also the way to keep a church full of life, and to have a harvest ripening all the time in the surrounding community. This is illustrated by the result at Riffe's school-house. Bro. Henry Haley, of St. Louis, had just preceded me there, and held a meeting of about ten days. The audiences were too large for the school-house, so they resorted to Bro. Riffe's tobacco barn, where a rough stand was erected, seats extemporized, and a bed of clean wheat straw spread upon the earthen floor, making a soft and elegant carpet. No noise of coming feet could mar the solemnity of the simple worship. In such a place, and with a simple rural people, the worship of God is more earnest, and often more sincere, than in the vaulted temple with cushioned pews and carpeted floor. There is no place in which I can do better preaching, or feel that I am so completely in the service of the Lord. Some twenty odd additions rewarded Bro. Haley's efforts; and when I arrived the same barn was occupied for five days, resulting in nine immersions, and two additions from the Baptists. Among these were some of the most substantial men of the community. Thus this richest and loveliest portion of Kay County is rapidly becoming' tributary to the original gospel.

Leaving this county, and turning back through Lexington, we come down to the famous August meeting in Dover, Lafayette County. This meeting has been well known in Missouri for many years. It is simply an annual protracted meeting which begins every year on Friday before the second Lord's day of August, and continues from one to two weeks according to circumstances. It was first established about the year 1820, before there was an organized church there, and before the present village was laid off, and has been kept up uninterruptedly during all the forty-six years that have intervened. Many hundreds of persons, within this period, have dated the beginning of their Christian life from these meetings; and many of the happiest remembrances of the saints who have worshiped there together, are

connected with them. It is a season of social reunion for members of various surrounding churches, for scattered members of various households, and for preachers from different parts of the State; and while the social feelings are called into lively play, religion presides over the occasion and sanctifies every other enjoyment. Happy meetings! May they continue as long as the church at Dover exists, and may that be until the judgment morning.

The preachers present on this occasion were Bros. T. N. Gaines, W. H. Robinson, Hiram Bledsoe, and Thomas Hancock. Bro. Gaines was so worn down with hard labor through a series of protracted meetings, that he could take but little part in the preaching. He had, within the last few months, gained between two and three hundred additions, which were not reported in any of our papers. And here I find fault with a number of our Missouri preachers for not reporting their success. Hundreds have been added to the churches there since the close of the war, while brethren abroad, for want of information, were imagining that the cause in Missouri was almost dead. It was the custom of the primitive preachers, as we see from Acts, to spread abroad the good news of the triumphs of the gospel; and it is a custom worthy of all acceptance. It is sometimes abused by vain glorious men, who fill their reports with self-praise; but our editors are learning to prick these bags of wind and let them collapse, and they ought to do it more frequently than they do. The best way, however, to rebuke such men is for modest brethren to make modest reports, and thus establish a better precedent.

I must not pass unnoticed in this hasty sketch, a question which has caused both the preachers and the churches of Missouri no little anxiety within the past twelve months. By the new Constitution of the State, it is unlawful for any man to preach the gospel or teach religion without having first taken a retrospective oath in reference to his conduct and sympathies during the war. Some of the brethren have taken this oath; some who could take it truthfully have refused to do so, because they will not allow the civil authority to dictate in matters purely religious; and others have refused both for this reason, and because they can not take the oath without perjury. Brethren of the latter two classes, with only one or two exceptions so far as I am informed, have continued to preach in disregard of the law; and most of them have been indicted, and are now under bonds for their appearance to stand trial in the criminal courts. It is generally conceded now that the United States Supreme Court have agreed upon, a decision which will soon remove this restriction; but in the mean time much evil has resulted from the existence of the law, chiefly through the alienation which it has caused among brethren. Questions of this kind, sprung suddenly upon brethren by unprecedented legislation, must almost inevitably be differently regarded by brethren

ren of different political views, and different surrounding circumstances. The greatest possible forbearance, therefore, should be exercised by all parties, and no alienation should result. I am glad to know that this sentiment prevails with the more thoughtful and prudent brethren of Missouri, and these are the men whose judgment and example should have control. Let the brethren remember that the pathway of conciliation is always the smoothest, and generally the safest.

We found the Dover church, as she has ever been, a faithful, zealous, and liberal body of brethren and sisters. Under the instruction chiefly of their own elders, with Dr. S. T. Meng in the lead, they have maintained their worship and their numbers throughout the war. As must always be expected under the circumstances, our meeting was successful. Twelve persons were immersed. Among these was an elderly Methodist lady, who in her early life was induced by a Methodist preacher to go through the farce of going down into the water (very shallow water), and kneeling there to have the water poured upon her. How strange that this preacher should imagine John and Philip to have been as great simpletons as himself. He ought to be hunted up and put into Barnum's cage of curious animals.

Another incident occurred in our meeting which illustrates at once the ruinous effects of Calvinistic teaching, and the power of truth to overcome the life-long prejudices of an honest heart. At the close of one of Bro. Gaines's discourses, an aged couple came forward, hand in hand, to confess the Savior, while convulsive sobs attested their emotion, and the whole audience were moved to tears. Before taking their confession, one of the speakers addressed the audience in about these words: "At our August meeting, five years ago, I was immersing some candidates in the stream just yonder, when an old father stood at the brink of the water, seeing some of his own children obeying the Savior. All but one of them had gone before him into the kingdom of God, and one of them is now in the spirit-land. As he gazed upon the scene he wept, and a brother drew near and asked him: 'Why can you not follow your children into the church?' 'I wish I could,' he replied, 'but I have been taught all my life to look for a change that *i* have never felt, and I am waiting for that.' And so, with his heart all broken up, and full of longing for the kingdom of God, the unhappy man turned away, the victim of a terrible delusion. Since that time I have been far away, preaching the word in another State; but I have never forgotten that scene at the water's brink, and have often spoken of it when warning men against the same fatal delusion. When I have mentioned it, I have had to tell the people that I did not know whether the old man was still alive, or had gone down hopeless to the grave still waiting for something that God had never promised. But now, thank God, I can testify

that he still lives, and has determined to wait no longer; for that old gentleman was none other than father Robinson, who is here before me to confess the Savior, with his aged companion by his side. When I saw them come into the house, I rejoiced that God had spared their lives so long, and I humbly prayed that they might be persuaded to come to Jesus to-day. My prayer is heard. The long wretched waiting is over now, and the last days of this aged couple will be their best and happiest." I need not tell the reader what tears of joy were shed while these words were being spoken; nor what rapturous congratulations greeted the honored pair as the brethren and sisters crowded around them. Oh, how rich is our holy faith, which brings to us amid all our tears and trials these blissful foretastes of heaven! It is worth all the toil and sorrow of a preacher's life, were there no other reward, to enjoy these moments of unspeakable bliss. The weight of such joy is too great for our poor hearts. It fills us with pain from the very excess of enjoyment, sure proof that the fullness of Christian blessedness is not for mortals in the flesh. It will require the strength of our strong and incorruptible bodies to bear, without pain, that pleasing painful ecstasy which is to be our portion forever. A fond adieu to that happy August meeting. May all who were together there come together again in that meeting which shall know no parting, is my humble prayer; and let them all say, Amen! M.

WE have thought, and talked, and read, and traveled for knowledge; and so deeply are we penetrated with a sense of its excellency, that were we possessed of the richest topaz of Ethiopia, the brightest diamond, or the costliest ruby, and were they of current value in intellectual merchandise, we should gladly exchange them for a few ideas on some of the sublime themes of heavenly science which the sacred pages of the divine volumes present to our reflections. But these are not to be purchased for such a price.

Still there is something in Heaven's estimation better than knowledge, and yet it is much cheaper. Knowledge and faith are good; hope is better; but love is best of all. "Now," says Paul, "abide faith, hope, love—these three; but the greatest of these is love." To be perfect in love is much more attainable than to be perfect in knowledge. Love is on all sides acknowledged to be the transcendent excellency in religion which hides in the ocean of forgetfulness a multitude of sins in a brother, and stimulates its happy subject to deeds of eternal renown. It is, indeed, the magnetism of religion, the gravitating principle in morality, and the mainspring of every laudable effort at reformation. The possession of it is not more indispensable to moral goodness of character, than the display of it to usefulness in society. The want of it has filled the world with countless volumes which ought never to have been written, for their memory will be forever painful to their authors. So much philosophy and heavenly science is there in the apostolic suggestion: "Let all things be done with love."—*Alexander Campbell.*

TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES IN FRANCE.

THE first great want of our own country is, beyond doubt, a faultless translation of the word of God into the language which we speak. More particularly is this true of the Old Testament, our common version of which is so exceedingly defective. The New Testament is better; as we have of this several highly creditable renderings. But if this want be great with us, how much greater must it be in France? To that country, so long cursed by the domination of Roman Catholicism, no question can possess the interest which that of a faithful translation of the Bible possesses. If France, sprightly, intellectual France, is ever to be emancipated from her two greatest calamities—infidelity and Popery—this is to be done by the Bible faithfully translated and universally circulated. The day this is done will be France's proudest day. That we pray for it most devoutly is but an inadequate expression of our feeling in the case. We have some hope that we may never have another Pope; and with the death of the Pope will begin to die Popery. Nothing can so much hasten this as the dissemination of true Bible light; and true Bible light can only circulate in correct translations of the Bible. We hence bind up the hope of France with the very measure which it now seems some of her fine scholars have inaugurated. In no country of the world can the Bible be better translated than in France, if the ability of that country can be thoroughly aroused and directed to that object. They have the scholarship, the talent, the money, the leisure; and what is not of less moment, they have the independence and the will. If they go into the work in earnest they will achieve much. But will they do this? Ah, this is the question. From France our expectations are not high. Besides, the very society which they have formed has in it the elements of defeat. When Roman Catholics, Jews, and Protestants unite to translate the word of God, and thereby to give us the will of Christ respecting the world, our vision of a glorious consummation is not bright. But though the present society may not succeed, it may yet accomplish a great deal. It may discover and remove the difficulties in the way of the work, and thus prepare the way for some other society to undertake and accomplish it. We hail every movement of the kind as a happy sign of the times, and ask the blessing of God upon it.

The following characteristic speech will give the reader some further idea of the enterprise. The speech is ardent, and, like everything French, full of hope. May the friends of the enterprise realize to the

fullest all they work for! But they will learn that a translation is not completed when a society therefor is formed.

ADDRESS OF M. THIERRY, SENATOR, AND MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF
FRANCE.

"*Gentlemen:*—There is a book peculiar among all that embrace not only the history, but the entire life of a nation, whose beginnings ascend to the cradle of the human race. This book is the depository of its religious law, of its civil law, of its moral law, of its poetry, of its domestic history, of its external history in its relations with other peoples, from the inhabitants of Persia and of Egypt, to the Greeks and the Romans, conquerors of Asia. No other nation of the world possesses an equal record of its past; and this book is a phenomenon no less grand than the nation whose unity it has maintained and protected, in spite of all its persecutions, and in spite of its dispersion to all parts of the globe. You understand, gentlemen, that I speak of the Bible. In the wonderful designs of Providence over men, the book of the Jewish people has become a universal book; and, to speak the full truth, it has become the book of civilization itself. While the antiquarian and the philologist seek here, as by a certain light, the one the progress of the extinct civilizations of the Orient, the other the most ancient of the Shemitic dialects, the mother of the family draws from it the moral law by which she instructs her children, and the poet aspirations and a language of incomparable grandeur. But of this book, so diligently explored by the man of learning and by the poet, so necessary to the discipline of manners, we have not yet a translation which all adopt; which all accept as exact and good.

" It is a sacred book before which the civilized world bows, and which is the root of its belief, however divergent may be the branches. You have named it the *Bible*, that is the book *par excellence*. These great religious confessions, sisters by the community of this book, proclaim it revealed, and defend it by this title as a text from whence they draw their reason for believing. And yet, this common book has not a translation which all recognize; far from it. Each communion has its own, and sometimes every subdivision, every part, of the same communion. The translation of the Catholic Christian is rejected by the Protestant Christian; and the Israelite rejects both. This state of things, so much to be regretted from the stand-point of science and of literary taste, becomes yet more deplorable from the religious stand-point; and we ask whether a translation faithful as to meaning, representing the forms and literary stamp of the original, is an impossible work, when we see criticism adopting as good and classic the translations of profane master-works, less beautiful perhaps, and assuredly less necessary for us than the Bible..

" The hour for undertaking such an enterprise seems to have ar-

rived. All eyes are turned toward the East, which holds the key of our past,—perhaps that of our future. The East has become for the science of our day an illimitable field of discoveries. Interrogated by our men of learning, the sphinxes of Egypt have answered, and the shroud which covered the mysterious civilizations of Babylon and of Nineveh is beginning to be lifted and to reveal its secrets. There is going on, for the countries of Asia, a regeneration like that which in the sixteenth century restored to light Greece and Italy; and this one may yet bring to us much richer treasures. Caravans, starting from France, England, Germany, and America, explore the remotest corners of Judaea under the banner of science, as the armies of our fathers traversed it of old under the banner of the faith, seeking out all the traces of the past. Other more daring investigators are constantly, in the midst of this venerable antiquity, digging among the Jewish traditions, and are propounding hypotheses that are not without danger for the present day. And the book which would throw out so much light to aid in discovery of defense seems to be left aside as useless, while so much is done to throw light, by many beautiful works, on the books of Persia and of India; and the Koran itself has found Christian interpreters. This need which we have set forth, of an exact translation of the Bible, has been felt at different epochs of the life of the Church, but never, perhaps, with so much force as to-day. It is now almost fifteen hundred years since one of the fathers of western Christianity, retiring to one of the caves of Bethlehem, undertook, aided by Christian monks and Jewish rabbis, a Latin translation of the Bible after the Hebrew text; and his work, at first assailed in the West, finally triumphed; for from it our Vulgate came forth. While he consulted the Greek translations of the Septuagint, of Aquila, of Theodotion, of Symmachus, used in the East, the most learned of the fathers of the Latin church kept above all to the Hebrew text, in which he saw the most direct reflex of the words of God, and, as he said, the Hebrew truth. This word pleased Bossuet who used it after Jerome; complete truth, in fact, because philological exactitude is here combined with purity of doctrine.

" We do not wish to deny that there are French translations of the Bible, translations of value; but in our eyes they all have one great defect, that of not being accepted by all. This distinguishes our enterprise from the translations that have preceded us. England, to-day, is revising the ancient translation that was cotemporary with its reformation; but whatever will be the learning brought to this work, in a land where there is so much of it, the English translation will remain isolated; it will be always only that of the English church. Russia, on its part, is not behind; it is at present making praiseworthy efforts to secure a translation of the two Testaments in the Russian language, and the Holy Synod, which directs the

work, consults all the eminent men of the orthodox church in all parts of the empire. Assuredly, from such a combination of light there must come forth a translation worthy of great praise, but it will nevertheless remain the particular translation of the Russian church; Catholics and Jews will avoid it as suspected, beyond all doubt. What is wanting, then, in all these enterprises so praise-worthily undertaken, so learnedly pressed? They lack the general consent of all communions that base their faith on the truth of the Bible, and the merit of being in accord with pure science, which looks at this book in itself as a literary monument independent of its sacred character. Is it possible to reach such an end? Why not, if this end is the truth? To claim that the various religious confessions do not want it, would be a falsehood and a slander; to believe that science would reject it, would be "an insult to the human mind. No! God has placed in our souls the respect for and the need of truth; and in our enterprise, which assumes a national character by the concurrence of all, science and religion join hands.

" Let us, therefore, commence our work with confidence,—Israelites, Catholic Christians, Reformed Christians, men of learning who cultivate science for its own sake, philologists who carry your studies into the Shemitic tongues, historians who meditate on the traditions of the Eastern world:—go with us; let us form but one body; let us each carry his humble stone to the common edifice, without giving up our own ideas, our convictions, our religious doctrines,—in one word, our personality. It is the Bible we want to translate. We do not wish to introduce confusion into doctrines; otherwise this would be the very Bable of which the Scriptures speak to us. We believe that the Bible should appear by our labors in the purity of its text; doctrinal interpretations we pay no regard to; they are the patrimony of the churches. This idea has come to a minister of one of the Protestant communions, M. Petavel; he has embraced it with the zeal and conviction of an apostle, and has accepted it as his mission to labor for its realization. He has traversed France and the lands of the French language; he has preached, he has knocked at every door and at every heart, and all generous hearts have been dilated, and all doors have opened to him. Scholars of the first rank, ministers of the Catholic worship, Protestants, Israelites, men of erudition themselves as well as devoted to their respective beliefs, have met him fraternally, encouraged and assisted him. Himself will relate to you, better than I can, his aspirations, his efforts, his success thus far, his profound confidence in the future of his enterprise. It is only those who conceive such things that have the talent to express them.

"A few words more, gentlemen, and I am done. The spectacle presented to your eyes,—the composition of our committee of organization, and that of this assembly, is it strange? No; but it is new.

It proceeds from the spirit of our age, which demands of human science conscientious sincerity, and from religion community of effort before a common danger. It is through this need of fraternal concord that we see here seated side by side ministers of different denominations, eminent by their character, by their learning, their position; some Catholics, others Protestants or Israelites, each one having behind him numbers of the faithful of his communion. We ask ourselves involuntarily at this sight, whether this meeting of intelligent minds for a holy purpose will not bring about some day a union of hearts; and, if in this community of labor, in the name of the same God, for the elucidation of the same book, there will not be effaced many hostile prejudices which in nowise concern the faith; if, in one word, charity joining hand with truth, religion will not draw from it new lustre. These are, gentlemen, questions, the solution of which belongs not to men, above all not to those who bring here only the humble tribute of a little earthly science. Let us leave to Providence the great tasks which he knows how to accomplish mysteriously in the secret of the souls of men, and let us be content to repeat this cry of our fathers when they marched, eight centuries ago, toward those countries of the East which yet to-day engage our attention, 'God help us! God help us!'

A MISSIONARY once presented a Bible to a young Indian, who possessed a fair knowledge of the English language, and exhorted him to read it, and obey its commandments. The book was received and read, as requested. Some time afterward the Indian met the preacher, and said to him: "I want you to go with me to the river. I want to be baptized." "I can baptize you without going to the river," said the preacher. "Where?" inquired the red man. "Here," replied the preacher. Said the Indian, in a tone of surprise: "I don't see how you can baptize me here, where there is no water." "We can have water brought for the purpose," responded the minister. But the young man was perplexed; he could not understand how they were to baptize him after the water was brought. The minister then explained to him that they could baptize him "by pouring a little water on his forehead." "Is that baptism?" "Yes," said the minister. Not yet quite satisfied, the young man again replied: "Well, if that is baptism, you have given me the wrong book."

His idea seemed to be that each denomination had a Bible of its own, and that the minister had, through mistake, given him one that represented baptism to be immersion. The impression that baptism is by immersion was made upon his mind by reading the Bible; but if pouring* is baptism, it must be learned from some other book; that is, the same book can not teach both pouring and immersion to be baptism. Why not? Because there is such a difference between pouring and immersion that if the one is taught to be baptism, the other can not be.— *W. W. Hayden.*

* Or sprinkling; the illustration is the same for either word.

THE FOURTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE present number completes the third volume of the *Quarterly*. When the work was first started, we could then hardly hope that it would ever reach through even a second year. It has, however, still struggled on to the end of the third. It has had its trials, as most papers have; but these, we trust, it is gradually overcoming. We do not yet feel that its success is complete, though its prospects are not gloomy. With the prompt and cordial aid of its friends we believe it could, in less than six months, be placed beyond the fear of failure. We hope we shall not ask brethren in vain to give us this aid.

To the preachers, especially, we make our most earnest appeal. Many of them take the *Quarterly*, and with not one dissenting voice they speak well of it. To no other class of men can it be so useful. Its thorough discussion of subjects must be especially interesting to them. In this feature the *Quarterly* is peculiar. No paper in our ranks goes so thoroughly into the investigation of the topics of which it treats as does it. This is what the preacher wants. From him, consequently, more than from any one else, do we look for countenance and encouragement. With his active assistance the success of the work is sure. Shall we, brethren, have it this year?

But while we appeal especially to the preachers, we ask the generous aid of all. With twice as large a list of subscribers as we now have, we can sustain the work and realize a handsome sum for the labor we perform. This enlarged list we hope to get. Brethren, gratify us in this matter.

The price of the work will still be \$2.50 a year. This we can not reduce till paper and printing decline. Indeed we are not sure that it should be reduced in any event. We believe the work to be worth the sum, and hence have no delicacy in asking it.

To all subscribers I would say, it is safest to send money in checks or in post-office orders. These are especially convenient. But where these can not be had, send the money.

Hereafter the volume will commence and end with the year. The first number, therefore, of Vol. IV. will be issued in January, 1861.

Subscribers need not wait for an agent. Let each be his own agent where one is not convenient, and send on at once his name and money. Brethren, renew your subscriptions immediately. This will enable me to determine how many copies to issue.