

A BAPTIST HERITAGE CLASSIC

PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY

or, Defenders of the Faith



BEN M. BOGARD, EDITOR

IMBM FREE BOOKS LIBRARY

**Pillars of Orthodoxy,
or Defenders of the Faith
Ben M. Bogard, editor, 1900**

CONTENTS

Pillars of Orthodoxy,	1
CONTENTS	2
Introduction	3
Chapter I A Sketch of the Life and Labors of Dr. A. C. Dayton	5
Chapter II Richard Fuller, D. D.....	12
Chapter III Elder William Vaughan.....	26
Chapter IV Elder A. P. Williams, D.D.....	34
Chapter V James P Boyce, D.D., LL.D.....	38
Chapter VI Major W. E. Penn.....	47
Chapter VII Elder Joseph B. Moody, D.D.	57
Chapter VIII Elder T. T. EATON, D.D., LL.D.....	67
Chapter IX J. R. Graves, LL. D.....	78
Chapter X - J. B. Jeter, D.D.	89
Chapter XI - Elder S. H. Ford, D.D., LL.D.....	93
Chapter XII - Elder J. M. Pendleton, D.D.....	101
Chapter XIII - John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D.....	125
Chapter XIV - Elder James S. Coleman, D.D., Ph.D.....	134
Chapter XV - Life of John T. Christian, D.D., LL.D.....	151
Chapter XVI - W. P. Harvey, D.D.....	162
Chapter XVII - J. N. [John Newton] Hall.....	177

Introduction

This book is a history, an album, and a collection of the choicest sermons and essays. It is a history of our great leaders who have fought hard and long for Bible principles and doctrines, and by their consecrated, and, in some instances, heroic lives, have shown themselves to be worthy of the title: Pillars of Orthodoxy.

The arrangement of the book is such that the reader can study separately the lives of each of these great men and read the specimen sermon or essay without reference to any of the others. Each life sketch is complete in itself, and no one chapter is dependent on another. The life sketch of Richard Fuller, and his great sermon on the "Desire of All Nations," for instance, is a complete chapter to itself, without reference to anything else in the book. This feature enables the busy reader to read a chapter at a time, and there is nothing lost by the long intervals between his opportunities to read. In a book where one chapter is directly connected with another, much is lost by failing to read straight through. The last chapter can be read first in this book and nothing will be lost by it.

It is always a pleasure to look into the face of a great man. There is something elevating about it. The pictures of these men, "who seem to be pillars" (Galatians 2:9), are the very best that can be obtained. The reader, therefore, while he studies the life, may look into the faces of these men who have made so much glorious history. By that means these pillars of orthodoxy will seem to be old friends, and it will make their life work seem more real.

It can be safely assumed that the sermons and essays, published as specimens in this book, are the best that have ever been published. Some of them are published here for the first time, while others have been published and have become famous. It is a pleasure to present to the public a volume containing the very cream of the best thought from the strongest men in the Baptist denomination.

There is J. B. Moody's great essay on "Conditions of Receiving the Holy Spirit for Service," which is published here for the first time. It alone is worth the price of the book. There is J. T. Christian's strong essay on "What Baptists Have Done for the World," which is published for the first time. Then there are other sermons and essays of great value that can be found only in this volume.

The published sermons and essays that are here reissued are, without exception, such as should be preserved, and will be valuable additions to any one's library.

Besides the aforementioned merits, may be mentioned the fact that the discussion of Scripture doctrines are such that the book, as a whole, becomes almost a complete embodiment of the theology of the New Testament.

It begins with Dr. Dayton's sermon on the "Existence of a God" and "Christ the Savior," by Fuller; then there is discussed, by Wm. Vaughan, the "Relation of the Law and the Gospel;" then "Regeneration," by A. P. Williams; "Baptism," by T. T. Eaton; "The Holy Spirit," by J. B. Moody; "The Divinity of Christ," by W. E. Penn, and so on to the practical subjects, such as "Glad Giving," by J. A. Broadus; "The Work of Baptists An Urgent Work," by that prince of preachers, J. S. Coleman; and the book closes with J. N. Halls' discussion of the "State of the Dead."

Other great articles by S. H. Ford, J. M. Pendleton, J. R. Graves and others might have special mention. In fact it is hard to decide which one is the best, because all are of the very best, and they will have to be rated by the individual taste of the

reader.

If, by sending out this book, I may be the instrument of doing good, of preserving the names and deeds of these noble men, and of helping in establishing my brethren in the faith, and of leading some wandering soul from darkness to light, I shall be well paid for the unusual labor put into its preparation.

Very truly yours,

Ben M. Bogard

Chapter I A Sketch of the Life and Labors of Dr. A. C. Dayton

Amos Cooper Dayton, the author of "Theodosia Ernest" and the "Infidel's Daughter," was the second son of Jonathan and Phoebe Dayton, and born in Plainfield, New Jersey, September 4, 1813.

His life up to his sixteenth year was spent on his father's farm "in plain living and high thinking." Before he was seven years old he showed a passionate love for books, and the first money he ever earned, by hauling a load of nuts to the village market, was at once invested in a grammar and arithmetic. "Our choices are our destiny. Nothing is ours that our choices have not made ours."

The little lad chose learning and a useful life, shaping his future toward those ends.

At twelve years of age he joined the Presbyterian church, of which his parents were members. When sixteen he was forced to leave school on account of an accident that came near destroying his eyesight. He worked his way, however, through the medical college in New York after this misfortune, and received his diploma in the twenty-second year of his age.

When traveling for his health in the Southern States he met, and after a brief courtship, married Lucy Harrison, third daughter of Capt. R. P. and Mrs. Eliza Harrison, of Shelbyville, Tenn.

The wedded pair left at once for Florida, where the young physician meant to practice his profession, and, if possible, regain his health. It was already feared that he had consumption.

In 1852 Dr. Dayton became a Baptist. How he was led to make this change he tells in full in his last diary, kept from '52 to '64; and the painful struggles through which "Theodosia" passed were not creations of his imagination, but were a recital of his own experiences.

It was at this time, during a long and serious illness, that he resolved to preach the Gospel of Christ.

In his journal he writes:

"It was the fondly cherished hope of my parents that my life should be devoted to the great work of the ministry. They intended, on account of this, to give me the benefit of a liberal education, and failed to carry out their design only because I lost health and eyesight at such an early age.

"When I was under such deep, conviction in '42 this was one of the great wrongs which I felt I had done. I had not employed my time and talents in spreading the truths of God's Word, but had wasted my life in other and comparatively useless labors."

In September, '52, on the Sabbath following his baptism, he preached his first sermon in the little Baptist church at Shelbyville, Tenn. His theme was "The Love of God." Singularly enough, this first sermon was also his last.

Only two Sabbaths before he went home he selected it from a collection of sermons where it had lain for years, and once more told with almost heavenly inspiration of the "love of Christ that passeth knowledge."

In 1855 he removed from Shelbyville to Nashville, Tenn., upon being offered the office of Corresponding Secretary of the Bible Board of the Southern Baptist

Convention. A few years later this was given up, and the duties of the associate editor of the Tennessee Baptist and of an author absorbed much of his time. He served several churches as monthly pastor as well.

It was now that "Theodosia Ernest" was published that brought him fame for all time.

"The Infidel's Daughter" followed, and various smaller works on denominational subjects.

In '59 he had a terrible illness, and from this he never fully recovered.

In '62 I find this record in his journal:

"I can walk once more. Oh, what a blessing to be able to walk — to stand up to preach! Once I had to sit in my chair. God has indeed done great things for me, and I try to give him thanks."

In '61 the horrors of the civil war drove him from home. In the spring of '63 he was offered the presidency of Houston Female College, in the thriving town of Perry, Ga., and here his last days were spent in teaching and preaching.

He died in great peace on June 11, 1865, and was buried in the cemetery at this place. His funeral discourse was preached by his dearly-beloved brother in the ministry, Rev. B. F. Tharpe, who died in the year 1899. They sleep together now under the Southern pines, whose mournful music is their requiem.

Dr. Dayton left behind him at the time of his death a large and helpless family, an invalid wife, five daughters and three sons. One son, Robert H., and a daughter, Mary Hand, have followed him to the better land in the last few years.

The oldest daughter, Laura, well known as the writer of a number of popular Sunday-school books, and as the consecrated leader of the Baptist and Reflector's, Young South, is now the widow of Albert Eakin and lives in Chattanooga.

The next in age, Lucie, is also a writer, and has been a contributor of stories to nearly all our Baptist papers for twenty years. Her last book, Thread of Gold, has added much to her reputation. She is the wife of Rev. J. M. Phillips, D. D., pastor of the Baptist church at Mossy Creek, Tenn., for the past four years. The other two daughters are Mrs. T. S. Stock, of Mississippi, and Mrs. W. W. Kannon, of Tennessee.

Of the two sons, John is a prosperous merchant of Chattanooga; Lawson a highly thought-of lawyer of Shelbyville.

The Existence of God By Dr. A. C. Dayton

Some years ago a lawyer who professed to be an infidel came one day into the office of a professional man, and seeing a tract lying upon his table, he picked it up and read aloud its title, "The Life of a Christian," and laying it down again immediately, added, "Otherwise the life of a fool."

Some young gentlemen who were present laughed at this and thought it very witty. Witty perhaps it was, but was it true?

Who is the fool?

Even supposing Christianity is false and the Bible an imposture, that there is no God and death is an eternal sleep, it would by no means follow that all who hold the contrary are fools, for it has some times happened that the wisest men have been

deceived, and besides, one may be allowed to think that the evidence that was sufficient to enlist the faith of such men as Locke and Newton, Milton and Bacon and others of their stamp, men who, in power of reasoning intellect, in rigid, clear analysis and logical deduction, stand among our modern would-be philosophers like giants among pygmies — the evidence, I say, which was sufficient to convince such men might reasonably be thought sufficient to justify a common mind in giving its assent without incurring the charge of either silliness or insanity.

No one can prove that there is no God. No one can prove that Christianity is not true. It is impossible in the very nature of things to prove such a negative. All that can by possibility be truly said is that we have not evidence enough to prove its truth. Let us grant this. Its truth is still possible. It may be even probable. Who then is the fool? Let us examine.

Sorrow is in the world; disappointment, distress and grief of heart will come upon us here. This is true whether the Bible be true or false. Now who is best prepared to struggle with this "sea of troubles," he who sees in the events of life the blind, unguided, objectless impulses of ungoverned chance, or he who looks confidently to Heaven, and hears even in the whirlwind and the storm of sorrow his Father's voice, exclaiming, "All things shall work together for the good of those who love me?"

Death is in the world. Alas, he often strikes the loveliest and the dearest — the friends of our childhood, the companions of our youth. But is there now such proof? Are any men such fools?

Go out

"- when night with starry wings

O'ershadows all the earth and skies,

Like some bright, beauteous bird whose wings

Are sparkling with unnumbered eyes."

Look up to the broad blue expanse of Heaven. Count the stars; observe their order; study their motions. Take with you the astronomer whose patient study has determined beyond all doubt or cavil that each of these glittering points in the infinitude of space is a vast globe like the mighty sun that shines upon our earth. Let him instruct you in the fact that countless millions more of these wondrous orbs of light lie still beyond the range of mortal sight; that each of these is probably like our own sun, the center of a vast system of worlds, revolving round it with their ponderous mass unjarringly and ever in their own appointed track age after age. Then while you look and while you think say if there is no God, if all this came by chance, if all by chance continues. Surely he is a fool who says there is no God.

Look abroad over the earth we dwell on. How admirably it is fitted for the habitation and the sustenance of the thousands of living things that swarm upon its surface, which soar in the air above it and float in the waters beneath it. Each is fitted for the place and the condition in which we find it, and all the arrangements of light and shade, of night and day, of seedtime and harvest, of cold and heat, rain and sunshine, evince the working of a wise, beneficent and all-controlling mind. All that we see in a careless glance, all that we learn by the most careful study of the works of nature shows an intelligent and infinite designer. The world is full of God. God looks down upon us from the wondrous stars. God blows upon us with his mighty winds and breathes upon us with the balmy breeze. God shines upon us in his glorious sun. God thunders in the storm and rains upon us in the shower. God giveth life and breath to every living thing, and he must be indeed a fool who says there is

no God.

Let man but look within himself. Let him consider all the evidences of wise, benevolent designs which his own frame exhibits, and if his mind be right he can not help but feel that such a wondrous structure was not the work of chance.

Was it by chance that the brain and other organs, a slight injury of which would seriously affect the whole economy of life, are so carefully protected by their bony coverings? Was it by chance that the arteries which bear to distant parts the lifeblood from the heart are placed in such positions as will expose them least to any injury? Is it by chance that in those parts where they must be exposed, as in the forearm and the hands and feet, they are so multiplied, divided and intermingled, communicating so with one another, the destruction of a part from any accident will not endanger the life of the part?

Was it by chance that the framework of bone was made so as to give the greatest strength in the smallest space?

Was it by chance that those wonderful contrivances, the muscles and tendons and joints, were so arranged as to give him the freest and most perfect control of all his motions with the least expenditure of strength?

Was it by chance that his eye was arranged with such consummate knowledge of the laws of light that it infinitely surpasses, as a mere optical instrument, anything which all the skill and science of the philosopher has been able to suggest?

Was it by chance that the organs of all his other senses are so admirably adapted to the objects of which they are intended to take cognizance?

God shows himself in man. God speaks in every breath. God moves in every motion. God beats in every bounding pulse. The man himself is in a thousand ways a constant living evidence of an all-wise, all-kind and powerful creator. And he is surely a fool who says there is no God.

There is another thought. Man's body is not all of man. He has a mind. He observes. He thinks. He feels. His actions show and his own consciousness declares that his mind is endowed with certain faculties or powers. First among these, exerting over the race of man a more extensive and controlling influence than any other, is his instinctive propensity to worship. His nature is such that he must have a God. In all times and among all people this is a striking and a most wonderful truth. The remains which tell us of the power and opulence of the nations of the olden times are mostly the ruins of their temples. Time has passed along and with his iron heel ground out from the face of the earth every other vestige of their power. Their commerce has left behind no token. Their military prowess has left no fortress where once embattled hosts engaged in maddening conflict. Their kingly pomp is gone. The palaces of the nobles have crumbled into dust. But there stand still in solitary grandeur the mighty ruins of the temples which they built in honor of what they called God.

I grant you that this instinct to worship is a blind and darkened instinct. But if there be no God to worship whence is this power of the human mind? Nature hath made no otherwhere such blundering work. If she have given us eyes it is because there is also light by which we may see with our eyes. If she have given us ears it is because there are things to hear. If we have love of friends it is because we live in society. If we have conscience it is because there is a right and wrong in human conduct. So if we have the instinct to worship, it is itself a proof that he is a fool who says there is no God for us to worship.

If it be said that it was nature that unrolled the star-bestudded sky; that it was nature that formed the million suns and rolls forever round them their ponderous worlds; that it is nature that controls the ever-varying seasons and endues all living things as best befits their place and object in the universe; that it is nature that formed us as we are, so "fearfully and wonderfully made;" that it is nature teaches us to look above ourselves and search for the superior power that we may worship it — I grant it, if you choose; but tell me now, I pray you, what is nature?

If nature is the cause of all these marvelous things, then nature is intelligent, for these things in themselves give evidence of an intelligent first cause; nay, of an infinite intelligence, which sees the end from the beginning and is ignorant of nothing.

If nature is the cause of all these things, then is nature all-powerful, for these things show evidence in themselves that the power which made, continues and controls them is almighty.

If nature is the cause of all these things, then nature is benevolent, for there is evidence in all the arrangements which we can fully understand that the author of them was kind, as it was wise and powerful.

If nature then be infinitely wise and powerful and good, nature is God, and tell me now why should we take the laws by which God manages the universe, the laws which we familiarly call the laws of nature, and weave with them a veil to hang before our vision and hide from our view that God who is the author and the executor of those laws? Nature is nothing but the manifestation of the power and wisdom and benevolence of God. The laws of nature are only the rules by which God works in carrying out his plans. Nature is but the working of nature's mighty God, and he is but a fool who puts the visible effect in place of the almighty Great First Cause.

But there are others to whom we may with strict propriety apply this term. They grant there is a God, wise, powerful and kind, and that he has placed us here, but has made to us no revelation of his character or will, or of our origin or destiny. He has created us and all the wondrous things above us and about us, and given us, with other qualities of mind, the instinct which forces us to feel there is a God worthy of our worship and requiring our adoration, but left us in utter darkness as to his nature and our relations with him.

These men assert (as Christians do) that God is wise and kind and cares for the welfare of his children. They say (as Christians do) that the whole face of nature abounds with the evidence of his goodness. They see it in the loaded tree, the teeming earth, the fruitful shower and the balmy breeze. They see it in the grassy carpet of the earth. They see it in the beautiful flowers that deck the fields. They see it in the vast variety of hill and dale, of fountain and fresh shade with which he has adorned the earth to render it delightful as the dwelling place of men. They see that he has provided not only for his necessities, but for his pleasures; not only for the continuance of life, but for its enjoyments. They say that God is good. Why then should he not gratify the reasonable desires of his children? While he provides so bountifully for their physical comfort and delight, why should he deprive them of the food of the soul? Why keep them in ignorance of what concerns them more than all things else to know?

Am I to live hereafter, or when I lie down in the grave is that the end of all my joys and sorrows, of all my hopes and fears?

If I am to live hereafter in what condition will it be? And will my conduct now from day to day effect my coming destiny?

What kind of conduct does my God approve and what does he dislike, or is he indifferent as to what I do?

If I have offended him how can I regain his favor and regard? Will he forgive me? If he will, upon what terms? If not, what is to be the consequence of his anger?

These questions and such as these greatly concern the sons of men. It will hardly be pretended that God could not answer them if he would. He might, in many ways we can conceive of, make known to us the truth.

Is he not then a fool who, while he owns that God is good, denies that he would make a revelation of his will?

But if he say he has virtually made such a revelation, but not that which is contained in the Bible of the Christian; that reason is the celestial lamp hung out by the hand of the Almighty to guide us to the truth, reason itself will answer that he is a fool, for all experience shows that reason has never yet been able to illuminate the darkness which, on subjects such as these, covers the human mind. The lamp of reason is too dim; its light is too faint. It required the full splendor of the glorious sun of righteousness to dissipate the mists and clouds that hung about the character of God and the destiny of man.

Even the first great truth which all admit, "That the maker of all things is good;" this fact which no one, Christian or infidel, would in this land now venture to deny, this fact which seems so plainly taught in every page of nature that reason could not fail to read it; even this simple truth reason did not discover. The nations on whom the sunlight of the Bible never shone have never worshiped such a God as ours. Their Gods were the embodiment of power, cruelty, revenge and lust. This was true of the most polished nations of the ancient times. In all their wealth of intellectual lore they never conceived of any such God. He was to them indeed the unknown God till Paul declared him unto them. And it is equally true now. Go to the nations in Asia, in Africa, or in America, who have not learned the character of God directly or indirectly from the Bible, who are still in all the darkness of reason, and ask ten thousand of their wisest men the character of God. and you will not learn as much of truth concerning it as from any little company of poor, unlettered Christians in the land of Bibles. Reason never has taught it, reason could not find it out, and he who trusts to reason only for instruction on these subjects of eternal and overwhelming interest may well be called a fool.

If, then, there is good cause to believe that God would make a revelation of himself, and reason is proved to be an insufficient guide, he is a fool who does not take the Bible as the revelation which it claims to be. There is no other pretended revelation which can claim to rival it. It stands alone in the lofty purity of its morality, in the stern, unyielding strictness of its laws; in the heavenly sublimity of its conceptions of the Deity. The excellence which other systems have, they have borrowed from this. This is the light of the world. It is here that life and immortality are brought to light. It is here and here alone that we can learn how we may please the God who made us. This is the revelation of his will. Here we can learn and here alone how we may be forgiven for our offenses. How God can be just and yet can justify the sinner who believes and obeys the Gospel. This Bible is the word of God, and he who does not take it for such may well be called a fool.

And, my brethren, is there not in some of us a folly which surpasseth this? We believe there is a God, holy, just and good. We take this book to be a revelation of his will. We believe there is a Heaven. Are we living in such a way as to fit us to enjoy its holy pleasures? We believe there is a hell. Are we not careless whether we

shall ever finally escape its tortures? We believe there is an eternity, an endless eternity of perfect joy or terrible distress awaiting us at death. Yet are not many of us such fools as to live here as though we should live always here, and spend our time and employ our labors in laying up treasures upon earth, while we give scarce any attention to the eternity compared to which time is but as a "forgotten circumstance?"

If we believe it, let us live as though we did believe it. Let us give the scoffers no room to say that we are even greater fools than they, even admitting our doctrine to be true.

My dear impenitent and unbelieving friend, there is a God and the Bible is the word of God, whether you believe it or not. Your belief or disbelief will not affect the truth or its results. You may doubt, you may deny; you may even scorn and hate the truth, but it will not help you. There is a God and you can not escape from out his hand. There is a God, and if there be, and this Bible is his word, how fearful is your case.

Here is your folly: If I am wrong, if I am deceived; if my reason has been imposed upon; if Bacon and Locke, Newton and Butler and Paley and others of their stamp, philosophers, logicians and reasoners by profession — if these men were imposed upon by cunningly-devised fables, and all the world of Christians are mistaken, we are at least no worse off than you, since the true Christian is a better man and a happier man for being such. He has his pleasant hopes, he has his joyful anticipations, while he lives and dies in the triumphant hope of an eternal weight of glory. He is at death as well off as any of you. He will be no more conscious of disappointment than you are, for by your own admission he will have ceased to be. The worms that feed upon his flesh will no more torture him than you. He will feel the coldness and dampness of the grave no more than you. He loses nothing which you do not lose, and he gains his present hope and his triumphant death. But if you are wrong and it should at last turn out that he is right — and remember you can not prove that he is not — then where are you? If it should prove true that there is a God, how will you fare who have insulted and despised him? If it should prove true that the Bible is his word, how will you fare who have rejected and ridiculed it? If Jesus was a Teacher come from God, how will you fare when, as he foretold, he shall come again to judgment?

If death should be no dreamless sleep, but only the door to a more active and never ending life; if it should prove true that there is a glorious Heaven and that there is a fearful hell, how will you fare who are neglecting, ridiculing and despising the only means by which you might escape from one and gain the other?

Oh, you will not call the Christian a fool then; you will not then esteem it folly to have led a godly life, a life of faith and penitence and holiness. You will not then think it folly to have secured an interest in the atoning blood of him whom you now profess to regard as an impostor. Then is it not the part of folly, of the most egregious folly, to live and act in such a way that you may have occasion to lament forever, while you might live so that the chance for life and endless blessedness would be yours, and the worst that could possibly happen would be no worse than what, according to your own belief, must now assuredly happen?

Chapter II Richard Fuller, D. D.

By Ben M. Bogard

In his Bible is found, in his own handwriting, this record: "Richard Fuller, Born April, 1805; Born Again, Aug. 27, 1832." The place of his two births was Beaufort, S. C.

His early education was conducted by Elder Brantly, D. D., of Beaufort, and he afterward studied at Harvard, and in his class of eighty students stood first in his studies.

Upon his return from Harvard he entered the practice of law, and he soon became one of the most successful lawyers in the State. His success along that line is another answer to the slander that men go to preaching when they can't successfully do anything else.

Mr. Fuller's religious experience was somewhat unusual. He first united with the Episcopal church, and his keen eye discovered that only immersion was baptism. He, therefore, demanded immersion at the hands of the Episcopal clergyman and was immersed. However, under the preaching of Eld. Daniel Barker, the famous evangelist, he was led to see that he had never been regenerated, and that he was in the "gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity." He was radically converted and united with the Baptist church in Beaufort, S. C., and was baptized by the authority of that church in the year 1832. His conversion was so radical, his new life was so distinct, that he could with perfect confidence make the record in his Bible, already referred to: "Richard Fuller, Born, April, 1805; Born Again, Aug. 27, 1832." There might be doubt about the exact day of his physical birth, and the exact day is not given in that record, but there was perfect certainty about "Aug. 27, 1832," being the exact date of his spiritual birth.

His Episcopal immersion was not looked upon by the convert nor by the church as being valid baptism, and, therefore, he was baptized by the authority of a Scriptural church. There could be no better index to the doctrinal character of the Beaufort church, and of Richard Fuller, than the fact that alien immersion was not considered by them as valid baptism. If they had regarded the Episcopal church as being a church, in the Bible sense, they would have accepted its baptism as valid, hence we are forced to the conclusion that the Beaufort church and Richard Fuller, at that time, regarded only Baptist churches as being Scriptural churches. That puts the church and the man in the list of churches now known as Landmarkers. He was rebaptized by Eld. Wyer, then pastor of the First Baptist church, Savannah, Ga.

Almost immediately after his conversion he entered the ministry and was elected pastor of the church in Beaufort, where he preached for over fourteen years; he afterward was called to the care of the Seventh Baptist church, Baltimore, Md., where he preached twenty-four years, and then he organized the Eutaw Place church, in the same city, and preached for it until his death — five years. He, therefore, spent forty-three years with three churches, his shortest pastorate was five years and his longest twenty-four. This is a remarkable record and is another illustration of the value of long pastorates.

Dr. Fuller was one of the greatest pulpit orators that has ever lived. Many regarded him as being the greatest. Certainly there were not more than two or three others that were anything near his equal, and there was only one that anybody thought could surpass him — the matchless J. R. Graves was regarded by some as being his superior, but it is fair to say that many others thought Fuller was superior to Graves.

Perhaps the one who was heard last was regarded as the greater.

As a debater Dr. Fuller was invincible. His great discussion with Bishop England, of Charleston, S. C., on the claims, of the Roman Catholic church, won for him the reputation of a most powerful and skillful controversialist. His published debate on the slavery question with Dr. Francis Wayland is a remarkable book. His language is choice, his temper excellent, his manner graceful. Notwithstanding the fact of the slavery agitation, which had unsettled everybody and everything and threatened to disrupt the Union, he was as calm as a May day. Not a harsh word was spoken, not a thing was said of which he might be ashamed in after years. As gentle as a refined woman, as fearless as a lion, that was Richard Fuller. He did not seek controversy, neither did he belong to the sentimental crowd which is opposed to debates; a mighty man who stood like a great pillar of strength for nearly half a century.

As a writer Dr. Fuller was eminent, and his writings were saturated with the classic spirit; his well-balanced sentences and his illustrations were superior to those of almost any other theological writer of his time. His published sermons, one of which is published at the close of this sketch, are models of oratorical beauty. Of course these published sermons can only give the words of the great man, while the flash of the eye, the gestures, the expression of the face, the general bearing in the pulpit, the tones of the voice, and the very presence of the living man are all lost, and yet the printed sermons are great sermons. His work on "The Terms of Baptism, and Communion" is a book of great worth. His articles for the religious newspapers and magazines were noted for beauty of diction, strength of argument and soundness of doctrine.

In an address at his funeral Dr. Brantly, his co-laborer in Baltimore, said: "To these natural powers, improved by diligent culture and varied reading, Grace added a love for Christ and a love for souls so intense as to pervade his whole being. When ordinary men were indifferent, he felt; when others only felt, he glowed; and when others were glowing, he was all aflame. * * * It was this fiery working of the unseen machinery which urged the whole man onward, right onward, to his object and made him a very prince in the pulpit."

His love for souls was shown in his work among the Negroes. He often said that he would rather be the means of the conversion of one poor Negro than to please ten thousand white people.

He was a hard student throughout life, and this, perhaps, was the great secret of his successful life. He remarked once to Dr. Brantly: "I am the hardest student in the State. My sermons usually cost me three days of careful study, beginning in the morning and working all day." That left him three days in the week for general study, visiting and literary work.

Just before his death he said: "To one in my condition the chief question is, 'If a man die shall he live again?' The world does not believe it. The church only half believes it. But I know it and I rejoice in it. When I am gone, go speak to the people and tell them Jesus Christ has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light in the Gospel." A short time after that he said, "Put this down: In a time of great trial my faith is perfect." When told of the great number who had been saved under his preaching, and reminded of the fact that this ought to cheer him, he said: "Poor creature! poor sinner!" How he felt his own unworthiness! The last audible words he spoke were: "Lord Jesus, keep us near thee; make us perfect, and thine shall be the glory forever and ever, amen." Jesus had called for him and he went home, and we are reminded of the words of Jesus when he said: "Father, I will that those thou hast given me be with me where I am."

At his residence, 87 Park avenue, Baltimore, Md., on Friday morning at 9 o'clock, Oct. 20, 1874, Richard Fuller "fell on sleep." His funeral took place in the Eutaw Place church, and addresses were made by Dr. W. G. Brantly and Dr. J. W. M. Williams. He was buried in the Greenmount Cemetery, and his body awaits the resurrection. "Well done, good and faithful servant."

The Desire of All Nations* * *By Richard Fuller, D. D.

"And the Desire of all nations shall come." — Haggai ii :7

The text foretold a strange phenomenon. It declared that the High and Lofty One who inhabits eternity would be seen among sinful men; that he who from everlasting had dwelt in light unapproachable, would assume some form, and make his entrance upon this globe; that the invisible and ever-glorious, whom no man had seen, or could see — the Eternal, forever concealed behind stars and suns, would veil his effulgence, and come into the world. Such is the prophecy; and if this wonderful event, dimly anticipated, could agitate and transport the inmost spirit of patriarch and prophet, flooding them with rapture, what should be our emotions now — now when he has come; when we have seen "the Brightness of the Father's glory," "come forth from the Father, and come into the world;" when he who, "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," has "made himself of no reputation, and taken upon him the form of a servant, and been made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, has humbled himself and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" when we can say, "without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory;" when, with adoring confidence, each of us can exclaim, "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief?"

Of this stupendous and overmastering deed of love, how can I worthily speak, who am a man of unclean lips, and live among a people of unclean lips? Well have we done, to commence from it a new era in the biography of our race. Amid the wreck of past ages, that transaction stands alone by itself, in unique and solitary grandeur: and stand it forever shall, amid the waste of future ages, the great epoch in the cycles of eternity, the masterpiece of infinite power, and wisdom, and love, to absorb our expanding souls long after this globe shall have been purged by fire, and when all its records and annals shall have been forgotten. Turning, then, from the mysterious, unutterable glories of this "new thing which God has made in the earth," let us come to what we may compass by our thoughts; let us confine ourselves to the very significant title applied to the Redeemer in our text; regarding the term "Desire" as referring to the expectation, and the wants and the happiness of the whole human family.

I. First, then, it is a fact deserving more attention than has, I think, been bestowed upon it, that among the nations there has ever existed a widespread, if not universal expectation of a glorious person to be the renovator of mankind, and to impress a new character on the spirit, habits and morals of the earth. A truth this, wholly inexplicable to the infidel, but quite incontestable for all that, and to every Christian admitting of an easy solution.

* Preached before the Southern Baptist Convention, at its first annual session, in Richmond, June 10. 1846.

Why, my brethren, such a catastrophe as the Fall — who will believe that it could ever be obliterated from the memory of man? And if our ruin, much more surely would the promise of our redemption be transmitted — a promise which in so peculiar a manner assured the guilty that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head," and which was performed when, "the fullness of time being come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

It is a famous question, which I shall not disturb, whether the benefits of the atonement by Jesus extend to other beings besides man. The Bible conveys clear intimations, that among intelligences peopling other portions of God's empire, the knowledge was dispersed, both of the degeneracy of our race and of some wonderful expedient for our rescue. And if in distant provinces of creation the advent of a Saviour into the world was matter of adoring study, away with the thought that God would leave the posterity of Adam in ignorance of a transaction so deeply affecting their destiny, and of which this earth was to be the theater. Accordingly we find that such a revelation was not only given, but perpetuated. And those of you who are acquainted with antiquity know that in all ages and among nations most distant from each other the expectation of a deliverer has been cherished, and cherished everywhere as an express communication from heaven.

The truth is that scarcely had the fall occurred when God began to announce a retriever from the ruins of that fall; and in antediluvian ages we see him so busied with this great promise that, studied by the light of faith, the history of the world even then will appear as the first act in the grand drama of redemption. It is a touching proof of God's compassion that, before the sentence was uttered against our guilty parents, the gospel was preached to them, and its golden notes mingled tenderly with those accents of wrath which otherwise might have driven them to despair. Directly after this, sacrifices seem to have commenced — an institution by which an innocent victim was to be immolated for the sins of man, a thing so entirely above the dictates of reason that we at once recognize in it the appointment of heaven and a type of the Messiah. The offering of Cain was as choice as that of Abel; the latter, however, was an expiatory sacrifice, and the conduct of God to the two worshipers was a proclamation never to be forgotten, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission, of sins; hence, "by faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." In short, brief — to me instructively, most affectingly brief — as is the record of those who lived before the flood, their cares and passions, and pleasures, and pains all summed up in a few pages, yet the Spirit has supplied one important fact. There were preachers in those days whose theme was the same Jesus we preach — Enoch especially foretelling his coming and preparing the world for his reception.

From the flood to the call of Abraham we see God still occupied in consoling the earth with the promise of its great restorer. The Scriptures, indeed, declare that the very manner of Noah's escape was emblematical of salvation by Christ. "The like figure whereunto," says Peter, "even baptism doth also now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." No sooner is that patriarch landed than this second father of mankind, by sacrifices of blood, inculcates on his family, then the whole population of the earth, the faith of the grand atonement. And upon all of Jehovah's dispensations at this period we discern the plain shining signatures of this illustrious doctrine. Audience is never given to man as an innocent being, but always as guilty and through the medium of sacrifices.

In process of time we find God adopting a singular measure. He separates one nation from all the nations, choosing them, not because they were more in number than any people, but for this peculiar purpose, that They might be the depositories of the "faithful saying," and might show from afar the magnificent redemption to be one day wrought out for man. If patriarchs rejoiced it was in anticipation of that event — Abraham desiring to see Christ's day, and gladdened by the sight; and Jacob exulting over death, as he leaned upon the top of his staff and turned his eye to the triumphant Shiloh. If prophets were inspired, it was to confirm the faithful in their aspirations for the Messiah, so much so "that the testimony of Jesus was the spirit of prophecy" — "the spirit of Christ which was in them testifying beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." Amid the pomp of royalty, if monarchs pined with a longing for the gratification of which they would have bartered their crowns, it was to see him who was all their desire and all their salvation. "Many kings have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear and have not heard them." Types, altars, oblations and all the gorgeous machinery of the temple were but shadows of the promised mercy. In short, wherever among the Hebrews "righteous men" were found, the consummation of all their desires would have been to witness the ingress of the Prince of Peace; and in every Hebrew woman's bosom, concealed but glowing, there was such an ambition of the honor afterward conferred upon Mary that the prophet calls the Saviour "the desire of women" — the fondest, highest, holiest dream of the sex, terminating in the bliss of becoming mother to that Son whom a virgin was to bear, whose name would "be called Immanuel, Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, and of whose government of peace there should be no end."

Up to this point, then, in all ages preceding the birth of Christ, you see how that wonderful epiphany was the engrossing theme of piety and inspiration. And here let me repeat two important remarks which have already been made, and which we should always take with us when perusing the books of the Old Testament. The first is that during this period the expectation of a wonderful personage to change and mold the destiny of the world was not confined to the Jews, but was diffused throughout the earth. It was impersonated in Melchisedec; it sustained the sufferer of Idumea, who, when all was desolation around and within, exclaimed, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:" it fired the lips of Balaam; it was scattered over Asia, Africa, Sicily and the islands of the Archipelago, and from thence was conveyed to Rome, and treasured among those Sibylline oracles which even the wisest men revered as sacred, and it prevailed, as Tacitus and Suetonius inform us, most anciently, all over the East.

This is one striking fact, and the other is the existence everywhere of sacrifices and the faith of appeasing the Deity by blood, by the substitution of the innocent for the guilty. Unite now these two truths, and how incontestable is the assertion that from the fall to the advent of Jesus Christ there was a general expectation of the mighty victim of Calvary, which justifies the application to him of this title, "the Desire of all nations."

We come now to the great advent, and as the nativity, and afterward the public manifestation of the Saviour approach, the truth I am urging becomes confirmed on all hands, and the earth is agitated by premonitions and prognostications exciting the most intense concern. In the West, at Rome, the metropolis of the earth, and only a few years before the appearance of Christ, Julius Caesar seeks to subvert the liberties of his country, aspiring to a throne; and by what argument is his claim supported? His friends appeal to an oracle in the temple predicting a king to arise at

that time, whose reign should be without bounds, and whose government should secure the happiness of mankind. And in a work almost contemporaneous with the birth at Bethlehem the most celebrated of the Latin poets rehearses this oracle, declaring it was now about to be accomplished, and employing, as to the wonderful offspring, almost the very images and language of Isaiah himself. In the East, the light to enlighten the Gentiles is not only seen from afar, but shines so clearly that the sages leave their homes and studies and repair to the birthplace, doing homage to the kingly Star of Jacob.

Above all, in Judea, and at the scene of this amazing mystery, how is everything in commotion, and from every quarter what notes of preparation!

Does the Hebrew enter the temple or walk the streets of Jerusalem, he sees the most devout and venerable of his nation bending with years, yet rejoicing that even their fading eyes should "behold the consolation of Israel." Does he leave the city, among the hills and buried in cells upon the mountains he finds those holy hermits of whom Josephus speaks absorbed with the immediate coming of Messiah, waiting to form his escort, and vindicating their sublime hope by prophecies not to be mistaken. From out the dreary depths of the wilderness, and along the verdant banks of the Jordan, resounds perpetually the voice of a most extraordinary man, an austere herald, who has drawn all eyes upon him as a prophet "with the spirit and power of Elias," and who still utters the startling cry, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make straight in the desert a highway for our God." In fine, my brethren, so eager and universal was the expectation* of a great deliverer that as soon as John appeared multitudes flocked and crowded about him, and the inquiry, "Art thou he? art thou he?" a question never before proposed to any of the prophets, now breaks from their impatient lips, and if they surrender their convictions it is most reluctantly, and only when the Baptist "confesses and denies not, but confesses that he is not the Christ," but merely his harbinger, and not worthy to perform even the most menial office, such as unloosing his sandals for that exalted personage.

Nor, my brethren (though it is out of place to make the remark here), was the sensation felt by the inhabitants of this earth alone. Other and very different orders of intelligences were moved at the astonishing phenomenon. On the night when the Saviour was born, hell, I make no doubt, stood aghast and marshaled all its forces, and commenced in Herod and the massacre of the children, that infernal conspiracy which pursued the Redeemer through his life, and seemed to triumph, but was most gloriously discomfited at the cross. And all heaven, we are expressly informed, was filled with a sympathy most thrilling and ecstatic. Man those glorious beings had known in Eden, and had loved with the love of a brother for a younger sister. The dismal hour of man's fall they had witnessed; nor can any tell their emotions when, amid the bowers of Paradise, there ran that shriek, Death, death is in the world! And now, when the Brightness of the Father's glory stoops to that world, and on such an errand, what wonder and rapture seize their adoring thoughts. All along their radiant, countless files roll anthems of high exultation, and then, wheeling down, they pour upon the listening ears of Palestine the music of the skies.

* Luke, iii. 15: "And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ," etc.

Yes, my brethren, not only on this scene of his love and grief, but in other and distant places were felt the communications of unutterable interest when the Dayspring from on high visited us. And if, when he came, the world knew him not, and honored him not, he was not without honor, such as no mere creature can receive. True, no star formed by mortal hands would ever glitter upon his breast, for he was to be despised and rejected of men; but a star made by eternal hands moves along the heavens, and, stopping in reverence, showers its lustre upon his cradle. No illuminated capital nor palace hails his approach, for he comes at midnight and in an humble village; but "the glory of the Lord shines around," and beams from the Shekinah irradiate the earth. No troops of admiring courtiers welcome the incarnate God — O no! low lies his head in a manger, and among the herds of the stall; but a retinue of strong and immortal cherubim and seraphim adore the Lord of glory, and shake the night air of Galilee with praises for that birth which would give "glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men."

The Expectation of all nations shall come. You now perceive, my brethren, with what propriety, in this view, the Saviour is called "the Desire of all nations." As in those regions where the sun is hid for months, all console themselves with anticipations of his light, and turn instinctively to the point where he will appear, and, when the dawn approaches, abandon their pursuits and dress themselves in their richest garments, and climb the highest hills to greet his first rays, so was it with the Son of Righteousness. The expectation of a deliverer cheered the earth in its gloomiest darkness. As the fullness of time drew near, the gaze of all settled upon that quarter where the Luminary was to arise, the pious and the wise secluded themselves from all their avocations, and, in the sublimest faith and loftiest contemplations, watched for that morning which was to know no night, but forever give light to them who sat in darkness and the shadow of death, and guide the wretched in the way of peace.

But it is time to pass to our second article, and to consider this title of the Saviour in another view, and with reference to the wants of mankind; for, as regards these also, he is emphatically "the Desire of all nations."

II. The words rendered "the Desire of all nations" mean, in fact, the want, the good needed, the grand desideratum of all the people of the earth. Nor, were this the place, would it be difficult to vindicate the text thus considered, both politically and socially, and to prove that those nations upon whom the gospel shines occupy summits gilded and gladdened by the orb of day, while all others are still in the deep valleys not yet penetrated by his rays. Why, my brethren, look abroad upon the governments of the earth. Who need be told that righteousness exalteth a nation, that Christianity alone can inbreed and nourish true patriotism, and that whatever be the form of civil polity, it will prove a blessing or a scourge, just as rulers obey or violate the precepts of the gospel? And so, too, as to the arts and sciences, as to liberty and order, as to every virtue which adorns a people (and woe, above all lands, to this Republic when such virtues come to be worn only with a loose and disheveled decency), in all these respects, while it is true that each age and nation hath its peculiar character, how unequivocal is the testimony of history that the characters of all depend upon the infusion or rejection of the principles of the gospel.

I am not, however, a politician or a philosopher, but a preacher. It is not my design to speak of political or ethical defects, but of wants far more profound and pressing — the wants of the soul, the necessities of the immortal spirit, exigencies which no earthly scheme of polity, or philosophy, or religion, lies ever even recognized, but which the gospel both reaches and abundantly satisfies. The entire system of the Bible, indeed, and every provision of the gospel, has this great peculiarity; it

addresses man as carrying within him the consciousness of wants overlooked by all teachers except Jesus Christ — wants which make him poor, and blind, and naked, and miserable, while he pretends to be rich and increased in goods. Christianity takes for granted a guilt and ruin such as no human expedient could meet. It is precisely on this account — it is because of its exact adaptation to all the dreadful emergencies of our conditions that the great salvation has triumphed and must triumph; that Jesus must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet; that Christ lifted up will draw all men unto him; that all nations shall call him blessed, and that unto him shall the gathering of the people be. And if you do not already feel all the force of this truth, suffer me to explain it to you.

In the first place, then, wherever a human being is found, there will be found a conscience — a moral sense; ignorant perhaps, perhaps stupefied, but still asserting, at least periodically, its mysterious power, and reverberating through all the chambers of the soul those thunders which awe and terrify the guilty. "This is the curse which goeth forth over the face of the whole earth," and secretly appalls the proudest, and flashes in upon the hardest, through all their steel and adamant, convictions that cleave, and agitate, and shake the soul with terror; nor from this pressure of unpardoned sin has man ever found, nor will man ever find deliverance but by the blood of Christ. Let men affect to despise the gospel, and seek to persecute its ministers and stifle its light; that gospel has in their bosoms a ministry they cannot resist, a radiance they cannot extinguish; and while their hands are reeking with persecution, the fell murderers of Christ, the ruthless, ferocious Saul, the cruel jailer, ask what they must do to be saved. Let men plunge into excesses, and seek in vice and revelry to drown the inward forebodings, the fearful looking-for of judgment: "Though they dig into hell," saith God, by his prophet, "thence shall my hand take them: though they bury themselves in the bottom of the sea, I will command the serpent to sting them there;" and Belshazzar, amid his delirious carousals, and Felix, triumphant in all his schemes of rapine and voluptuousness, find their faces gathering paleness and their frames shivering with terrors they cannot conceal. In a word, let men seek by mere repentance to atone for guilt: it is in vain. Everywhere the imploring cry is heard for some medium, some mediator between God and man. Wherever humanity is diffused there the deep, earnest, imploring exclamation is, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God; shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old; will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil; shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" and blood, blood flowing in every land, altars groaning with victims, hecatombs smoking with gore, lacerating hooks and torturing pilgrimages, the reddened axles of Juggernaut, and the wail of anguished women on the Ganges, attest the inefficacy of repentance to give peace to the conscience. No, my brethren, the great want of a guilty world is the atonement of Calvary. It is the Lamb of God alone who taketh away the sin of the world. To him John, the great preacher and impersonation of repentance, pointed; in him there is a redundancy of merit for the vilest; from his cross there floats down a voice, saying, "Look unto me and be saved, all ye ends of the earth!" And in this view how truly is the Saviour "the Desire of all nations," bringing "peace to them that are nigh and to them that are afar off."

Guilt. To the want produced by guilt add now that created by the corruption which sin hath shed through our nature, blinding the mind, perverting the will, and not only encasing the heart in obduracy, but filling it with enmity to God; a corruption so entire and universal and self-propagating that the Bible employs, in portraying it, the most frightful image, and pronounces all men not only without life, but dead — meaning by death not merely the absence but the opposite of life; death as a

principle, a power so active, so terrific in its destructive energy, that in a few hours it reduces to a mass of disgusting putrefaction all the vigor and beauty which the more sluggish element of life had been for years maturing and perfecting. "All," say the Scriptures, "are dead, dead in trespasses and sins. Such is the natural condition of the whole world, and were men left to themselves this corruption, this virus, this leprous essence would forever work, and spread, and forever feed the deathless worm .and the quenchless fire. And as most gloriously "the life of the world," as he who "has come that we may have life, and have it more abundantly" than by the first infusion; that the Spirit may quicken, and purify, and renovate, and pour into the imperishable fabric the elixir of immortal strength and vigor — in this view how truly is Jesus "the Desire of all nations."

In fine, take but one thought more: the just anger of God — that wrath which hangs in unmitigated blackness over a guilty world, and from which there is no refuge but at the cross of Christ. The wrath of God is a calamity without a name — a calamity which none can comprehend — which it will require eternity to comprehend and deplore; and even the possibility of incurring it must fill a reflecting mind with unspeakable concern and alarm. In heaven it once burned a little, and, promptly as the peal follows the flash, came the crisis upon the crime. Forthwith, without any waiting for a second offense, without hope or respite, angels were weeded out of their "first estate." Radiant cherubim and seraphim, the choice and prime of all the celestial hierarchy, withered into devils, and sank all naming into hell, flung from eternal splendors down to bottomless perdition, where they now lie, "reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." And not only are all the children of Adam "children of wrath," but all hear the premonition, all hear that cry, "Flee from the wrath to come." All know that the consciousness of guilt is the prophecy of vengeance, and until sheltered in Jesus all stand helpless and hopeless, exposed to the lurid cloud which is only suspended for a while — only waits till it shall have been charged and burdened with storms, and fires, and every deadly material, when it will break and beat forever on their heads, and pour a deluge of eternal wrath upon their souls. And in this view is not Christ — that Jesus who "hath delivered us from the wrath to come" — O! is he not "the Desire of all nations?"

It would be easy to multiply details on this article, but I must not. It were easy to show that, in reference to the most profound and pressing necessities of man, the gospel is the great desideratum — literally the one thing needful. The spiritual wants of every age and clime and class declare how worthy of all acceptance is the faithful saying, and the assertion would not be at all extravagant should I use the image of the Apostle and say that where Christ is not known the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for his manifestation, and the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together for a deliverance he alone can bestow. Justice pursues, vengeance thunders, conscience shoots its clear and ghastly flashes, Satan sways his baleful sceptre, death "reigns over all," trampling the nations under the hoofs of that terrible pale horse, and after death "hell follows." Such is the state of man; nor is there any hope for him but in the Redeemer. Until that Sun of eternity arise a canopy of perdition and despair envelops him, "clouds and ever-during dark surround him;" he turns on every side

"Eyes that roll in vain,

To find the piercing ray, and find no dawn."

III. Our last article requires scarcely a word from me. Here I had proposed to consider the epithet "Desire" as synonymous with happiness, but it cannot be necessary to prove that the happiness of all must be found in Christ. Not that all feel

this, for men. alas ! ignorant on all subjects, are most ignorant as to what constitutes their true felicity, and thus call that good which they love, and reject and hate the gospel which condemns their sins. Yet it is not less true that only Jesus can confer true happiness; he alone can say, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Happiness, because the mind of man can rejoice only in truth, and Christ is "the truth." Without him we grope darkling in mazes of error, and are perplexed and wretched amid doubts and speculations as to all it most concerns us to know. Happiness, because the heart of man can only be satisfied with objects worthy of it, and Christ alone proposes those objects — objects which fix the heart, but without which the passions wander in unrest and pining through creation, fretting themselves with things gross and sensual, whose possession only stings us into a consciousness of our immortality, and whose best gifts are only a pleasing degradation. Happiness, lastly, because God is the life of the soul, and Christ alone reveals this Being, and reinstates us in his favor and love. To be without Christ, say the Scriptures, is to be without God, and to be without God is to be severed from the supreme good, to be cut off from the source of all joy, to have our souls cursed and blasted now, and dying thus, they must become forever most desolate and wretched — the orphans of the universe, the outcasts of eternity. But, as I said, a word here will suffice.

The subject, my brethren, on which you have been addressed is one very dear to me, not only for its interest, but as the common joy and glory of all Christians. It is because the disciples of Jesus wander from the cross that they are separated, and walk over hidden fires forever flaming up in controversy. As they gather around this sacred altar, one heart glows in every breast, and all the elements of strife are melted and fused into one monopolizing love for God and for each other.

And now, in applying this discourse, what shall I say? Why, the very entrance of such a Being into this world, and the mission of which this earth was the theater, how astonishing and absorbing. There are times in the lives of all men when we feel that we are not all matter; when our thoughts wander far away from the finite and mutable, and become familiar with eternity; when our souls are agitated with the mystery of that eternal Spirit by which they are encompassed — are athirst for God — and ascending to the perfect and ever-glorious, exclaim, in the language of Philip, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us."

My brethren, that God, that eternal Spirit has rent the veil and shown himself in our midst. The Word which "in the beginning was with God, and was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us." "Christ Jesus has come into the world." And, now, what movement should stir our minds? In Christ, "God was manifest in the flesh." He is "the image of the invisible God," "the brightness of the Father's glory and express image of his person." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." In his temper the character of the Deity was impersonated; in his life the attributes of the Deity were embodied; in his cross the very heart of the Deity is p. 56]

disclosed to our love. What a Being! Search creation through, explore the universe, scale all heights, fathom all depths — no such object can be found for the admiring, adoring contemplations of the mind, the imagination, the heart.

What have we to do with thee?" As if they had said, "Thou hast not come to save us." No, they had nothing to do with him; but we have everything to do with him, since he came for us men and our salvation. O, when the Invisible steps forth upon this scene of visible things, on such a mission and in such a form, must not our hearts yield, melt, love, worship, adore?

The enterprise — and then the cost. From everlasting there he sat, the princely majesty of the universe, amid admiring, adoring thrones, and principalities, and powers, who drank in love and blessedness from his smiling countenance, and forever caused the golden atmosphere to re-echo his praises. But he left all.

He abdicated all "the throne and equipage of "God's almightiness." There was something sweeter to his heart than all the harmonies and ecstasies of heaven. It was mercy — it was pity for our wretchedness — and he came, he flew, he stooped and took our nature in its meanest and most mournful conditions. And, in this nature, what sufferings did he not endure — sufferings which destroyed his life, though they could not destroy his love. Think of these, and how are you affected? "Christ," says Peter, "hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust;" but in that once what sufferings were not concentrated. Ah, miserable sinner, from eternity had the only-begotten reposed in the bosom of the Father, and now see him leaving that bosom and taking the form of a servant for you. From eternity had the fairest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely, been rich in the glories and hosannas of the skies, and now see him becoming poor for you — so poor that, living, he had not where to lay his head; and dying, he would have been buried, but for charity, like a common malefactor, by the highway side. Follow the adorable Jesus from scene to scene of ever-deepening insult and sorrow, tracked everywhere by spies hunting for the precious blood. Behold his sacred face swollen with tears and stripes. And, last of all, ascend Mount Calvary and view there the amazing spectacle; earth and hell gloating on the gashed form of the Lord of Glory; men and devils glutting their malice in the agony of the Prince of Life; and all the scattered rays of vengeance which would have consumed our guilty race, converging and beating in focal intensity upon him of whom the Eternal twice exclaimed, in a voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." After this what are our emotions ? Can we ever be cold

or faithless? No, my brethren, it is impossible, unless we forget this Saviour and lose sight of that cross on which he poured out his soul for us.

That is an affecting passage in Roman history which records the death of Manlius. At night, and on the Capitol, fighting hand to hand, had he repelled the Gauls and saved the city when all seemed lost. Afterward he was accused, but the Capitol towered in sight of the Forum, where he was tried, and, as he was about to be condemned, he stretched out his hands and pointed, weeping, to that arena of his triumph. At this the people burst into tears, and the judges could not pronounce sentence. Again the trial proceeded, but was again defeated; nor could he be convicted until they had removed him to a low spot, from which the Capitol was invisible. And behold, my brethren, what I am saying. While the cross is in view vainly will earth and sin seek to shake the Christian's loyalty and devotion — one look at that purple monument of a love which alone, and when all was dark and lost, interposed for our rescue — and their efforts will be baffled. Low must we sink, and blotted from our hearts must be the memory of that deed before we can become faithless to the Redeemer's cause and perfidious to his glory.

But this thought has carried me beyond all bounds. I return and with a single reflection more I finish. That reflection regards our duties and the solemn responsibilities which the subject charges home upon us all.

My impenitent hearer, how loudly does the text speak to you; and I cannot sit down without asking you, "What think you of Christ? How are you treating him who came and who seeks to save you? You have heard that he is the desire of all nations; tell me, is he your desire or aversion? Will you receive and obey him or are you resolved

still to say, "Not this man, but Barabbas?" Recollect, without him you can have no peace now — your deepest, strongest wants must be unsatisfied — the whole creation cannot make you happy. Recollect, you will soon have nothing to do but to die; then "the desire of the wicked shall perish," and what will become of you? Soon the Saviour will come again, and very differently. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." And then, when you call upon mountains to cover you, and abysses to shelter you, how will your present conduct appear? And what a wail will be yours when, shattering the air, and shattering your soul, that sentence shall be pronounced, "Depart, accursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels!"

It is, however, to us Christians that the application of the text especially belongs at this time, and in our bosoms how many thoughts ought it to awaken. True (O blessed be God for this,) Jesus Christ is all our desire and all our salvation. We know him as such, and our souls do magnify the Lord. But, with the possession of this blessing, what responsibilities devolve upon us!

My very dear brethren, is Christ the Desire of all nations? Then why are there so many nations still ignorant of Christ? The angel declared that the tidings should be to all people — why, then, have so many not heard those tidings? The Saviour's command is, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" — why, then, have not the heralds of the gospel traversed the earth? The answer to these questions I blush to give; it is (shame on our covetousness — the reproach of our country and of our churches) that Christians have not done, and will not do, their duty.

Ah, my brethren, my brethren, just now. as I surveyed the cross, I pronounced it almost impossible for us to be faithless to Christ; but alas! when I turn from the cross to the conduct of Christians, I have most painfully to confess my mistake. Where is the spirit of Christ among us? Upon whom has his mantle fallen, all wetted with tears for the perishing? "When he saw the multitudes he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd;" how few are affected with such a sight now. "Five hundred millions of souls," exclaimed a missionary, "are represented as being unenlightened. I cannot, if I would, give up the idea of being a missionary while I reflect upon this vast number of my fellow-sinners who are perishing for lack of knowledge. Five hundred millions ! intrudes itself upon my mind wherever I go and however I am employed. When I go to bed it is the last thing that occurs to my memory; if I awake in the night it is to meditate on it alone, and in the morning it is generally the first thing that occupies my thoughts." Nor is it only the heathen at a distance; among ourselves how many thousands of the sons of Ethiopia are stretching out their hands, and how have they been neglected. My brethren, let us awake to our responsibility ere the wrath of God wake us up to sleep no more, and the cry which goeth up into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth attract his righteous indignation.

Is Christ the Desire of all nations? Then, my brethren, let us preach Christ, and let our missionaries preach Christ. We do not want philosophers, nor metaphysicians, nor even theologians, but preachers of Christ and him crucified. Nor let us fear that God will not open a great and effectual door for us if we are willing to be co-workers with him. What am I saying? How wide a door is already open; and if, instead of indolently crying, "There are yet four months and then cometh harvest," we would only "lift up our eyes and look on the fields," upon every side we would see them "white and ready to harvest."

Lastly, is Christ the Desire of all nations? Then how sure is our success. True, we must expect difficulties, and it is not improbable that, before the gospel conquers the earth, there will be many conflicts and convulsions. But when we consider what God has promised and done, how intent and busy is the whole Trinity in the grand scheme of salvation, what difficulty can move us? Who can doubt that all events shall conspire to secure Immanuel's triumph, and even the passions of the world become ministers in its conversion to God? Many of us deprecated and deplored the disruption which lately divided our churches, but the man has blind eyes who sees not already the hand of God in this; and he, among us, has a cold heart who has not felt a glow at the noble conduct of our brethren at the North and is not fired with holy emulation. And thus shall it ever be; the truth shall yet bind kings in chains and nobles in fetters of iron; the wheels of the Redeemer's chariot move not back, but shall roll on until "the Desire" shall become the Delight of all nations, and shall reign over them in righteousness. All the resources of the universe are in the hands of the ascended Jesus. To him the Father hath said, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;" and the hour hastens on when the whole earth shall become a temple, and that temple be filled with the glory of the Lord and echo with the hallelujahs of "An assembly such as earth

Saw never, such as heaven stoops down to see."

Welcome the glorious consummation! O months, and seasons, and years speed your tardy flight and usher in the blissful period; that day when, from every hill and valley, shall ascend clouds of incense, to return in sparkling showers of mercy; when from every human heart shall swell the angelic hymn, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will to men;" when the pealing chorus of a renovated world shall answer back the thundering acclamations of the skies, and every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them shall say, Alleluia! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; Worthy is the Lamb that was slain; Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Amen!

Chapter III Elder William Vaughan

By Ben M. Bogard

William Vaughan was born February 22, 1785, in Westmoreland county, Pa. He was of Welch extraction. His father moved to Kentucky and settled in Scott county when William was only three years old.

He had in his almost wilderness home but very few educational advantages, and what he learned was due to his native ability more than any outside encouragement. He, however, became a proficient scholar before he reached middle life, and used his acquirements to good advantage in his long ministerial career.

He displayed his inclination to preach when a small boy, age eight years. The sermon he preached was to a number of his playmates and was as follows: "Boys, if you break the Sabbath, or tell stories, or swear, or don't mind your mammy and daddy, or don't mind your books and be good boys, you will die and go to hell — a lake of blue blazes, burning with fire and brimstone. And when you ask for water the devil will melt lead in a ladle and pour it down your throat." Of course he was not converted to Christ at that time, but it was an indication of the predisposition of the child, and his developing into a great preacher is not to be wondered at. For this sermon, however, the brutal teacher gave him a whipping, and the whipping was so severe that he carried the marks twelve months. Let us thank God that we have a more humane class of school teachers in this generation.

In early life Mr. Vaughan learned the trade of tailor, and for several years he made an honest living with his needle. During this time, by reading Paine's "Age of Reason," he became skeptical — almost an infidel. For a time he belonged to an infidel club, yet he said, on one occasion, to Elder J. H. Spencer, "I never expected to die in that faith."

The influence of literature cannot be estimated. How many have been led to ruin by reading bad books! Let Christian people be diligent in circulating good books, and, as far as possible, counteract the pernicious influence of the trainloads of cheap and ruinous stuff now being scattered among the people.

Upon visiting a rich friend who was wicked, profane and skeptical, and who was on his deathbed, Mr. Vaughan was made to reflect seriously upon his own lost and ruined condition. He there and then resolved to seek the salvation of his soul, but he felt like he would be disgraced if he should make a profession of religion — all of his infidel friends would deride him and turn against him. In this condition he resolved to become a Christian and live a righteous life and prepare for Heaven and not let any one know it. Of course, upon reading the Bible, he found this was folly. His trouble deepened, and; the fact of his wickedness became oppressive. He said to himself, "How wicked I have been to sin against so good a God."

While in this state of mind he attended a little log meeting-house where a preacher by the name of Leathers preached, and after he preached he was followed by Eld. Geo. Eve, preaching from the text, "Ye must be born again," and after he sat down Eld. James Quisenberry concluded the services by preaching from the text, "The great day of his wrath is come and who shall be able to stand?"

This was truly a primitive meeting — three long-sermons at one sitting — but it mightily aroused Wm. Vaughan, who was soon converted and made a public profession of his faith in Christ. Let us hear him tell how he accepted Christ: "It

seemed to me that I cried every breath: 'Lord be merciful to me.' This continued a half hour. Suddenly the thought occurred: 'What a great change has come over me. Six weeks ago I could not utter a sentence without an oath; now every breath is a prayer for mercy.' Then this text occurred to me: 'Ye have received the spirit of adoption whereby ye cry Abba, Father.' In a moment it seemed to me that the blood of Christ overwhelmed me, and I felt that my burden and distress were gone. I felt such a love for Jesus Christ that I thought if he was on earth and I could get hold of his feet I would press them to my bosom."

Such was the conversion of Wm. Vaughan When God raises up a man to stay the onward march of heresy he gives that man unmistakable evidence of his acceptance with God. A powerful conversion was meet for Wm. Vaughan since he was the chosen one to frustrate the pernicious work of Campbellism. He had a clear insight into the doctrines of Grace by experience, and his earnest and persistent study of the Holy Scriptures confirmed that rich experience.

He was licensed to preach February, 1811, by Friendship Church, Ky. He made some dismal failures at the beginning, but he increased in power as he continued to try, and no other man in Kentucky ever became so great a preacher as he. Testimonies from various sources could be quoted, but suffice it to say that all accord to Wm. Vaughan the first place as a great preacher of all who lived during the first half of the nineteenth century. Others have risen up who have perhaps been as great, but none equaled him in his day.

He was at various times pastor of a number of country and village churches, and traveled extensively as missionary and evangelist, and thousands were converted and baptized under his ministry. He labored untiringly, and braved the cold and the heat, and went under all circumstances "everywhere preaching the word." The greatest work of his life, however, was his fight with Campbellism. He met the leaders of the Campbellite movement in debate and always administered a crushing defeat to his opponent. Besides this he confirmed the churches and the ministry.

Had it not been for his powerful preaching whole churches and associations, that are now among the strongest in Kentucky, would have gone with Alexander Campbell. Such men as Wm. Warder and Jeremiah Vardeman, and several other lesser lights, were saved from the errors of Campbell by his influence.

The Baptists will never know until eternity reveals the facts how much they owe to Wm. Vaughan. Among the mighty defenders of the faith stands as a pillar of strength this remarkable man. He gave a son to the ministry who made a strong, useful preacher. He gave solidity to Kentucky Baptists, and they have ever since been noted for their orthodoxy.

His greatest debate was with Alexander Campbell. In this debate "he dissected Mr. Campbell's system with a masterly hand, drew the line between it and the doctrine of the Baptists, and made open war on the new theory." (Spencer's History Ky. Baptists, page 226.)

In 1868 Elder Vaughan fell and crushed his hip. Being in his eighty-fourth year he was permanently disabled, but he had preached constantly up to that time. His remarkable activity at that great age, and his powerful preaching for the twenty-five years preceding, proves that the fad of "laying on the shelf" all preachers at the age of sixty is superlative nonsense. A preacher is really not at his best until he reaches fifty, and for twenty years after that he should do, and generally does, his best work. After the age of seventy we may look for a decline, but many remain effective and strong to eighty or ninety years of age. For instance, there is the subject of this

sketch and Dr. A. D. Sears, who in his ninety-sixth year preached every Sunday acceptably for the church in Clarksville, Tenn.; and there is S. H. Ford, who at the age of eighty-one preaches with great power. J. M. Pendleton did the best year's work of his life, judging from the results, when he was seventy-one years old. It was his last year at Upland, Penn. The author calls attention to this because of the pernicious idea that our old men should step aside just when they are strongest mentally and spiritually and give place to young men with but little to commend them besides their energy. The author is himself a young man, just thirty-one years old, but he hereby enters a protest against the mischievous practice of pushing out of the ministry our strongest and most experienced preachers.

During the last years of his life he lived with his son, Eld. T. M. Vaughan. He was a student to the last, and occasionally preached a sermon while he sat in his easy arm-chair, being unable to stand. On February 25, 1877, at the advanced age of ninety-three years, he preached his last sermon in the church house at Danville, Ky. On the 31st day of March, a few days over a month thereafter, he fell asleep in Jesus, and was laid to rest in the Bloomfield (Ky.) cemetery, near the pulpit where he had preached for over thirty years.

"Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?" — II Samuel 3:38.

The Law and the Gospel By Elder William Vaughan

Bloomfield, KY

Man, as a depraved creature, has no realizing sense of his dependence upon God, or the claims of his Maker upon him. He lives to himself and loses sight of his accountability to the author of his being. He passes on to the judgment seat of Christ ignorant of his relation to God, never investigating the nature, spirituality or extent of the law which he is under, Or, what is still worse, and possible, calling in question its very existence.

I proceed, in the first place, to show that man is naturally and necessarily under the law to God. This results from the character and perfections of the Divine nature, and from the immutable relation that exists between God and man. The one is the Creator, the other his creature. From God, man has received his existence. All his intellectual and moral powers are a gratuitous bestowment from the Almighty; and consequently he is placed in a state of dependence upon God, and subjection to his will. And as man was created an intelligent being, endowed with liberty of action as a free moral agent, and capable of moral government, this proves that he is under law to his Creator. He was created capable of knowing, loving and obeying God, and it is fit and proper that he should do so; indeed, I consider it impossible, in the very nature and fitness of things, for an intelligent being to exist without being under law to God. This is what theological writers call the law of nature and the moral law. The angels in heaven are under such a law. This is evident from the fact that a part of them sinned, and are now suffering the punishment merited on account of sin, "for sin is the transgression of law; but where there is no law there is no transgression." Man, in Paradise, was under such a law; and its principal articles are, to some extent, enstamped upon the hearts of all men. "For the Gentiles, who have not the written law, are a law unto themselves, which show the works of the law written in their hearts." Why is it that even among the heathen there is a catalogue of sins universally forbidden, and of virtues everywhere acknowledged as binding upon mankind? We answer, because man is placed, by his Maker, under a moral constitution which forbids the commission of crime, and requires the practice of every holy duty.

It is also evident that man was under law to God prior to the giving of the law to Israel on Mount Sinai; for death, the penalty of the law, reigned with uncontrolled dominion "from Adam to Moses over those who had not sinned, after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Paul represents the Galatians, who were Gentiles, as being under the curse of the law before the gospel was revealed to them; they were kept under the law, "shut up to the faith, which should afterward be revealed." "Now we know that what thing soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world may become guilty before God." Conscience, the inward monitor, admonishes all men of their accountability to God. Why is it that the impenitent sinner dreads to appear before his Maker? Just because he is conscious of guilt, contracted by the violation of the law he is under, and of punishment, deserved in proportion to the degree of guilt he is the subject of.

In the second place, we proceed to notice the goodness of the moral law, as a correct idea of the purity of the law unfolds to the mind the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the need of the atonement of Christ to magnify the law and expiate the guilt of transgressors.

The purity of the law must be admitted by all, who acknowledge God to be the

author of it, as holiness is essential to his nature, and constitutes his glory and loveliness. Pure streams flow from untainted fountains. It expresses the sentiments of his heart in reference to all moral beings; it secures to the Creator the claims of his government, and binds all holy intelligences to his throne, and is the very transcript of his nature. It enjoins all that is due from man to his Maker, and all that is due from one moral being to another. It prescribes all that is morally good, and forbids all that is morally evil. Men, as lawgivers, require their subjects to live virtuously; not because they are themselves the lover of virtue, but merely because virtue promotes the well-being of the social compact. But the law of God prescribes virtue or holiness because of its intrinsic excellence, and condemns vice on account of its intrinsic evil.

Human laws take notice only of the outward acts of men, but the divine law sits in judgment upon every volition of the mind; upon the thoughts, desires and affections of the heart. And no act is pure in the eye of God unless it proceeds from a principle of love to the great Lawgiver. "The commandment," says David, "is exceedingly broad." Paul declares "that the law is spiritual, and the commandment is holy, just and good." It is a law never to be abrogated, set aside. Were it unholy it never would have been given or perpetuated. Its purity is manifest from the awful sanction annexed to prevent man from transgressing it, and the judgments inflicted on men on account of their rebellion. The curse of God fell upon the earth for the sin of man. He was driven from Paradise and a cherubim and flaming sword stationed to guard the tree of life; the old world drowned, the cities of the plain burned with fire. Now, all these inflictions of divine wrath proclaim the holiness of the law of God. Some apology may be offered for the violation of an oppressive law, but none whatever for the transgression of a law that is holy, just and good.

Once more we remark that the strongest evidence of the holiness of the law is seen in the cross of Christ. For it would have been inconsistent with the character and perfections of God to have placed man under an unholy law, oppressive in its nature and not adapted to his capacity as the subject of his moral government, and then give his own Son to die the painful death of the cross to magnify it. Thus we see that, in the judgment of God, the law was worthy of being honored by the active and passive obedience of Christ; and there is no glory in the gospel but upon the supposition that the law is glorious.

And it is worthy of notice that almost every error imbibed by men in reference to the plan of salvation results from wrong views of the nature and excellency of the moral law. We have said that God is the giver of the law. The following occurrence we mention to prove the truth of this declaration:

Some years since there lived in one of the Northern States an infidel lawyer, of strong and cultivated mind, who felt a desire to examine the claims of the Bible to inspiration by the Almighty. After reading the twentieth chapter of Exodus, he said to a pious friend, "I have been reading the moral law." "Well, what do you think of it?" asked his friend. "I will tell you what I used to think," answered the infidel; "I supposed that Moses was the leader of a band of banditti, and that, having a strong mind, he acquired great influence over a superstitious people, and that on Mount Sinai he played off some sort of fireworks, to the amazement of his ignorant followers, who imagined, in their mingled fear and superstition, that the exhibition was supernatural."

"But what do you think now?" inquired his friend. "I have been looking," said the infidel, "into the nature of that law. I have been trying to see whether I can add anything to it, or take anything from it, so as to make it better. Sir, I cannot. It is

perfect. The first commandment," continued he, "directs us to make the Creator the object of our supreme love. That is right; if he be our creator, preserver and supreme benefactor we ought to treat him, and none other, as such. The second forbids idolatry. That certainly is right. The third forbids profaneness. The fourth fixes a time for religious worship. If there is a God he ought surely to be worshiped. The fifth defines the peculiar duties arising from the family relations. Injuries to our neighbors are then classified by the moral law. They are divided into offenses against life, chastity, property and character. And," said he, applying a legal idea with great acuteness, "I notice that the greatest offense in each class is especially forbidden. Thus, the greatest injury to life is murder; to chastity, adultery; to property, theft; to character, perjury. Now, the greater offense must include the less of the same kind. Murder must include every injury to life; adultery, every injury to purity; and so of the rest. And the moral code is closed and perfected by a command forbidding every improper desire in regard to our neighbors. I have been thinking, where did Moses get that law? I have read history. The Egyptians, and the adjacent nations, were idolaters; so were the Greeks and Romans; and the wisest and best Greeks or Romans never gave a code of morals like this. Where did Moses get this law, which surpasses the wisdom and philosophy of the most enlightened ages? He lived at a period comparatively barbarous; but he has given a law in which the learning and sagacity of all subsequent time can detect no flaw. Where did he get this law? He could not have soared so far above his age as to have devised it himself. I am satisfied where he obtained it. It must have come from heaven. I am convinced of the truth of the religion."

The infidel was infidel no longer, but remained, to his death, a firm believer in the truth of Christianity.

The great Lawgiver is doubtless disposed to prevent transgression, and to secure the obedience of his creatures, and to impress upon their minds a sense of the holiness of his law. This is evident from the awful but righteous penalty annexed to it. Its language is, "The soul that sinneth shall die," and like law in general, it cannot tolerate the transgression of itself. Such an idea is a burlesque upon every principle of legislation, human or divine. And all who expect to obtain salvation by works; imbibe the idea that the law is relaxed in its strictness, and that God has adapted it to the condition of man in his present lapsed estate. Hence it is often said that if God were to punish his erring creatures for every sin committed, he would be unjust and tyrannical in the extreme. Now, if this be so, God has given to man a law by which he cannot abide without incurring the charge of injustice and cruelty. But the language of Scripture is, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." And can it be supposed that the law, which requires us to love God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourself, has ceased to be holy, just and good because of man's indisposition to obey it? And we know that the want of a disposition to obey the law cannot set aside its claims upon us.

Again — what does the best obedience of a sinner, out of Christ, amount to? It proceeds from a heart totally depraved; and the heart is the source of moral action; and if the fountain be impure, so are the works flowing from it. "The ploughing of the wicked," says the wise man, "is sin." And assuredly impure acts must be the poorest materials imaginable out of which to produce a righteousness commensurate with the demands of God's pure and holy law.

But further. Can the advocates of a mitigated law tell us how far it is relaxed? And if not, all is thrown loose, and involved in uncertainty, and no infallible rule is given by which the conduct of man is regulated or governed. Surely, such a sentiment is a

reflection upon the omniscient and immutable wisdom of the divine Lawgiver. It is saying that God originally gave to man a law, which he learned by experience was not suited to his nature as the subject of law; and, therefore, he lowered it down, to suit his moral taste as a sinner, that he might render such an amount of obedience to it as would atone for his sins and thus obtain salvation. What a reproach to the Holy One of Israel does such an idea convey.

The impossibility of salvation by works will further appear if we reflect upon the impossibility of human merit. Had man, in his state of innocence, obeyed the law perfectly, he would only have done his duty and been an "unprofitable servant." According to this teaching of the Saviour, obedience to God is a debt. And who ever dreamed of rewarding a debtor for discharging his just debts? No one.

Again. Suppose a sinner were invested with power to obey the law perfectly, and were to do so even after committing his first sin — even that would avail him nothing as an atonement for the sin committed, simply because his present and future obedience could not have a retrospective effect so as to atone for the sin committed prior to the exercise of holy obedience. The fact is, that present obedience can no more atone for past sins than it can for sins committed in the future. The claims of the law are, at all times, obligatory, and we cannot render more obedience than will release us from present obligation. Present duties cannot annihilate the past. And is not this in exact accordance with the teachings of the Bible? "Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse, of the law, being made a curse for us."

Again. The experience of every renewed sinner accords with these statements. In his most serious moments his heart assures him that his works are tainted with sin; that he has no claim upon God whatever; and that salvation is by grace, pure and unmerited.

I proceed to another idea, advanced by many, by which they suppose that they are not shut up to the faith or at all dependent upon Christ for exemption from the consequences of transgression. The persons to whom I allude attach great importance to repentance; so much so that, in their judgment, it secures to the sinner the pardon of his sins. Now, we feel certain that, without the interposition of Christ, repentance is an utter impossibility, inasmuch as the natural tendency of sin is to harden the heart and deaden all the moral feelings of the soul. And the longer man continues under the influence, the farther he wanders from God, the more insensible is he of his condition. And without the influence of divine grace to counteract the effects of sin, he will become daily and hourly more and more hardened in sin, and less disposed to turn from his evil course, to repent of his wickedness, and to seek the favor of God. And were God, from this hour, to determine to withhold all divine influence from the hearts of men by fastening guilt upon the conscience, there never would be, on God's footstool, another broken-hearted sinner. And be it remembered that man, by his rebellion, shut up every avenue through which the grace of God could, consistently with the requirements of law and justice, be bestowed upon our fallen race. But Christ has, by his mediatorial office and work, opened up a new and living way through the rent veil of his flesh. We have now access, through him, to the Father, who is the giver of every good and perfect gift. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour; to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins."

But suppose men were morally capable of exercising unfeigned repentance, uninfluenced by the grace of the Redeemer, would that render them capable of pardon? Before maintaining a principle of this sort the individual should know if there

are not reasons for making the punishment of sin necessary in the government of God; and then he should know the effect the dispensing of these reasons would have on the different intelligent beings governed by the Almighty. But the divine government is such a mysterious and complicated affair, and so far beyond the grasp of the human mind, that no man living can answer such a question. Besides, we well know that when a man violates the laws of his country, and subjects himself to the penalty thereof, and repents of his transgression, he is not released from the punishment incurred, nor is the chief magistrate of the State justifiable in pardoning the penitent convict. The punishment of the guilty is necessary as a terror to evil-doers, and to deter others from the commission of similar offenses. Even in this life penitence does not remove the guilt of a vicious course. If a man, by vice, ruins his health, character or fortune, he does not find, upon repentance, that he is placed in the condition he occupied prior to his violating the laws of God and man. How, then, can any one prove that repentance removes the awful consequences which God has annexed to sin in the life to come? In the judgment of those who thus reason it is more important to maintain inviolate the claims of the human governments than the claims of the divine government. Here, again, we see that the sinner is "shut up to the faith," and that there is no way of escaping the penalty of transgression but by the cross of Christ. It is worthy of notice that, after a sinner is soundly converted to God, and repents of his sins, and believes in Christ, he still deserves, when compared with the law, the wrath of God as much as he ever did. His present righteousness does not, in the least degree, atone for his former wickedness. In a word, there is no hope whatever for the salvation of the most devoutly penitent man that lives but through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. No Christian lives to God until he is dead to the law. Says Paul, "I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I might live unto God."

Go, ye that rest upon the law
And toil, and seek salvation there;
Look to the flames that Moses saw,
And shrink, and tremble, and despair.
I'll retire beneath the cross;
Jesus, at thy dear feet I lie,
And the keen sword, that Justice draws,
Flaming and red, shall pass me by.

Chapter IV Elder A. P. Williams, D.D.

By Ben M Bogard

A. P. Williams was born in St. Louis county, Mo., March 13, 1813. He was a son of Lewis Williams, who was a preacher of great power. He also had three brothers who were preachers of ability, viz: Perry D. Williams, I. T. Williams and M. F. Williams. His nephew, Eld. J. D. Murphy, D. D., is also a preacher of decided ability, and has through a long ministry met with good success.

Eld. A. P. Williams was a self-made scholar. He was proficient in Greek and Hebrew, as well as an excellent scholar in his mother tongue. He was a master of the English language, as those who have heard him preach and those who have read his books will testify.

As a theologian he was without a superior in his day. He was looked upon by those who knew him best as a second Andrew Fuller. He could repeat whole chapters of the Bible from memory, and if the Bible had been utterly destroyed, it is said that he could have reproduced nearly all of it, exactly as it is written, while he could have reproduced the substance of all of it.

As a result of his wonderful knowledge of the Scriptures his preaching was pre-eminently scriptural. He literally "preached the Word" — he "was mighty in the Scriptures." He knew philosophy, and he knew full well that philosophy is not able to save, and he, therefore, "preached the preaching that the Lord bid him to preach." O that his mantle might fall on ten thousand of the rising ministry.

Dr. Williams gave his whole time to study, preaching, writing and pastoral duties. There were near four thousand conversions and baptisms under his preaching. He never took a rest, but rode on horseback, or walked, with an occasional steamboat ride, from place to place, and preached day and night for months at a time. As a preacher he was eminent. His eloquence, pathos and earnestness would set all his sermons on fire and move and melt the people. To this may be added a wonderful gift of exhortation, power of appeal, and a certain winsomeness of manner which is now seldom seen.

He was pastor at Lexington, Richmond, St. Joseph, Miami, Bethel, Rehoboth, Good Hope and Glasgow churches, all in Missouri. These churches prospered under his ministry, and there are many still living who bear loving testimony to his worth as a preacher and pastor.

The title of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him twice, once by Georgetown College and afterward by Bethel College, of Kentucky.

He died in Glasgow, Mo., Nov. 9, 1868, while yet a young man — fifty-five — and while in the midst of a successful pastorate at Glasgow. His death moved almost every Baptist heart in Missouri, as well as thousands in other States. Truly a "great man and a prince in Israel had fallen."

He left to the world a good name, which is more valuable than riches, an impress for good upon thousands of characters which, by his preaching and writing, he had helped to form, and he published three books which are still blessing the world; one on Baptism, another on Communion, and still another on Campbellism Exposed. This last book is decidedly the best that has ever been written on that subject, and no one has ever had the temerity to attempt to answer it.

Dr. Williams was a debater of great skill. He had numerous discussions, both oral and written, but the details and incidents of these debates are lost to the world. It is to be regretted that all of his notes and memoranda have been destroyed, and the author is indebted to the Baptist Encyclopedia and to his nephew, Dr. J. D. Murphy, of Charleston, Mo., for the facts concerning this great life found in this sketch.

While we are not able to learn all the facts about this great man, we may be sure that all of his deeds have been recorded in a book which shall one day be laid open for all the world to read, and few other men will have a better record.

"He was a faithful man, and feared God above many." — Nehemiah 7:2.

Sermon Notes on Matthew 5:8 By A. P. Williams, D. D.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

"I. "Who are the pure in heart?"

"II. Why are they blessed?"

"1. Who are the pure in heart?"

(a) Sincerity is not purity of heart. Paul was very sincere while a persecutor.

(b) Orthodoxy is not purity of heart. Many hold the truth in unrighteousness. Romans 1:18.

(c) The heart is the seat of the affections, fountain of actions.

(d) Two kinds of a heart — carnal or fleshly, deceitful. Jeremiah 17:9. Then there is the spiritual, such as we receive in regeneration. Ezekiel 11:29; 36:36. Jesus says make the tree good and his fruit good, or make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt.

(e) How may we know that our heart is pure? By their fruits ye shall know them. Paul specifies the fruits of the flesh and of the spirit in Galatians 5:19-23. Compare Mark 7:21-23. Remember that if we live after the flesh we shall die, but if we through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body we shall live. Romans 8:14. 'They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh.'

"We consider:

"2. Why they are blessed, (a) Shall see God. See. Enjoy. When? Here — especially hereafter. David says: 'Whom have I in Heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth I desire beside thee.'

""Blessed are the pure in heart.""

This brief outline is a fair sample of the amount of manuscript he took into the pulpit with him. It is a fact that the really great preachers have, almost without exception, preached with but little or no manuscript before them in the pulpit. There are Fuller, Graves, Broadus, Spurgeon, Hall, Ford and Williams who were never known to preach from manuscript. There never has been a man who could preach as well as any of these, who read his sermon. Sermon reading is not consistent with the best preaching. However closely a man may write his sermon, he should be able to preach it without the use of the manuscript. Read much to become full of the subject; write much to be accurate in the expression of thought, but speak, speak, SPEAK, when you enter the pulpit. Manuscript is to a sermon what a wet blanket is

to the body — it has a cooling effect.

We publish an article of Dr. Williams' on Regeneration, which was written for Ford's Christian Repository, April, 1866, and republished in that magazine in December, 1899. As will be seen, it is a clear and strong statement of the subject as it is taught in the Scriptures.

Regeneration By A. P. Williams, D.D.

In these days of religious inquiry and discussion, much is said on almost every subject connected with Christian Theology. Every now and then I meet with something on this subject. I had supposed that it was generally very well understood, both in regard to what it is and the means by which it is produced. But it seems that in this I have been mistaken. There is no uniformity in sentiment here, even among Baptists. Some of our brethren confine the term in its meaning to the very work of the Spirit in the process of conversion, while others extend it so as to include the entire process. The former exclude instrumentality in the work, while the latter recognize the truth as the great instrument employed in effecting it. Now, why this diversity of opinion? Is it because the Bible does not afford sufficient light to clear up the question? Or, is it because we receive our notions from theologians who treat this, as well as every other, subject, as a part of their system, and interpret it to suit?

It is, perhaps, too much for me to claim that I have ascertained the truth in regard to this subject, and ask the brethren to hear me as they would an oracle; but I will "show mine opinion."

The term "regeneration" is used but twice in the New Testament: By the Saviour in Matthew 19:28.

"Ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And by Paul in Titus 3:5. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

In the former of these examples it is difficult to tell precisely to what the term alludes. According to the punctuation in our version, it alludes to the renewing of the heavens and the earth at the coming of the day of God. But there are some who think that the comma should not be after the word "me," but after the word "regeneration," believing that the Saviour expressed by the term something in which the persons addressed already had followed him. I incline to the sense the punctuation gives it. If this is its sense, then the term cannot be confined to the very first act in the process of the renewal of the heavens and the earth; it must take into its meaning the whole process. When the work of regeneration is done the new heavens and the new earth stand out complete.

In the latter passage the context sheds no light upon the meaning of the word. Paul simply states that God saves us "by the washing of regeneration;" but we are left to study the meaning of the word from its own grammatical import. Regeneration is a compound word, made up of the word "generation" and the prefix "re." The word "generation" is expressive of the work of producing or giving existence to a thing. Hence, regeneration must signify the reproducing of a thing. This leads us back to the contemplation of the thing first produced. In other words, it leads us back to the contemplation of the man as he came from the hands of his Maker. Well, the testimony of the Bible on this subject is, "God made man upright." (Ecclesiastes 7:29.) Hence, God produced man, in common with everything else which he made,

"very good." (Genesis 1:31.) We view man then, as he came from the hands of his Maker, as a holy being — innocent in life and pure in heart. But man fell. In his fall he experienced an internal as well as an external change, and the internal preceded the external, the heart and the life both became corrupt. Therefore, while the Bible so abundantly testifies that man's "way is perverse before God," it as abundantly testifies to the corruption of the heart. Of man, as he was before the flood, it says: "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." (Genesis 6:5.) Of man, since the flood, it says: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." (Jeremiah 17:9.)

It is in consequence of this that man is said to be "dead in trespasses and sins." With respect to the heart he is destitute of love, therefore of life; for love is life (1 John 3:14, 15). His mind is carnal, enmity to God, this enmity is identical with death (Romans 8:6). With respect to his life, he is dead in law; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." (Galatians 3:10.) As a condemned criminal he is bound over to death, and is obnoxious to the "wrath to come."

Hence, in his regeneration, man is made alive in every respect in which he can be said to be dead. He is made alive with respect to his heart when the love of God is shed abroad therein by the Holy Ghost. (Romans 5:5.) Hence John says, "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." He is made alive in law when the sentence of condemnation is revoked. The Apostle says: "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature;" of course, then, regenerated; but "there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ." (Romans 1:8.) I do not see anything in the Scriptures that will justify us in regarding any one as regenerated who is still in his sins and under condemnation. When the work of regeneration is finished the "new man" must stand out before us, and we must be able to say of the sinner, "he was dead but is alive again." Hence I am inclined to the belief that regeneration includes all that God does for us in making us his children. If it does, then it includes more than the mere beginning of the work — more than the mere vitalizing of the affections. It includes also our deliverance from the wrath to come. The whole work is expressed in the following passages of Holy Writ: "I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts. * * * I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." (Jeremiah 31:33, 34.) If the former part of this work, only, were done for a man, he would be alive with respect to his heart, but he would be still dead in law; for until his sins are forgiven he remains bound over unto death. If the latter part, only, of this work were done for him, he would be still dead in his affections. But, thank God, these two works always go together. They are the internal and the external of regeneration. Where God creates in man a clean heart, and renews within him a right spirit, he also washes him thoroughly from his iniquity, and cleanseth him from his sin. Hence Jesus, in his conversation with Nicodemus, expresses the whole work by "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God;" while he expresses both parts of it by "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit."

Viewing the subject in this light, the work of regeneration is effected by two distinct efficient causes, the Holy Spirit and the blood of Christ. The former producing the internal, and the latter effecting the external; while the Holy Ghost sheds abroad the love of God in the heart, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin.

Cambridge, Mo., April, 1866.

Chapter V James P Boyce, D.D., LL.D.

By Ben M. Bogard, 1900

James Petigru Boyce was born in Charleston, S. C., January 11, 1827. His father was a wealthy banker and planter; said to be the richest man in South Carolina.

James P. Boyce was an exception to the rule that rich men's sons never amount to much. There have been very few sons of poor men who have become the equals of James P. Boyce. The rich man's boy, as a rule, turns out bad, but God elected otherwise in this case, and few men have labored so unselfishly for the good of mankind and the glory of God.

His earliest religious impressions were received under the preaching of that excellent and powerful preacher, Basil Manly, Sr., the father of Dr. Basil Manly, so long connected with the Seminary, and for a number of years President of Georgetown College, Ky. Dr. Boyce's father never made a public profession of faith in Christ and died out of the church. He was never fully reconciled to his son's becoming a preacher, looking upon it as throwing himself away.

Under the preaching of that wonderful preacher, Richard Fuller, Boyce was converted, and on the 22d of April, 1846, he was baptized and became a member of the church in Charleston, S. C. It means a great deal to a man to be brought under the influence of such a man as Richard Fuller at the very beginning of his religious life. It necessarily set before Boyce a high ideal and possibly inspired him with a lofty purpose. If we had more Fullers to preach we might have more Boyces converted.

He graduated at Brown University, September, 1847. Dr. Broadus, in his "Memoir of James P. Boyce," says: "It was a sad disappointment to Mr. Ker. Boyce when he found * * * that James was immovably resolved to be a minister. Besides a natural ambition that his son might become distinguished as a lawyer, and perhaps as a statesman — for both of which pursuits the father's insight discerned in him peculiar qualifications — he began already to hope * * * that James would be the man to take charge of his large estate and carry on his great business undertakings for the benefit of the whole family * * * it was hard for him to acquiesce in the youth's determination to 'throw away' all his practical powers and possibilities upon the work of a minister."

On the 14th of September, 1847, he was authorized by the church in Charleston to preach the Gospel "wherever God in his providence might call him." He married Miss Lizzie L. Ficklen, December 20, 1848, and he at once settled in his native town, Charleston.

For about one year he was editor of the Southern Baptist, and showed his ability in a number of excellent editorials. Dr. Broadus says of him: "For one so young, with little experience in preaching, and no regular study of theology, Mr. Boyce had done remarkably well as an editor. Had he thought proper to continue in this line of work, his great administrative talent, wide and eager reading, special interest in practical enterprises, * * * and rapidity of composition, would sooner or later have made his editorial life a marked success."

Dr. Boyce was a great theologian, and his work on Systematic Theology is one of the best books of its kind. An extract from this excellent work is published at the close of this sketch. His position on election and predestination is hyper-Calvinistic, and is somewhat extreme for a Baptist, yet no one will be willing to say that Dr. Boyce has not very ably defended that position, and, after all, how much difference is there

between hyper-Calvinism and plain Calvinism?

For five years Dr. Boyce was pastor at Columbia, S. C. This was during the years of 1851-1855. During this pastorate a good, substantial church house was built, largely with Boyce's money. There was a steady growth in the membership during his pastorate. While in this work he gave a great deal of attention to the religious welfare of the Negro slaves, and while all the North was agitated about the imaginary cruelty meted out to the black man of the South, such men as Broadus, Richard Fuller, Robert Ryland and Boyce were earnestly looking after the Negro's spiritual welfare. There were, no doubt, many evils connected with slavery, but the malicious misrepresentations found in Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin are slanders too vile for even a wretch such as the slave owner was represented to be. Let us rejoice that the Union of States was preserved and that people of all sections of our great Republic willingly rally around one flag, yet, in the behalf of such men as Boyce, we demand that misrepresentation cease.

In November, 1854, he was elected Moderator of the historic Charleston Association, and after that he was frequently called on to preside at denominational gatherings. He was on several occasions elected President of the Southern Baptist Convention. His ability as a presiding officer was exceptional.

His first work as teacher of theology was in Furman University. This position he held until he succeeded in establishing the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, which is a monument to his energy and zeal. For thirty years he bent every energy of his powerful life in establishing this great school and putting it on a solid basis.

Dr. Boyce undertook to establish a seminary for the reason, to use his own words, that "historians who have professed to write the history of the church have either utterly ignored the presence of those of our faith, or classed them among fanatics and heretics; or, if forced to acknowledge the prevalence of our principles and practice among the earliest churches, have adopted such false theories as to church power and the development and growth of the truth and principles of Scripture, that by all, save their most discerning readers, our pretentious to an early origin and a continuous existence have been rejected."

The foregoing language is found in his address on "Three Changes In Theological Institutions." If this language means anything it means that Boyce believed in the "continuous existence" of Baptists from Christ, and that for this reason a seminary should be established to train men to defend the Baptist position. This is the more clearly brought out in the next few sentences of this same great address. He further says: "The Baptists in the past have been entirely too indifferent to the position they thus occupy. They have depended too much on the known strength of their principles. * * * We owe a change to ourselves — as Christians, bound to show an adequate reason for the differences between us and others; as men of even moderate scholarship, that it may appear that we have not made the gross errors in philology and criticism which we must have made if we do not right; as the successors of a glorious spiritual ancestry, illustrated by heroic martyrdom, by profession of noble principles, by the maintenance of true doctrines; as a Church of Christ, which he has ever preserved as the witness for his truth, by which he has illustrated his wonderful ways, and shown that his promises are sure and steadfast."

His belief in the "continuous existence" of the Baptists from Christ to the present could not have been more unmistakably asserted. And this is one of the reasons why he wanted to establish a seminary, that men might be trained to defend that position. To this end he gave his noble life, and it would be enough to well-nigh cause the grand old man to turn over in his grave if he could know what efforts have been

made, by those in authority, to destroy the very idea for which he gave his life, and to so change the purpose of the seminary as to make it stand for the exact opposite of what he intended.

Dr. Boyce, in numerous private conversations, asserted that he got these ideas, which he gave in this remarkable address, from Pres. Francis Wayland, of Brown University. (See Broadus' Memoir of Boyce, p. 142.) If this is true it follows that he was not alone in his orthodox Baptist position.

It has been charged that there are some things in the Abstract of Principles of the Seminary which are not altogether in harmony with these ideas. While this has not been satisfactorily shown, yet, if it be granted to be true, it does not follow that Dr. Boyce did not hold these avowed positions, since Dr. Manly wrote this Abstract of Principles, and inasmuch as it was written at a time when all Baptists believed in the "continued existence" of Baptists from Christ, it may not be as guarded in its statements on this point as it might be.

While connected with the Seminary he was pastor at different times of small country churches, as was his illustrious colleague, John A. Broadus. Although great in mental power and rich in purse, he was not above preaching the Gospel to the poor.

During the civil war Dr. Boyce was a chaplain in the Confederate army and preached to the soldiers. He was opposed to the South's seceding, but when his State seceded he went with his State and cast his lot with the Confederacy. His experience in the army greatly helped his preaching, as he was forced to speak extempore when his habit had been to stick closely to his manuscript, which does not comport with the best preaching.

At one time he was offered \$10,000 per annum to accept the presidency of a South Carolina railroad; at another time he was offered the same amount to become president of a banking company. At any time he could have commanded a handsome salary at other employment, but he turned away from it all for Christ's sake. This is another answer to the slander that men go to preaching when they cannot succeed at anything else.

Dr. Boyce was opposed to alien immersion (immersion performed by others than Baptists), and had Dr. Williams removed from the chair of Church Government in the Seminary, and took the place himself, because Dr. Williams believed that Baptists might receive the immersions of other denominations as valid baptism. (Memoir, p. 226, by Broadus.) Besides this, he publicly opposed the reception of a candidate for membership in the Louisville Broadway Baptist Church, who wanted to come in on his alien immersion, and his opposition was sufficient to keep the person from being received, although the pastor, Dr. J. L. Burrows, favored the reception of the candidate. (See Memoir, p. 284, by Broadus.)

Dr. Boyce was a sound Baptist, a pillar of orthodoxy, and he has left his impress on thousands who came under his influence. He went to his reward from Pau, France, whence he had gone in search of health, December 28, 1888. His body awaits the resurrection in Cave Hill Cemetery, Louisville, Ky.

The Doctrine of Divine Decrees By James P. Boyce

[Extract from Boyce's Theology]

The doctrine of the decrees of God, or, as it is frequently called, predestination, is justly considered one of the most difficult of all the doctrines in which Christians believe. It involves some things hard to be understood, and the ignorant and unlearned have often wrested the doctrine to their own destruction. The difficulty of the doctrine and its dangers are, however, no good reason for refusing to study it. Least of all can any one afford, on this account, to refuse to accept it. The sole question with us is whether it is taught in the word of God. If so, it must be a part of our creed. For God would not have revealed it to us if he had not meant to have us receive it. In considering this doctrine we will first try to state plainly what the doctrine is. We will then present the Scripture proof for the view taken. We will then examine the objections, or theories, that are urged against the doctrine, and we will conclude our consideration with some practical suggestions concerning the manner of holding and teaching the doctrine.

The Doctrine Stated

The decrees of God may be defined as that purpose or plan by which eternally and within himself, God determines all things whatsoever that come to pass. Let us see now just what points are involved in this definition. God determines all things whatsoever that come to pass. Let us see now just what points are involved in this definition.

1. God's Purpose Or Plan. These decrees are defined to be God's purpose or plan. The term "decree" is liable to some misapprehension and objection, because it conveys the idea of an edict, or of some compulsory determination. "Purpose" has been suggested as a better word. "Plan" will sometimes be still more suitable. The mere use of these words will remove from many some of the difficulties or prejudices which make them unwilling to accept this doctrine. They perceive that in the creation, preservation and government of the world, God must have had a plan, and that that plan must have been just, wise and holy, tending both to his own glory and the happiness of his creatures. They recognize that a man who has no purpose or aim, especially in important matters, and who cannot, or does not, devise the means by which to carry out his purpose, is without wisdom and capacity, and unworthy of his nature. Consequently, they readily believe and admit that the more comprehensive, and, at the same time, the more definite is the plan of God, the more worthy is it of infinite wisdom. Indeed they are compelled to the conclusion that God cannot be what he is without forming such a purpose or plan.

2. Formed Eternally and Within Himself. Any such plan or purpose of God must have been formed eternally and within himself. **(1)** It must have been eternally purposed. For God's only mode of existence, as has been heretofore proved, is eternal, and therefore his thoughts and purpose and plan must be eternal. The fact also that his knowledge is infinite, and cannot be increased, forbids the forming of plans in time, which, as they become known to him, would add to that knowledge. It is also to be remembered that the plan must precede its execution, but as time began with that execution, the plan could not have been formed in time, and must be eternal. **(2.)** In like manner, also, was it formed within himself. He needed not to go without himself, either for the impulse which led to it, or the knowledge in which it was conceived. He had all knowledge, both of the actual and the possible, all wisdom as to the best end and means, all power to execute what he devised in the

use, or without the use, of appropriate secondary means, and free will to select, of all possible plans and means, whatever he himself should please; and the impulse which moved him existed alone in that knowledge and will.

3. Embraced All Things That Should Come To Pass. It is as the result of this plan, or purpose, that things come to pass. According to this doctrine of decrees, God assumes a certain responsibility for the universe. This, as we shall see, is the most difficult feature in the doctrine. Nevertheless we cannot hold to any real doctrine of decrees and deny this feature. We should, however, make a distinction at this point. When we say that God determines whatever comes to pass, we should distinguish between an efficacious determination and a permissive determination. Some of the things which come to pass are the outcome of an efficacious decree on the part of God, that is, they come to pass because God determined not only that they might come to pass, but that he himself would bring them to pass. As to these things God, in decreeing them,, took upon himself the responsibility of their coming to pass. There are other events, however, which may be truly said to have been in the decrees of God, and yet God repudiates responsibility for their ever coming to pass. His decree concerning these is a permissive decree. These things were in his plan or purpose as truly as the others. But the purpose as to these was a purpose to permit and not to effect. God did not simply foreknow these events. He actually made a place for them in his plan. In a true sense he intended them to occur. But he did not intend to bring them about. Such, for example, is the entrance of sin; such also are all sinful acts that have ever occurred.

This distinction between efficacious and permissive decrees may not be altogether satisfactory. It may be difficult for us to see how God could plan to take sin in and not be himself responsible. But some such distinction we are bound to hold. For it is clear that God has not taken all events into his plan in just the same way and with the same sort of purpose or decree.

In one or the other of these ways, however, God has decreed all things whatsoever that come to pass — not some things only, but all things; not all things in general, but each thing in particular. It is useless, we repeat, to try to evade this conclusion if we hold to any real doctrine of a plan, or purpose, on God's part concerning the universe which he has created. For so interwoven are the events of the universe that a lack of purpose as to any one event would involve a lack of purpose as to a multitude of others also — indeed as to every other event in any wise connected with the one not purposed. Events do not happen without sufficient cause or causes. If, therefore, a particular event is purposed, then the antecedent event or events which caused that particular event must have been purposed also. And if any particular event was not purposed, then the antecedent event or events that caused this particular event were not purposed either.

To such an extent is the force of this realized that it is admitted by all that in the mechanical universe, and even in the control of the lower animals, everything that comes to pass is purposed, or decreed. But the free agency of man, and of other rational and moral agents, is supposed to prevent God's purposing, or willing, all things with reference to them. It is said that such purposing would take away that free agency and consequent responsibility.

The Scriptures, however, recognize the sovereignty of God and his control of man, and also the free agency and accountability of man. Consciousness also assures us of the latter. The nature of God, as has just been shown, proves the former. The Bible makes no attempt to reconcile the two. Paul even declines to discuss the subject, saying, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. 9:20.) The

two facts are plainly revealed. They cannot be contradictory, they must be reconcilable. That we cannot point out the harmony between them is a proof only of our ignorance and limited capacity, and not that both are not true. It is certain, however, that whatever may be the influences which God exercises or permits to secure the fulfillment of his purposes, he always acts in accordance with the nature, and especially with the laws of mind that he has bestowed upon man. It is equally true that his action is in full accord with that justice and benevolence which are such essential attributes of God himself.

II. Proof that this Doctrine is True But for the fact that this doctrine seems to lead to certain consequences that are hard to explain or receive, it would very likely not have been called in question, or at least would not have been so violently opposed. The difficulties connected with it, however, and the opposition to it make it necessary to marshal with special clearness and force the proof in favor of it.

1. A Reasonable Doctrine. This is, first of all a reasonable doctrine in itself. If one can divest himself in his thought of the supposed hard conclusions that follow from the doctrine, he must see that it is reasonable. For if God is really the eternal, all-wise, omnipotent ruler of the universe, he assuredly has had a plan concerning his universe. If he is really omniscient he must have known everything that would come to pass. It is not possible that God could have been surprised by anything that has ever occurred. But if he foreknew that everything would come to pass, and did not in any wise interpose to prevent, then he must at least have purposed to permit those things to come to pass. And so there is absolutely no rational way by which anything can be thought of as not coming at least permissively under God's decrees.

[This rational view is greatly strengthened when we remember that God is not simply a spectator of the universe, foreknowing what will happen, but its actual ruler, and that he upholds all things by his power, and that absolutely nothing can happen independently of him. If everything that exists draws its existence and its support from God, and is able to act only by reason of the fact that God upholds it in its acting, how can it be that anything has ever come to pass without some kind of purpose on God's part concerning it?

The difficulty, from a rational point of view, is not in accepting the doctrine that everything that ever comes to pass has been always in God's plan. The real difficulty is to see how anything, even sin, has come to pass without God's having been responsible for it. This difficulty will be solved if we ever understand fully the nature of God's rational creatures and the element of freedom and responsibility which God has lodged in them. But meantime there is no difficulty, from a rational point of view, in holding that the plan, or purpose, of God includes all things whatsoever that come to pass. This seems to be the only reasonable conclusion.]

2. Sustained by the Scriptures. This doctrine is not only a reasonable doctrine, it has also the clear support of the Scriptures. This scriptural authority for the doctrine will appear from the following statements and references, gathered with slight modifications from Hodge's "Outlines," pp. 205-213: **(1)** God's decrees are eternal: Acts 15:18; Ephesians 1:4; 3:11; 1 Peter 1:20; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 2 Timothy 1:19; 1 Corinthians 2:7. **(2)** They are immutable: Psalm. 33:11; Isaiah 46:9. **(3)** They comprehend all events. a. The Scriptures assert this of the whole system in general embraced in the divine decrees: Daniel 4:34, 35; Acts 17:26; Ephesians 1:11. b. They affirm the same of fortuitous events: Proverbs 16:33; Matthew 10:29, 30. c. Also of the free actions of men; Ephesians 2:10, 11; Philippians 2:3. d. Even the wicked actions of men : Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; 13:29; 1 Peter 2:8; Jude 4; Revelation 17:17. As to the history of Joseph, compare Genesis 37:28 with Genesis

45:7, 8 and Genesis 50:20. See also Psalm 17:13, 14; Isa. 10:5, 15. **(4)** The decrees of God are not conditional: Psalm 33:11; Proverbs 19:21; Isaiah 14:24, 27; 46:10; Romans 9:11. **(5)** They are sovereign: Isaiah 40:13, 14; Daniel 4:35; Matthew 11:25, 26; Romans 9:11, 15-18; Ephesians 1:5, 11. **(6)** They include the means : Ephesians 1:4; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2. **(7)** They determine the free actions of men: Acts 4:27, 28; Ephesians 2:10. **(8)** God himself works in his people that faith and obedience which are called the conditions of salvation: Ephesians 2:8; Philippians 2:13; 2 Timothy 2:25. **(9)** The decree renders the event certain: Matthew 16:21; Luke 18:31-33; 24:46; Acts 2:23; 13:29; 1 Corinthians 11:19. **(10)** While God has decreed the free acts of men, the actors have been none the less responsible: Genesis 50:20; Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:27, 28.

III. Objections to the Doctrine

Owing to a belief that the purpose of God accomplishing his will in his rational creatures is inconsistent with their free agency, several classes of theologians have presented theories in opposition to the scriptural doctrine of decrees above set forth.

1. Theory of the Socinians. The most objectionable theory is that of the Socinians, who deny that God can know what a free agent will choose or do before he acts or wills. They maintain that the will is, at the moment of its choice, in such perfect equilibrium that there are no tendencies in any direction which prevent an absolute freedom of choice. No knowledge, therefore, of the will itself, nor of the circumstances which surround its action, will enable any one to say, before it is exercised, what will be its choice. Hence its act is entirely undetermined and undeterminable until the free agent wills. It cannot even be known beforehand by God himself.

The objections to this theory are obvious:

(1) It is based upon a wrong conception of the nature of free agency; for it supposes each act of the will to be an arbitrary choice. But such arbitrary choice is not found even in God. As regards man, we know, from consciousness and experience, that his will is influenced by motives. Indeed, so truly is it governed by the nature of the man, and the attendant influences, that even we can predict his will and action in many cases, and only fail to do so perfectly in all because of our limited knowledge. The omniscient God cannot fail to know everything that affects the decision, and therefore what the decision will be.

(2) This theory is also opposed to the independence of God. It supposes him to have made beings of such a nature that his own actions and will must depend upon theirs, and that he must await their decision, wherever it will have any influential bearings on anything future, before he can know or purpose what he himself will do.

(3) As is also manifest from what has been said under the first objection, this theory is opposed to the omniscience of God. It expressly puts a limitation upon that omniscience by declaring that he is limited in his knowledge, at least so far as not to know beforehand the decision of the will of his creatures. But ignorance of this would also involve ignorance of all things in the future with which it may be connected. This would, in a world inhabited by free agents, constitute no small part of all that will occur.

(4) It is opposed to the many instances mentioned in Scripture of the prediction beforehand by God of even the bad actions of certain men. See as to Pharaoh, Exodus 7:3, 4; Hazael, 2 Kings 7:13; Judas, Matthew 26:21; Peter, Matthew 26:34, etc.

2. Theory of some Arminians. Another theory has been advanced by some Arminians, who maintain that God does not know the free actions of men, not because he cannot know them, but because he chooses not to do so.

(1) The first objection to this theory is that, were it true, it would not give greater freedom to the will than does the orthodox statement.

Though this theory honors God more than the former, it is inferior to it with respect to the object for which it is introduced. If it could be true, as the first theory claims, that so indeterminate is the future will of a free agent that even God cannot know it, then that future will would certainly be entirely under the control of the free agent, and he would, to the utmost extreme, be free. His will would be in absolute equilibrium in the act of choosing. Neither would any motive exist to influence that choice. It would be thoroughly arbitrary, and so would not be a matter of God's decree at all.

But this second theory has not this advantage, for it does not suppose this condition of equilibrium. In claiming that God does not choose to know what he might know if he should so choose, it admits the certainty of the event. For the certainty of what will occur is as much fixed as it could be if actually known to God. For the supposition is that God could know it if he chose so to do. (And it is clear that even God is not able to know an event as something that will occur, if it were not certain that it will actually occur.)

We object to this theory then, first, on the ground that it has no advantage whatever over the orthodox theory. If it is said that the fact that God could know the event does not make God in any wise responsible for the event, it can be answered that, according to the orthodox theory of God's permissive decrees, God is fully as free from responsibility for the events which he only decrees to permit as he is, according to this theory, for the events which he is supposed to decree not to know. Moreover, this Arminian theory makes just as really a place for God's decree and influence in the free acts of his creatures as does the theory which we have shown to be the Scripture doctrine. For this Arminian theory does not try to rule out a free exercise of influence on God's part to bring about any result that he desires or purposes. And so man, under the divine influence, is left not a whit more free, according to this theory, than he is under the theory which we have shown to be the doctrine of the Scriptures.

(2) A second and chief objection to this theory is that it is based upon a wrong conception of the relation of the will of God to his nature. That will does not confer the attributes of his nature, nor does it control them, but is itself influenced by them. God knows all things, not because he wills to know them, but because, from his nature, he has infinite knowledge — knowledge of all things possible, and knowledge of all things certain. If by his will he could refrain from knowing, he would change his nature. As well speak of a man not choosing to see with his eyes open the objects presented to his sight, as of God not choosing to know anything, whether that is only something which is possible or something which in any way has been made certain.

3. Ordinary Arminian Theory. There is, besides the theories already referred to, the ordinary Arminian theory. This is that God knows all things that will come to pass, but does not decree all, but only some of them. The decisions of free agents are among those things which he is supposed not to decree. This theory aims to provide for the larger freedom of God's rational creatures. But —

1. A manifest objection to the theory is that it does not accord with the statements of the Bible. This has already been made clear by the passages of Scripture which

have been advanced in proof of the various points involved in the ordinary Calvinistic theory.

2. A second objection will be found in the fact that this theory does not thus secure that freedom from certainty in the decisions of free agents, which is the great reason for the objections to the decrees of God concerning them. For if God knows that any event will occur, and can prevent it and does not, it is evident that he purposes that it shall exist, and makes it a part of his plan. The event is as absolutely certain to occur (if God actually knows it as an event that "will come to pass") as it could possibly be under any purpose that God could have to bring it about. What God knows "will come to pass" is certain to come to pass. Otherwise he would know a thing as future which may not be future. His knowledge of it would be false. He would be himself deceived.

(3) A third objection to this theory is that it fails to accomplish another object for which it is introduced, namely, to secure such a relation of God to any free act of man as will take away all influence exerted upon that act by God's decree. We have seen that, so far as the permissive decree is concerned, the knowledge of the event does indeed render it certain that the event is going to happen. But it is only when the decree is effective, and introduces means for its accomplishment, that the free agency is affected. As to this case also, the Arminian theory is no whit better than that of the Calvinist.

The Arminian holds as firmly as does the Calvinist that God is sometimes directly active in his gracious influences upon men. Both hold that in all such gracious acts God is both merciful and just. Calvinists extend these gracious acts or influences no farther than do Arminians, for they deny as strenuously as others that God acts effectively to lead men to wicked decisions and deeds. So far as the nature of God's actions upon free agents is concerned, both parties agree. But the Arminian theory, in asserting foreknowledge without purpose, and in alleging that the foreknowledge is all that there is in God, is contrary to the relations of God's will to his knowledge, as well as to the statements of Scripture about the decrees of God; and while it leaves the event equally certain, supposes fully as much influence over the will of the creature and has equal difficulty in reconciling the free agency and consequential responsibility with the inevitable certainty of the event.

(4) Chief Objection. The chief objection to the doctrine of decrees arises from the existence of sin. According to that doctrine sin has not occurred accidentally, neither was it simply foreknown; it was a part of the plan and purpose of God that it should exist. But for this difficulty the doctrine would seem a most natural one. It is not likely that any one would object to a doctrine of decrees such as this if it applied only to heaven, or to a realm where there is absolutely no sin. But when it is said that the coming and the existence of sin were, in any sense, a part of the plan or purpose of God, then there is a disposition to shrink back and say it cannot be so.

The difficulty here is freely admitted. And in this respect the dispensation of God is surrounded with "clouds and darkness."

The following statements, however, may be made:

(1) That its being a part of the purpose or plan of God renders its presence no more difficult of explanation than that he should have foreknown its appearance, and not exerted his unquestioned power to prevent it. **(2)** That amid all the darkness we can yet see that God is so overruling sin as to cause it greatly to redound to his glory and the happiness of his creatures. **(3)** That even without any, explanation of it, we can rest in our knowledge of the justice, wisdom and goodness of, God. **(4)** That we

cannot see how its possible entrance into the world could have been prevented, consistently with the creation and putting upon probation of beings with moral natures, endowed with free will, and necessarily fallible because mere creatures.*

Chapter VI Major W. E. Penn

By Ben M. Bogard

Evangelist W. E. Penn, generally known as Major Penn, was born in Rutherford county, Tenn., August 11, 1832. His early life was spent with his parents on a farm, and he worked with the slaves in the fields until he was almost grown.

He was born again near the present town of Milan, Tenn., in 1847, at the age of fifteen years. The story of his conversion can be better told in his own words as follows:

"As he [the preacher] said these things I thought he was looking straight at me. This was the arrow that entered my heart and wrought in me the conviction that my condemnation was just and nothing could save me but the mercy of God. My heinous sins rose up and testified against me; they stood like mountains around me and left no way of escape; and then the sermons, prayers, tears and entreaties of friends and parents, and God's patience, long-suffering and tender mercies poured down upon me like melted lead. In agony of soul I wrestled with God until 2 o'clock in the morning, then I got to the point that I could do nothing myself but turn my case over to Him, bad as I was, and when I did this He saved me for His mercy's sake. Oh, what a change! My heart was filled with love, joy and peace; the light of the few tallow candles was all we had, but the place was as bright to me as the noonday sun. Only a few old brethren and sisters had remained with me, and their faces were lighted up as with the light of heaven. I had often made sport of them, laughed at their singing; but that night, as they rejoiced over me and sang:

'Tongue can never express

The sweet comfort and peace

Of a soul in its earliest love,'

I thought this was the sweetest music I ever heard. I often think that when I get to heaven, as I enter the pearly gates, I want to see Jesus first, and next to him those good old Christians who watched and prayed with me that night."

In October of the same year he was baptized into the fellowship of the Beachgrove Baptist church by Elder Griffin Wright.

The preacher who preached the sermon under which he was convicted was Eld. James Hurt, familiarly known as "Uncle Jimmie." He was an obscure backwoods preacher. What encouragement is this to brethren in the out-of-the-way places, working for nearly nothing, yet preaching the glorious gospel of the Son of God. We owe a debt of gratitude to that class of men which we shall never pay, but, like Paul, they "have fought a good fight * * * and there is laid up for them a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give them at that day." Many of them will receive a greater reward and stand higher in heaven than any of these great men whose history is given in this book.

Major Penn began life for himself by reading law with the law firm of Williams Wright, Lexington, Tenn. When in his twentieth year he opened a law office in Lexington and

began a career of successful practice. After his marriage to Miss Carrilla Sayle he became somewhat of a politician and identified himself with the Whig party, and he made a great many political speeches, and opposed the secession of Tennessee from the Union.

It is needless to say that Tennessee failed to follow his advice, but when the State seceded he went with his State and raised a company and was elected captain of it, and went into the Confederate army. After suffering imprisonment he was exchanged, and was raised by E. Kirby Smith to the rank of Major, which title he bore to his death.

After the war was over he moved to Jefferson, Texas, and again entered the practice of law. The war had ruined him financially and he went to Jefferson without a law book of any kind, and he had no money to buy any. He borrowed a copy of the Digest Laws of Texas and began work. In less than two weeks he was given a case that paid him \$400 in gold. From that time on, as long as he practiced law, he had a lucrative practice.

The Baptists in Jefferson were very weak, and only had preaching once a month. Bro. Penn and wife cast their lot with the little weak church, and he was soon elected Superintendent of the small Sunday-school. There were only thirty-five students in the school at that time, when Jefferson had a population of ten thousand. He threw himself into the work and the next Sunday there were seventy-five in the school, and in two months' time there were four hundred students — the largest school by far in Jefferson. What Major Penn did, he did with his might.

Professional and business men may learn a lesson here. To join a little, weak, unpopular church, and to engage actively in its work, will not hurt their business. Major Penn succeeded grandly, and yet he identified himself with the smallest and most unpopular church in town.

"While living in Jefferson he was pressed into the -work of the ministry. Dr. J. H. Stribbling, pastor of the church in Tyler, Texas, asked Bro. Penn to conduct a prayer meeting at nine o'clock one morning. There was such an interest manifest that he was prevailed on to remain in Tyler and conduct the meeting again that night. The interest was so great he could not get away, and he stayed and held a protracted meeting. Scores were converted and added to the church, and Major Penn had become an evangelist without intending it.

Within two weeks he was invited to Bryan, Texas, to hold another meeting; after that he went to Cal-Tert and then to Navasota; afterward to Anderson, then to Waco, and so on to the end of his life. He was never idle. He held meetings in country, town and city, in almost every Southern State, and besides that he spent several months in England and Scotland, where he met with good success.

Altogether there were about twenty thousand public professions of faith under his preaching. He strengthened the churches, held up the hands of pastors, denounced sin and warned the sinner. A fair sample of his style of preaching may be seen in the outline of a sermon on the "Divinity of Christ," which is published at the close of this sketch.

On Saturday, the 27th of April, 1895, he died. One thousand people attended his funeral, which was conducted May 1, 1895, at Eureka Springs, Ark., where he had moved some years before, and had built a beautiful and substantial stone residence, a picture of which may be seen on another page. Eld. W. P. Throgmorton, D. D., preached his funeral from the text: "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with

him." — Psalm 126:6.

Outline of Sermon on the Divinity of Christ By W. E. Penn

When compared with the subject we have before us to-day, all other subjects sink into utter insignificance. It is the one great subject upon which all future hopes depend — upon which all future happiness hangs. It is my purpose to so present this subject to-day that every man and woman who are really, truly skeptical, will be compelled, if honest, to admit that I have dealt fairly and honestly with the subject.

That a man called Jesus Christ — and sometimes, by way of reproach, Jesus of Nazareth — once lived upon the earth is an undisputed fact with all who place any reliance in history, either sacred or profane. The ground of dispute concerns divinity. Was He man? just such as we are, and no more? or was He what He claimed to be — what the Bible declares He was, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world? I assume the affirmative; that is, that He was and is just what He claimed to be — the Son of God, far more than man — though born of the Virgin Mary, and I propose to establish it in the mind (not in the heart) of every man who has not come into court with his verdict in his pocket.

In speaking of things that belong to this time, the most important to which we could refer would be a trial for life. When such a trial comes before the court, our wisest jurists and ablest law-makers have determined that, in order to give the accused a fair and impartial trial, a venire shall be summoned from the body of the county, and that each man so summoned shall be sworn, in the presence and hearing of the accused, that he will true answers make to all questions asked him by the court, or its authority, touching his qualifications as a juror in the case of the State, or Commonwealth, as the case may be, against A. B., the defendant.

Something like the following questions are asked: "Have you expressed or formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant? " If the man answers in the affirmative, a second question is asked, which is: "Is there fixed in your mind such a conclusion that the same could not be removed by the hearing of the evidence and the charge of the Court?" If he answers in the affirmative, he is turned aside as incompetent to do justice in the case. My hearers are the venire summoned for jurors in the trial of a case of far more importance to each man and woman before me than if they were on trial for their lives, because upon the decision of this case hangs the destiny of the soul for a never-ending eternity.

In testing your competency to sit as jurors in the case we have before us, I will not ask the first question; that is, "Have you formed or expressed an opinion as to the truth or falsity of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? " for it is but reasonable to suppose that all have done the one or the other, and perhaps both, but I deem it proper and right that I should ask the second question: "Is there formed in your mind, from prejudice or otherwise, such a conclusion that the same cannot be removed by logical reasoning and stern facts?" In other words, have any of you come into court with your verdict in your pocket? If any shall be compelled to answer in the affirmative, it must be admitted that such are incompetent jurors, and should be turned aside as wholly incapable of rendering a correct decision.

It is but candid to admit that every unbeliever's mind is more or less prejudiced, but it might be very profitable for each one to inquire as to the cause of this prejudice. First, I will say that it cannot be based upon the religion taught by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, because every honest man is bound to admit that if the whole world

would admit their teachings there never would be another crime committed, but that this would become the paradise of God. The only reply that skepticism can make to this is that man is wholly incapable of attaining to this high estate. In this reply they admit two great gospel truths, to-wit: Man's total depravity and his utter inability to extricate himself. There are two causes for real skepticism. I say real, because I believe that there are real skeptics, men and women, who are really honest.

A blind man put in the midst of a garden of the prettiest flowers that ever grew on the earth, may hear his wife and his mother praising them for their beauty and sweetness, and yet, as he walks among them, he is continually being pricked by the thorns hidden by the flowers, and much pain is all that he finds; and that man almost doubts the honesty of his own wife and his old mother. When the natural man who is spiritually blind walks into the beautiful garden of flowers — the Bible — he is continually pricked with the thorns — the great truths, which remind him that he is a sinner — that he is a lost soul — that he must repent of and give up all his sins, and in all these things he cannot see any beauty; but these thorns of truth continually prick him, until he is led to doubt whether his wife is honest, or his mother and his friends in their expressions of delight in the Word. The real skeptic is always a man of shallow thought on this subject, though of great mind generally, and thoughtful on other subjects. Being accustomed to rely on his natural wisdom in all earthly matters, and knowing no other source of wisdom, he is led astray in this matter. He overlooks that passage in the word of God which says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, because they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

He loses his soul in trying to reason his way to God.

Others become skeptical because of the samples of Christianity we too often furnish them to look at.

Infidel Hypocrites

Strange, but true, we have what I would call Infidel Hypocrites. They are men (sometimes women) who profess to be infidels, but they are not. Whenever you find a young man professing to be an infidel, you will find one who will never die of brain fever, but will be almost certain to die of the "big-head." You will never find one such with brains enough to attract the attention of any respectable fever. The little fellow is trying to impress some old man's girl that he has some sense — that he is "educated" — but the fact is that he could never get an appointment to a lightning-bug convention.

And if by any fraudulent device he could get such an appointment, the lightning-bugs would laugh themselves to death at his little light. The committee on credentials would swear that he was a gnat, and that his little light was fox-fire, and he would be sent home. If he ever gets married the woman he gets will wish that she had married a gnat in less than a week, for she could kill the gnat and not be charged with murder, but if any woman should kill such a fellow in any of the States where murder is defined to be "The killing of any reasonable creature in being," I am of the opinion that she could make a good strong fight on the point that the thing she killed was not a reasonable creature in being, but only a two-legged creature in being.

Another class of so-called infidels is represented by the fellow who manages to get credit in the North and East, and goes up there and buys a large stock of goods, wares and merchandise — all on credit — and brings them down to this country and sells them out and gets the money and puts it in his wife's pocket, and then goes into a bankrupt court, or some other court, and swears that he has been swindled

out of all he had, or that it was burned up in the house (which he set on fire), and then he makes a settlement with his creditors, and it is not long until he is in business in the name of his wife, or some other person; and so, when the big meetings come along, he feels his sins so much and a good deal more than any one else, except the coldblooded murderers, but knowing that a just God cannot forgive his sins unless he will pay back his ill-gotten money — the money he stole — and not being willing to do that — he must give some reason for at least not trying to become a Christian, and so he looks as wise as an owl and says, "I'm an infidel." Poor fellows try to hide under an infidel umbrella, which is made of a very thin article of mosquito-bar goods.

Honest Skeptics

It is to this class I will now address what I have to say. In attempting to establish the divinity of Christ the custom has been to ASSUME that the Bible is of divine origin, and then to turn to its pages for proof of the position. But the honest skeptic says: "This is taking an unfair advantage of me; if I admit that the Bible is what it professes, to be — that it is worthy of credit — I will then have admitted all that could be required of me, and as the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, I would be a fool to deny his divinity." And he further says: "I deny the divinity of the Bible; I deny the credibility of your witness." I propose to use the Bible in discussing this subject, but I propose to establish its divinity before I put it on the stand as a witness.

I will present the subject in the nature of a bill in Chancery. I file the bill for, and represent the complainants — those who are contending and claiming that Jesus Christ is what he professes to be — against all who deny his divinity as respondents.

The only way to handle any subject fairly and honestly is to begin at the bottom; and so I will begin at the very bottom of this.

My first proposition is that there is more or less uncertainty as to the authorship of every book on earth, the book called the Bible alone excepted. To state the proposition in another way : The Bible is the only book on earth the authorship of which can be ascertained and determined by reading its contents.

First

It must be admitted that this book was made by some intelligent being, or beings, at some time, or times, in the past of the world's history.

Secondly

It must be admitted that it was not made by any lower order of intelligence than man.

It must be admitted that there is no higher order of intelligence known in the world than man. Here we find that we are irresistibly FORCED to the conclusion that this wonderful book called the Bible was

Made by Man or by some higher order of intelligence than man, of which we know nothing at all outside of the Bible, except what we learn from the great Book of Nature around us. My next proposition is that it is wholly

Impossible for Man, or Men, to have been the Authors of the Bible

If I make this point then my case is gained, for I will have established the divinity of the Bible, and have made it a competent witness, entitled to full credit for all that it says, whether you or I understand it or not. If men made this book we call the Bible,

they must have been of a much higher order of intelligence than any now living, or who have lived in the past 1800 years, because no one has been found able to fathom its depths or to scale its heights. If such an order of intelligence ever existed among men, is it not passing strange and most unaccountable that they never made

Their Mark or Left their Impress upon anything else, except to make and hand down 'to their posterity this wonderful book — the Bible? Is it not the strangest thing beneath the sun that these great men — the authors of the Bible — never left any other evidence of any kind whatever of their superior intelligence, their great learning, their wonderful vision, except in making and handing down to their posterity this, the most wonderful of all books now upon the whole earth? It must be admitted that nothing short of a very intelligent being, or beings, could have been the author, or authors, of the Bible, and that an intelligent being, or beings, would have had some very important end in view — would have had reasonable ground for believing that they would be remunerated, compensated in some way, for this immense labor in thus making or handing down to their posterity such a book as we find the Bible to be? Let us go back to the age, or ages, in which the Bible must have been written, if we place any confidence in history, either sacred or profane. The art of printing not yet being known in the world, it could not have been to get gain by its sale, because they could not have written them fast enough; and because they would have been so unpopular there would have been no demand for them.

It could not have been to get unto themselves a great name at the expense of bringing everlasting infamy and disgrace upon themselves and their posterity, because it is recorded in the Bible that all men are conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity — that all men go forth from infancy speaking lies — that none doeth good, no not one — that all have gone astray, that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked — that the thoughts of the heart are evil, and that continually — that the tongue is set on fire of hell — that man is of his father, the devil — that he is filled with all unrighteousness, and many other Scriptures on the same line teach that man is a cesspool of iniquity, and all of which applies to and includes ALL MEN, which must of necessity include the author, or authors, of the Bible — if man be its author. It is impossible to believe that any man or men could have written thus about themselves, and their children, and their children's children, without a very fair prospect of great gain in some way; and as I have shown that it was utterly impossible for them to have even expected any remuneration whatever, it is impossible that man could have been the author of the Bible.

Good or Bad

If men were the authors of the Bible, they must have been either good or bad men. They could not have been good men, because good men could not have originated and palmed off on the credulity of their own children and their children's children, without any hope of being benefited thereby, such a miserable fraud as the Bible must be if man be its author. They could not have been bad men, because bad men — men of such wicked and depraved hearts as all men are declared to be in their natural state, in the book called the Bible — never could have conceived of such pure and exalted principles of morals as we find laid down and taught in the Bible — so pure, upright and holy that no man can be found in all the earth who can live up to, keep and observe, in letter and spirit. A bad tree cannot bear good fruit. Here the most skeptical, if not under a fatal delusion, must ground their arms, must make a complete surrender, and make the honest confession that it is wholly impossible for man to have been the author of the Bible.

If man was the author of the Bible, it must be admitted that it is the basest fraud

upon the whole earth, and it must be also admitted that this stupendous fraud — this fountain source of lies, this cesspool of iniquity has remained uncovered — has baffled the skill and ingenuity of thousands of the wisest men that have lived in the past 1800 years, because no man has ever professed to understand it.

Is the Religion of Christ of Man or of Good?

It cannot be of man, because it is not within the range of possibility that any institution or organization of man could have passed under the dark clouds — could have crossed the stormy seas — could have crossed the rivers of blood — could have withstood the unceasing war of its millions of enemies, among whom have been many of the most learned men in all the professions and avocations of the last 1800 years, and far more than this, could have survived the seemingly internal divisions and strife, often ending in some of the most cruel and bloody wars; and, even more than this, could have survived the miserable conduct of the hosts of traitors — black-hearted HYPOCRITES — the religion of Jesus Christ has always had within her camps, from Judas Iscariot down to the present time. Could that time-honored institution — Free Masonry — have withstood one-hundredth part as much and still have maintained its existence? Every honest man must answer with an emphatic "NO, NO; Free Masonry would be a stench in the nostrils of a thief." But in the face of all these things combined, and many others I could mention, destroying, exterminating from existence this religion, or even lowering its standard of excellency, or in any manner marring its purity, it has come out from it all without the smell of any or all of these terrible hot fires upon its garments; and to-day it presents a smoother surface than at any age of its existence, and is the pride and admiration of the entire civilized world — the few skeptics alone excepted — and even they do not wish to see the Bible destroyed. Gamaliel, one of the shrewdest men who lived in the Apostolic times — and who was an unbeliever, a skeptic — said: "If this religion be of man it will come to naught;" and now, if Gamaliel could come to life, he certainly would say: "This religion cannot be of man, because it has stood for over 1800 years the severest tests that anything on earth ever written has stood, and has a firmer hold on mankind than it has ever had." Yes, it is a fact that the glorious principles of this religion are falling upon the minds and hearts of the heathen nations of the earth like the small rain upon the mown grass. To-day her blood-stained banner is unfurled in every land beneath the sun. The religion of Jesus Christ cannot be of man, because, in the hour of death, all man's institutions have been renounced as insufficient to give peace, solace and comfort in that trying moment; but not one professor of the religion of Jesus Christ was ever known, to renounce it upon a deathbed; and this is the more worthy of note since it is a fact that this religion has, had within its camps many of the weakest minds, and that many of them have endured the severest tests, such as being tortured in stocks, being sawn asunder, and burned at the stake, etc.

My last witness is that peculiar people, scattered among all the nations and tribes of the earth, called Israelites, or Jews. They once lived together as other nations — had their civil, laws and all the paraphernalia of government as other people, but something over two thousand years ago they were overpowered by the Gentiles — their land was taken from them — the walls of their beautiful Jerusalem was beaten down, and they were led away captive and scattered among the nations and tribes of the earth, and so have they remained until this day.

During all these long years of captivity, long and weary years of exile from their fatherland — years to uncalled-for abuse and bitter persecution, even to the shedding of the blood of their wives, mothers, old men and little children, they have strictly maintained their nationality, and the same form of worship observed by their

fathers over three thousand years ago. No nation or tribe that has ever existed upon the earth can furnish a history like unto the Jews. None so remarkable, so wonderful, so very mysterious. Without the Bible the history of the Jews presents a problem, a mystery, that no human wisdom can solve. The intelligent mind knows that there must be a reason — that there must be a cause for the Jews being, for more than 1800 years, in this scattered condition, and yet maintaining their nationality and their religion intact. Other nations have been broken up and scattered over the earth, and some have become extinct; the Jews alone are the same, whether under their king in their own land, living in their gilded palaces, or homeless wanderers among the nations and tribes of the earth — hated, despised, and often persecuted even unto death. Can the wisdom of this world,

Unaided by the Bible account for these things? Where would human reason begin? Would you attempt to account for it because of the ignorance of the Jews? You would utterly fail, because, if all the Jews were gathered together from all the nations and tribes of the earth, and colonized upon some of the islands of the sea, you would see the most intelligent nation of all the earth. If you will bring me one Jew or Jewess who cannot read or write, I will bring you five that can speak five different languages.

Poverty

Would you say that it was because of their poverty?

When you colonize them let them carry with them just what belongs to them, and you will have the wealthiest nation in the world.

Outside of the lids of the Bible these things must be and remain a profound mystery until the death-knell of time shall be sounded. **A Bill of Discovery**

In the Chancery Court, when the opposite party are in possession of documentary evidence, or of facts that cannot be obtained from any other source, the party desiring the information, or evidence, may file what is called a Bill of Discovery, representing that the other party are in possession of the documents, or facts, and that they cannot be had from any other source, and ask that they may be required to bring them into court, to be used in the trial of the case. I here file a Bill of Discovery, and ask that the Jews, who are a portion of the respondents, come into court and bring with them the Old Testament. My request is granted and I obtain an interlocutory order, or decree, and the Jews come into court and bring the Old Testament; and now let me read a little from it and see if we cannot have the mystery explained.

If in this old book we find that a correct history of the Jews was written over four thousand years ago; that is, that God caused a man, or that a man four thousand years ago did write a correct history of the Jews for four thousand years to come, will not every honest man be compelled to admit that the Old Bible is not of man alone, because it would be impossible for a man to look through the dark vale of the future for four thousand years and tell with perfect accuracy what should occur with a nation of people during this time? If we shall find that it is true that a correct history of the Jews was foretold 4000 years ago, and that it is recorded in the Bible — the Old Testament — will you not, as an honest man, admit that the Old Testament is of divine origin,

That it is of God?

And if you are compelled to admit that the Old Testament is of God, you are bound to admit that the New Testament is of God, and if you admit that the New Testament

is of God, you are bound to admit that

Jesus Christ is the Son of God, just as He is represented in both the Old and New Testaments. Moses said, over three thousand years ago, of and concerning the Jews: "Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field; cursed shalt thou be in thy basket, and thy store; cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land; cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee until He shall have consumed thee from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And thou shalt grope at noonday as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways. And thou shalt be only oppressed, and spoiled ever more, and no man shall save thee. And thou shalt become an astonishment — a proverb, and a by-word among all the nations whither the Lord shall lead thee; and the Lord shall scatter thee among all people from one end of the earth, even to the other, and among these nations shalt thou find no ease — neither shall the soul of thy foot find rest, but the Lord shall give thee these, a trembling heart, a failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind; and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear, day and night, and shall have none assurance of thy life. In the morning thou shalt say, would God it were even, and in the evening thou shalt say, would God it were morning." This being written by Moses, we know that it was written before the children of Israel — the Jews about whom Moses was speaking — had entered the promised land. How could Moses have known the history, the destiny of this people, when it all lay deep hidden in the womb of time? Every intelligent being is bound to admit that nothing short of the mighty God could have known these things, and that He must have communicated them to Moses. Now, if in searching this Old Testament, we shall find that not only has the history of the Jews been foretold with perfect accuracy, but that we have the birth, life and death of Jesus Christ foretold with equal accuracy — all the prominent things connected with Him, and all foretold by men of God — the Prophets from 487 to 400 years before His birth, what will you then say of His divinity?

Hear What the Prophets Say

One of them tells us, 4000 years before his birth, that He would be born; 1921 years, the nation, tribe and family He would descend from; 1689, the time when he would be born; 1452, the place he would be born; 698, that he would be worshiped by the wise men; 606, that there would be a massacre at Bethlehem; 740, that he would be carried into Egypt; 713, that He would be known by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him — that he would work miracles — that He would cast the buyers and sellers out of the temple; 712, that He would be hated and persecuted; 1000, that the Gentiles and Jews would conspire to destroy Him; 518, that He would ride triumphantly into Jerusalem; 487, that He would be sold for thirty pieces of silver; 1000. that He would be betrayed by one of His own familiar friends; 485, that His disciples would forsake Him; 1000, that He would be accused by false witnesses; 712, that He would not plead upon His trial; 1000, that He would be buffeted, insulted and spit upon; 700, that He would be scourged; 1000, that He would be crucified; that they would offer Him gall and vinegar to drink; that they would part His garments, and cast lots for His vesture; that He would be mocked by His enemies; 487, that His hands, feet and sides would be pierced; 700, that He would be patient under His sufferings; 1000, that He would pray for His enemies; 713, that He would die with malefactors; 500, that there would be an earthquake, and remarkable darkness at His death; 700, that He would be buried with the rich; 780, that He would arise from the dead; 1000 that His betrayer would die suddenly and miserably.

Born of A Virgin

By three different Prophets — by one 4000 years before His birth; by one 712, and by another 606, it was foretold that He should be born of a virgin. Now, add to all this the prophesy of Jesus about the Jews. Just before His crucifixion He said: "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Now, is it not a fact that within less than forty years after he said this that the prophesy was fulfilled to the letter? Is it not a fact that they have been thus scattered among the nations and tribes of the earth for more than 1800 years, and that they are so scattered at this moment? These are stubborn facts, which no intelligent man or woman will attempt to deny, and, being beyond refutation, will establish the divinity of Christ beyond the shadow of a doubt, for no mortal man could write the future history of a nation of people, with perfect exactness and precision, for more than 1800 years. Leaving all other points I have established, this alone establishes the fact that Christ is all that he claimed to be, THE SON OF GOD, THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD.

Second Coming

Christ has told us that the Jews would remain in this scattered condition until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, at which time they shall be gathered to the land God gave them, and He shall come and reign over them. "He whose right it is to reign" shall come in clouds and great glory. Then shall every eye behold him, and they also who pierced Him, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son.

Chapter VII Elder Joseph B. Moody, D.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

J. B. Moody was born June 24, 1838, in Clarksville, Va. His early life was spent in Virginia and Kentucky. He was educated at Bethel College, Russellville, Ky., and entered the ministry September 17, 1876. Thus it will be seen that he was thirty-eight years of age when he began preaching, but he has developed into one of the strongest men, and is one of the greatest preachers and ablest debaters that has ever lived. He is indeed a pillar of orthodoxy.

He has been a successful pastor and evangelist. He has been pastor of Pewee Valley, LaGrange, Owenton, Paducah and other churches in Kentucky, and of Trezevant, Martin and some smaller churches in Tennessee. He was supply for the Central church, Memphis, for six months. He also served churches in Hot Springs, Ark., San Antonio, Texas, and Tampa, Florida. He is now again serving the church at Hot Springs, Ark. These churches have prospered under his ministry, being built up in the faith and strengthened for the discharge of duty.

His strong denunciation of sin has often caused the churches to withdraw from the disorderly. His manner of preaching is such that it is well-nigh impossible for ease-loving sinners to remain long under his preaching without either being converted or driven away. His preaching is direct, doctrinal, pointed and practical.

Dr. Moody's evangelistic work has been noted for its thoroughness. The immediate results have never been great, but his work is always solid. There have been numerous conversions in his meetings, but the immediate results have been less than what would be seen in the months and years following.

He assisted Eld. R. W. Mahan in a protracted meeting at Liberty church, Graves county, Ky., and preached for two weeks without there being a single convert. The preachers and the church were very much disappointed and discouraged. However, Bro. Mahan relates that for eight years thereafter there were frequent conversions as the result of Moody's preaching. Bro. Mahan thinks it was the best meeting ever held in that church. Yet there were no visible immediate results. For eight years there were people converted who dated their conviction for sin back to Moody's meeting. Was it a failure? It was a fulfilling of the Lord's promise that his word should not return unto him void. That meeting was an extreme illustration of the general character of his work. Eternity alone shall reveal the real life work of J. B. Moody.

As a debater Dr. Moody has few equals. He has met in public debate Guilford Jones, Methodist; Bedinger, Presbyterian; Drs. Brents, Briney, J. A. Harding, D. Lipscomb, J. S. Sweeney, S. Lucas and Morgan Morgans, Campbellites. His last debate with Mr. Harding has been published in a book of about six hundred pages. There are very few men who would now willingly meet J. B. Moody in debate. His logic is invincible and he is perfectly at home in the Scriptures.

He has written several books which have reached a large circulation. Notably his little book on "The Name Christian," which has reached a circulation of twenty-five thousand. For four years he was co-editor of the Baptist Gleaner with J. N. Hall. For three years he was co-editor with J. R. Graves, of The Baptist, Memphis, Tenn., and for a short time he was associate with E. E. Folk on the Baptist and Reflector, of Nashville, Tenn. He has been one of the directors of the Baptist Book Concern, of Louisville, Ky. His books and newspaper articles are always read because of the clear and strong presentation of whatever subject he may be discussing. A characteristic

essay of his is published at the close of this sketch on the "Conditions of Receiving the Holy Spirit for Service."

He is now sixty-one years old, but he is growing stronger as a preacher and writer as he grows older. He is good for at least fifteen years effective service yet. Such a man as he never grows old in mind. His body may decay, but his mind will continue to renew its youth and grow stronger with the years.

Bethel College, Russellville, Ky., did itself the-honor of conferring on him the title of Doctor of Divinity, June, 1892.

He has "in all things showed himself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed." Titus 2:7-8.

Conditions of Receiving the Holy Spirit for Service By J. B. Moody, D. D.

I will use the term condition, in its primary sense, as denoting the states of mind and heart in which we receive the Holy Spirit, rather than works to be performed by which we procure the Holy Spirit. Like the Son, the Holy Spirit is himself a gift, and all the qualifications he bestows are also gifts; and, more, they are free gifts, not bought with money, nor the merit of human performances. True, he is promised to them that ask, but asking is not the condition. He is not given because we ask, or in consideration of the asking, for our part of the asking is nothing if not characterized by spiritual qualities beyond our capacity. Asking must be the expression of those states of mind and heart which are well pleasing to God, and which we will now consider. Of ourselves we can't ask for the Holy Spirit or anything else "as we ought." For a solution of this mystery we appeal to the New Covenant, by which God purposes to prepare a people for his service by cleansing them from sin; by giving them new hearts and right spirits; by giving them the indwelling Holy Spirit so as to cause them to walk in his statutes and keep his ordinances, which becomes our reasonable service. Thus, a people is prepared of God, "zealous of good works." The mission of these children of God is like that of their Elder Brother — "to do the will of God." "Resisting," "quenching" and "grieving" the Holy Spirit do not properly belong to my subject, as the first is before, and the others after, receiving the Holy Spirit for service. Then, first, a condition of receiving the Holy Spirit for service is not simply a desire for service, but a desire that the service shall be according to the will of God. In other words, a desire "to do the will of God from the heart." For this purpose the Holy Spirit was sent, and for this he must be sought. By him the Bible was inspired; by him we are regenerated and illuminated, and all to secure our obedience, or service to God. There is no direction of the Holy Spirit when our service conflicts with the Bible. Any spirit that supplants, suppresses or suspends the precepts of God's word is an unholy spirit. Consciousness directed by the Holy Spirit never substitutes, but always substantiates the word of God. Our subject is loaded with error on these points. To see the importance of desire to do the will of God from the heart, look for a moment how the world is evil affected by the zeal of a misdirected service — "a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge." Being ignorant of God's right ways, and maybe seeking the help of the Holy Spirit, they go about to establish their own supposed right ways, and will not submit to the right ways of God. The Bible says much of such misdirected service of God. "Not to every one that says, Lord, Lord, or that prophesies in his name or in his name casts out devils, and in his name does many wonderful works; not every one who knocks, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us;

not those who say, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered or athirst, or a stranger or naked, or sick or in prison, and did not minister to thee; not all who seek to enter shall be able; not all who call shall be heard, or who seek shall find; not those who serve by casting motes out of their brother's eye while there is a beam in their own; not those who, with a good conscience, persecute the church of God, verily believing they are doing God's service; not all who teach the holy law, and contend with Godly zeal for its righteous requirements; not all who have kept these commandments from their youth up; not those who teach for doctrines the commandments of men; not those who seek to profit themselves or to please men; not those of whom all men speak well; not all who speak with tongues of men and angels, and who have the gifts of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have all faith so they can remove mountains; not every one who bestows all his goods to feed the poor and then gives his body to be burned; not these, nor those like them, of which there are many classes, but only those who possess the internal preparation provided in the New Covenant, and who seek to perform the duties enjoined by the New Covenant. Christ limits it thus: "But to those who do the will of my Father who is in heaven." Paul's capitulation when apprehended was in these words: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He afterward wrote: "Be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is."

The Holy Spirit knows the divine mind and purposes concerning us, and he will work in us "both to will and to do of God's good pleasure," which is our service. But if we prefer to walk in our own ways and after our own devices it is vain to seek the Holy Spirit for such service. When seeking the Holy Spirit for service we must not presume to act as his counselor to give him understanding. He has no infirmities for us to help. We neither know what to pray for as we ought, nor what to work for as we ought. He must help us in both the matter and manner of both prayers and performances. To illustrate this error. There is danger in our churches seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit in calling a pastor; that they seek only his help in securing the man of their own choice. True, they must call one of their choice, but if their choice is not the fruit of the Holy Spirit, his help in securing him as pastor is no correction of the mistake. If every member should seek the Holy Spirit in the matter of his individual choice, then the ballot, if sincerely committed to the Lord, would express the Lord's choice, and this would be the work of the Holy Spirit. Every church should prefer a pastor after God's heart and of God's choosing, and the ballot was ordained to do that very thing. If balloting for a pastor is not serving the Lord, then what is? The Lord knows what is lacking in every field, and who will best supply it. He never will send a man to please men by speaking smooth things, and to cry peace, peace, when there should be no peace, though that is the popular demand. He will never send one to apologize for popular sins, whether the transgression of the law of Moses or the commandments of Christ, though that is the popular demand. He will never send one under whose ministry any class of sinners as such can find comfort, nor one of whom all will speak well, though that is the popular demand. Those who take this service into their own hands may seem to succeed and have a name to live like the Laodicean church, rich and wanting nothing, while they are spiritually dead. They may build, and build, and build, but may be building on the sand for the flood, and building of wood, hay and stubble for the fire. They seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit in doing their will and their way, and are willing for the Lord to have his will and his way, provided it agrees with their own. There is danger of deceiving ourselves and others in this matter.

God does not submit his will to us for our examination and approval before we adopt it. His will needs none of our examination and approval. We are not to accept it on our judgment of it, but on the divine right to rule. Paul surrendered to it first and

then inquired what it was.

This prepares the way to a deeper insight in the consideration of the second important condition of receiving the Holy Spirit for service, namely, that we not only desire the will of the Lord in the service, but that we recognize the sovereignty of that will. Sovereign in choosing the servants, the service and the gifts for that service. A sovereignty uninfluenced by us, and, if need be, contrary to us. There is so much more in this than at first appears that we must be at some pains to develop it, for this lays the ax at the root of all our failures of both seeking and serving. He set the member in both the natural and spiritual bodies "as it pleased him," "dividing to every one severally as he will." Our service should be rendered "according as he hath dealt to every one the measure." "Having then gifts differing according to the grace of God." I do not say like some that there is no free and sovereign grace, but I do say there is no other kind of grace. Hence even these superlative adjectives are superfluous unless used to enlighten the ignorant; and for such, if such there be, I say that this diversity of gifts is according to the free and sovereign grace of God. It is this that gives contentment and pleasure and glorying in our part of the service. He calls unto him whom he will, and sends them where he will, and to do what he will; all such walk by the Spirit. We may desire the best office, and covet the best gifts, but we must be content with the service assigned us, and diligently use the gifts bestowed for that service. If we have the gift of prophecy we should not despise prophesying, but prophesy, and not covet tongues or other gifts sovereignly bestowed upon other chosen vessels of mercy. Or he that has the gifts for the office of a deacon let him exercise them in deaconizing, or he that teacheth in teaching, or he that exhorteth in exhortation, or he that giveth in simplicity or he that leadeth in diligence; and he that showeth mercy in cheerfulness, "to every one his own work;" yet we are laboring together with God, so that the most important members should not think the feeble are unnecessary, but give the more abundant honor to those who seem to lack.

The apostles found out by experiment, experience and inspiration that "it was not right for them to leave the word of God and serve tables." So others filled with the Holy Spirit were chosen for that particular work. The work of these two offices having been made thus distinct, the Holy Spirit will not guide a preacher in the work of a deacon, nor the deacon, as such, in the work of the ministry. This is spoken of official work, but the same principle holds good in every department of labor. Every one must do his own work, using his own gift, which was sovereignly assigned, and therein to be content.

And here comes the test, the fiery trial that is to try us, the cross to be daily taken up, the crucifying with Christ, the dying daily, the offering of ourselves as living sacrifices, holy, acceptable unto God, which is reasonable service. Let us not be deceived about this sovereign will of God. We are willing for the will of God to be done, and perhaps are willing to do it, but are we willing that that will shall be sovereign? The antithesis, "Not my will,, but thine be done," is not a play upon words. If it taxed or overtaxed the pleasurable will of Christ for God's purposing will to be done in his case, then how can our pleasurable wills escape when in contact with the sovereign will of God's purpose concerning us? Is it too much to say at least of beginners in service that "thy will" always means "not my will?" Oh, his ways are not our ways, nor his thoughts ours. Hence the language, Deny thyself, deny thyself, and take up thy cross daily and follow me. It may devolve on one to forsake father and mother, another to forsake wife and children, another brothers and sisters, another houses and lands, another to lay down his own life, another all these and all else. If this or that be the will of Christ we must do it or we can't be his disciples; not

that he is contrary to us, but that we are contrary to him. So the Holy Spirit must lead us out of ourselves, cost what it may, or we are not fit for service. Our flesh and our former conduct in it utterly unfit us for the service of God. Now hold, while the knife of sacrifice cuts deeper, so as to take out the very roots of the evil that hinder acceptable service. We are not to forsake all that we have, that may be in our way, as a sort of exchange for something better. The something better may be allowed as an inducement and an encouragement, but it must be effectually cut out of the motive of our doing. We are not to serve for the loaves and fishes. When the apostles left their boats and nets, they never considered for one moment the question of loss and gain. Indeed, Christ keeping nothing back, said to them after they had left all to follow him: "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; they will deliver you up to the councils, and will scourge you in their synagogues, and ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. When they persecute you in one city, flee to another. What I tell you in darkness speak ye in the light, and what ye hear in the ear preach ye upon the housetops, and fear not them who can kill the body. Think not I am come to send peace on the earth, but a sword; and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." Does it not seem from this, and especially from what we will further note, that "thy will" means "not my will," or the Spirit wars against the flesh; our wills would have ordained the praise of men and the friendship of the world, and would have turned Godliness into gain, as we see abundantly verified around and about us. It seems now that those follow Christ best who please men most and please most men. When Paul said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" he surrendered his will, and the answer shows that the will of Paul was slain. The Lord's will could not possibly have been Paul's will, except by adoption, and the adoption cost him "the loss of all things." "To bear the name of Jesus of Nazareth," full of contempt, "far hence unto the Gentiles" "and to kings," "and to suffer great things for his name's sake," amounted in a very important sense to the crucifixion of Paul with the Lord. "Not my will, but thine be done." The whole life service in which he was called was an unspeakable cross, that could not have been borne except by sovereign, recreating, sustaining power, working in him, both to will and to do of God's good pleasure. Those four fiery commands contained in that "heavenly call" were uttered, not after Paul had done some great thing as the performance of a condition to procure the Holy Spirit for a service of his own choosing, but was after he had given utterance to that state of mind and heart which recognized his sovereign Lord, who had sovereignly chosen him for a service that was according to the purposes of his sovereign grace. Listen! Look! "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Who can say it? If we can say it like Paul said it, every jot and tittle of it, and mean it, then the filling of the Holy Spirit for service is nigh at hand.

The offering of Isaac was a work of faith. It seemed both immoral and irrational. It was God's will, not Abraham's. Abraham could not have boasted of the binding, the altar, the knife or the sacrificing act. Why should God command a man to do that which the man desires to do? The very word command bespeaks coercion of some kind. God never coerces against the will, yet he exercises a holy coercion of the will.

Galatians 2:8 contains Paul's statement of the mystery of this mighty inworking power, this recreating grace: "For he that wrought effectually in Peter the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles." The power that wrought in Peter and Paul, and must work in us if we are ever fitted for any great service, must be mighty to be effectual. It will help us in Paul's case to look a little at Peter's case. I can't decide which had the greater cross in serving, Peter going to the circumcision or Paul to the uncircumcision. Peter was a castaway from the house of Israel, like Moses from Pharaoh's house, and to go to such a people, recognized as the seed of Abraham, "to whom pertained the adoption and

the glory of the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the promises, and the inheritance," and unto whose covenant Gentiles must be grafted before they could partake of the promises; to go to these recognized chosen people of God, "who had the advantage much every way," chiefly in that, at that time, they had the only oracles of God, and of whom Christ said: "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;" whose zeal for God's word would lead them to "compass land and sea to make one proselyte;" who made long prayers and oft repeated them, and who loved to pray, and who paid "tithes of mint and annise and cummin;" who made clean the outside of the cup platter; whose outward righteousness appeared indeed beautiful to man; who built the tombs of the prophets and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous, and who condemned the killing of the prophets by their fathers; to go to such people, profuse in their oblations and prayers and sacrifices for sins, and tell them as he would a Gentile dog to repent, and trust upon the name of Jesus of Nazareth for the remission of sins; the one, "the Holy One, whom they had betrayed, and wicked hands had crucified and slain;" knowing, too, that in that service he would be hated and persecuted and beaten in their synagogues, and tried before kings and governors; such a service, to such a people, with such experience, known beforehand — what was it but another example of saying, "Not my will, but thine be done," and shows also in Peter that condition of mind and heart which we are here considering, viz: an entire surrender of our will and our way and our all to him who deigns to call us into his service? It was this that secured the filling of the Holy Spirit for the great service to which Peter was chosen.

Paul says that the same power that wrought effectually in Peter to the circumcision was mighty in him toward the Gentiles. Colossians 2:29 says: "Whereunto I labor, striving according to his workings in me mightily." It was Paul's submission to the sovereign will of his Lord that was accompanied and followed by that inworking power that uprooted his will and "brought every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

In further confirmation that the great service into •which the Holy Spirit will lead us is necessarily a cross-bearing service, to which our hearts and minds must yield consent, let us consider briefly the examples recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said: "They were filled with the Holy Spirit." I fear that many who think they desire to be filled "with the Holy Spirit are seeking happiness rather than service, rest rather than labor, pleasure and not pain, and if such knew before what service and experience they would be called into, that they would decline to be filled by the Holy Spirit. Some having cultivated their emotions to excess, are claiming to be filled with the Holy Spirit because they feel good, and make void the word of God by their traditions, and boldly set aside the commandments of Christ by their whimsical notions and their capricious and conflicting consciousness. All such are condemned by the light of the following cases, which contained nothing of the goody, goody experience, the compromising policy nor any of the characteristics of our modern boastful cases. How faithful to truth and principle are the words and actions as recorded in these genuine New Testament cases of Holy Spirit infilling. Read the faithful words of Peter in Acts 2:22-24: and 36-38, with Acts 3:15-19. Such fidelity to his orders brought him a night's lodging in jail. But the next day being brought to trial, Peter, "filled with the Holy Spirit," uttered the courageous words recorded in Acts 4:9-12. This speech resulted in being "straitly threatened," "commanded" and "further threatened," but the reply was: "We must serve God rather than man." We learn from this that when the service of God provokes opposition, antagonism, contention, disputation and strife, that we should wax strong and quit us like men; that we should put on the whole armor of God, that we may be able to stand and to

withstand, and having done all to stand. When filled with the Holy Spirit we will pray as they did for boldness to speak as we ought to speak, the very words that brought them to prison and to chains. I deprecate the puerile and pernicious sentiment modernly entertained, that when one is filled with the Holy Spirit he will be guided clear of all contentions and strife; that the world will fall in love with him, and the devil will make peace with him. But being filled with the Holy Spirit makes one God-like, or Christlike, and as sure as the world hates God and his Christ so sure will those filled with the Holy Spirit suffer persecution.

Let me say by way of parenthesis that in apostolic time, when contentions were most furious, conversions were most numerous; "howbeit many believed, and the number of men were about five thousand," was written as the result of the preachers' being in jail. But the contentions were for principles, not persons.

When these threatened and imprisoned servants found their courage failing, they reported their troubles to their own company. Then they all, with one accord, prayed for boldness to speak the forbidden word. "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they all spake the [forbidden] word of God with boldness." Note, again, how men and women act when filled with the Holy Spirit. Not doing their own will, but the will of him that sent him. In further rebuke of modern idiocy on this subject, let me say that these men, like their master, who had the Spirit without measure, uniformly, purposely chose controverted truths, knowing that thereby they would provoke opposition. But what is opposition but opportunity for fidelity and Christian manhood? Are not temptations for our resistance, and difficulties for our development, and contentions for our courage, and strife for our strength, and persecution for our happiness? Can there be victory without battle, success without opposition, or life without death? The curse is for the fearful and to "those who draw back," and the promise is for the "overcomer," but what is our generation of Christians overcoming but their conviction of truth and duty? A man filled with the Holy Spirit would act like Peter, and James, and John, and Stephen, and Paul, and not one of these knows how to apologize to the opposers of truth, or to capitulate for a peaceful compromise.

Following these recorded cases further, we find in Acts 5:17 that the opponents of the apostles were "filled with indignation," resulting in another imprisonment. But the Lord sent his angel to open the prison door and say: "Go, stand in the temple, and speak to the people all the words of this life." They were arrested again and reminded of their orders and strictures; but the answer again was: "We ought to obey God rather than men." For this they were beaten and threatened again, but, "daily in the temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach" the things forbidden by men.

In the 6th chapter of Acts we have Stephen "filled with the Holy Spirit," and "wisdom," and "faith," and "power," and "grace," and thus endued and endowed he disputed with the libertines and Syrenians and Alexandrians, and them of Silicia and Asia; and these not being able to "resist the wisdom and spirit which he spoke," got furiously mad and resorted to meanness and mendacity and violence, but the great debater's face shown like the face of an angel. The spirit and manner of Stephen is clearly seen in the last ten verses of chapter seven, where he lost his life as the result of the strife. Being filled with the Holy Spirit he boldly delivered his message, leaving results with God. And so would we do now if filled with the Holy Spirit, and strife and loss of life are no evidence to the contrary.

In chapter 9:17-22 we find Saul of Tarsus "filled with the Holy Spirit," and "straightway in the synagogue he preached that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

If one should do such a thing in a synagogue in these days, knowing, as Saul did, that it would give offense and stir up strife, who would say that he was filled with the Holy Spirit? Yet that is exactly what one would do if so filled. When the strife came, instead of apologizing, "Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews, proving that Jesus is the very Christ." "Then they took counsel to kill him, but he was let down the wall in a basket."

These things were written for our example. We are sent to convert everybody to Christ, and then every convert to "all things whatsoever he has commanded." So reads the commission of all whom Christ sends. Better brook opposition than make peace, and compromise and lose all. Paul assaulted in season and out of season, and rarely if ever made a failure. With every disputation and strife it is recorded that some or many believed, some of the priests, some of the chief women, and of others not a few. If all Baptist preachers were filled with the Holy Spirit, they would be filled with the spirit of Christ and of the apostles, and prophets, and martyrs, and these all had the spirit of contention, and they strove for the faith of the gospel. This would soon turn the world upside down. I insist, and assert, that men can do thus now and be Christian gentlemen, as the apostles and martyrs were. To be always and everywhere contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints is not porcupinish, nor discourteous, nor austere, nor ungentlemanly, nor any of those mean, ugly things ascribed to such by this generation. Paul was a Christian gentleman, yet he gave place by subjection, no not for an hour, not even to those recognized as pillars in the church, nor to Peter, nor to those without, whether priests, princes or potentates. In nothing was he terrified by his adversaries, but fought a good fight, warred a good warfare, kept the faith, all of it, the least as well as the greatest of Christ's commandments. If we were thus permeated and panoplied and perfected, how long would it take to turn the wrongness of the world upside down and its rottenness inside out? But we are too afraid of contention. If the archangel disputed with the devil about the body of Moses, ought we not to contend for the living oracles of God? What are we but children playing in the market places, saying to the opponents of Christ's commandments: "We have piped unto you and ye have not danced?" Are we not tickling a generation of vipers with straws? Afraid of contention! of strife! of the face of man and the shadow of some! We invert and pervert the right ways of the Lord when we try to be first peaceable and then pure. It is an impracticable and impossible policy. The question that confronts every Baptist in every age is, Shall we have peace and error, or strife and truth? Truth is exotic, and must conquer every inch of its territory, but "tares are sowed while men sleep." All the evil that confronts us now, whether within or without, must be met and overcome. The victory would redound to God's glory, even though we should lawfully strive unto blood. God is glorified always and everywhere, and his cause advanced by overcoming evil with good, not goody. But the evil must be overcome and supplanted with good. When wolves entered in not sparing the flock, Paul did not salt them, for salt is for sheep; but he slew them with the sharp two-edged sword of truth. True, the world was looking on, but they saw men true and tried contending for the right against the inside as well as the outside. What a cleaning up and cleaning out there would be if we were all filled with the Holy Spirit. Indeed, short work and effectual would be made of it. We would see that 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 was written for instruction.

But the last recorded example we shall notice is Acts 13:9-11, where Paul was withstood by Elymas, who sought to turn the deputy from the faith. But Paul, being filled with the Holy Spirit, set his eyes on him and said: "O, full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" Filled with the Holy Spirit and talk that way?

Yes.

We are allowing the cause to suffer by mistaken notions of the effect and fruits of the Holy Spirit's filling. There are times to be sweet, and times to get sweet and keep sweet, but this is the time to be men. The Holy Spirit chooses men, and qualifies them for the service of soldiers, good soldiers, to war a good warfare, and to fight a good fight, and this does not mean to fight the air. Somebody is presupposed to be on the other side. Are we not sorely in need of men out of whom martyrs could be made? These goody, sweet sentiments become children and sweethearts, but they are unmanning our men by emasculating their manhood, so that some pulpits are calling for feminine men, and some for masculine women. These things ought not so to be.

Now, in conclusion. Who is willing and ready with the conditions of mind and heart now considered, first, do we desire to do the will of the Lord from the heart? And, second, do we desire to do the will of the Lord from the heart, when that will is sovereign, even antagonistic, in everything to our own will, so that nothing we have is ours, not even our wills, but every desire, and thought, and purpose, and aim shall be his, brought into subjection to him, at all times and in all things, so that, "through floods and flames, if Jesus leads, we'll follow where he goes;" so that, though bonds and imprisonment await us, we care not; come weal, come woe, come life, come death, we are his and his forever, keeping back nothing, but offering ourselves wholly for his service, and that service to be sovereignly assigned us?

Who is ready with these two conditions? Verily, he shall be accepted, and prepared, and used by the Holy Spirit in the service of Christ. When all shall have done this, then the kingdoms of this world shall soon become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and his will will be done on earth, even as it is in heaven. For which let us continue to work and pray as our Lord instructed us, never forgetting that it is no prayer at all unless we include ourselves in doing that will on earth as angels do it in heaven. If it becomes us to pray thus, it becomes us to do thus. It was none of self and all of thee when we sought the Lord; let it be so when we serve the Lord. But all of self and none of thee, or some of self and some of thee, or less of self and more of thee, does not fulfill the conditions. It must be none of self and all of thee.

Now a word to encourage this sacrifice of self. If God can best rule the world sovereignly, that is without taking counsel with men, cannot he better rule our individual lives thus? And if to use us he must undo us and outdo us, so mote[sic] it be. Jesus said: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." His application of this is in the next verse. "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." "If any man serve me let him follow me, and him will my Father honor." John 12:24-26. This law of life, out of death in nature, is projected into the kingdom of grace. Service comes with sacrifice. The wood of the forest is for the service of man, but it must be sacrificed. Man must do unto it as he will or it is fit for neither lumber nor fuel. Even fruit-bearing is the sacrificial service of the wood, and the fruit is no service till sacrificed. Coal is for service, but the service comes out of the sacrifice. Out of its reduction to ashes comes the heat, and out of the sacrifice of oil comes light, and out of the sacrifice of animal flesh comes human life. Even the burden-bearing animals render a sacrificial service. If vegetable life rises to the higher order of animal life it must be sacrificed. If flowers are useful it is because they are missionary in sending out their fragrance for the service of man. It is a poor service without sacrifice.

The values of different products, and different qualities of the same product, are

reckoned from sacrifice. "16 to 1," the relative values of gold and silver, refer to the amount of sacrifice required in their production.

The same principle holds in the service that man renders to God. If Abraham was to be the father of the faithful, and the friend of God, he must leave his country and his kin and go into a country that he knew not of, and there dwell in tents, and be driven by famine into Egypt, and there for a time lose his wife. But since against hope he believed in hope, he was permitted to come forth with great substance. And being not weak in faith, and considering his own body dead, and the deadness of Sarah's womb, he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but judging him faithful who had promised, in due time Isaac was born. And now, if in Isaac the seed is to be called, let Isaac be offered in sacrifice on the altar.

The greatest man from Adam to Christ was he who refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the down-trodden people of God. The man who did more for the world than perhaps all the generations of men from Adam to Christ was the man who sacrificed the pleasures of sin in a king's house and esteemed the reproach of Christ greater than the riches of Egypt. "By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king, for he endured as seeing him who is invisible."

If the apostles would receive an hundredfold in this life, and in the age to come, thrones and crowns of honor, let them forsake all they have for Christ. The man who has done and is doing more for the world than perhaps all men from Christ till now, was the man who was "more abundant in labors, in stripes, in imprisonments, in deaths, in journeyings, in perils, in weariness, in painfulness, in watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings, in cold and nakedness, and in the care of all the churches." The man who profited more than his equals in the Jewish religion, and who had more to glory of in the flesh than any of the boasters, blameless righteousness in the law, must count the things that were gained him loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless he counted all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord, for when he suffered the loss of all things, and counted them but dung, it was that he might win Christ. When the searchlight of eternity shall fall on the pages of history so as to bring to light all hidden things, then will we be surprised, not at the abundant fruits of Paul's labors, but the surpassing abundance over and above all we had ever known or thought.

The woman who has done more to encourage and stimulate beneficence in the cause of Christ than all others was the woman who cast in the two mites, which was all her living, into the treasury of the Lord. What would Christ be to us or to the world if he had not died — if he had not sacrificed himself? And what can we be to Christ if we do not die to the world and to self — die daily a living sacrifice, willing, holy and acceptable unto God? Let us yield ourselves with these conditions of mind and heart, and God fill us with his Holy Spirit for service, and what a service that would be.

I believe that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is past, but I believe we may and ought to be filled with the Holy Spirit. We no longer need tongues and miracles and signs to confirm the word and to credit the divine mission of Christ and the church, but we do need the comfort and help of the Spirit. We all ought to live in the Spirit and to walk by the Spirit, and to be filled with the Spirit. How barren is our preaching and how fruitless our labor. Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, preached one sermon, and three thousand of the saved were added to the church, and again five thousand men besides women. But now, with all our natural and educational advantages, it sometimes takes three thousand sermons to add one soul to the church. Without the Spirit we can add many of the unsaved to the church to the great detriment of the

individual and the church and the cause. It is this class that do not sacrifice to serve God. If the weather is good and the preacher flowery and funny and the fashions are to be displayed, on Easter or a May day, they go; they go, not for sacrifice, but for show. But if there is to be a sacrifice, if the weather is to be brooked, if money is to be paid, if prayers are to be offered, if principle is to be maintained, if danger is to be encountered, if there is to be sacrifice, they all with one consent begin to make excuse. Some sacrifice nothing, some sacrifice little, some sacrifice more, but who, oh who, is willing to sacrifice self and all else for him who sacrificed all for us?

Let us lay all on the altar of sacrifice. He may not in every case require it. He may say, as in the case of Isaac, It is enough, and return it. But if he accept it all, so much the better for us. As we sow in this field, which is the world, so will we gather in the world to come. Seed sowed is seed sacrificed. If we sow sparingly we shall reap sparingly, if we sow (sacrifice) bountifully we shall also reap bountifully. No sacrifice, no reward, and sacrifice, the measure of reward, is written in the blood of the lamb. The silly saint who seeks to shun sacrifice is a self-destroyer. The spiritual inscription on every altar is: "Give and it shall be given unto you. Good measure, heaped up, pressed down, shaken together and running over shall be given into your bosoms," and the payments are promised both in this life and also in the life to come. "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service," and thus "prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

Chapter VIII Elder T. T. EATON, D.D., LL.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

T. T. Eaton was born in Murfreesboro, Tenn., Nov. 16, 1845. His father, Joseph H. Eaton, LL.D., was a preacher and educator, and was, for a time, pastor in Murfreesboro, Tenn., and President of Union University, and it is to him that the honor of founding the University is due.

T. T. Eaton was educated in Union University, and afterward studied at Madison University, New York, and at Washington College, Lexington, Virginia. He is a ripe scholar, and is one of the very few men to whom Dr. John A. Broadus went for advice.

He has been pastor at Lebanon, Chattanooga and Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Petersburg, Virginia, and for nineteen years he has been pastor of Walnut-street church, Louisville, Ky. His success in Louisville has been extraordinary.

During his present pastorate not less than fifteen hundred have been given letters by Walnut-street church, to go into the organization of other churches. Seven hundred were granted letters in one day to go into the organization of the Twenty-second and Walnut-street church, Louisville. This church, located eighteen blocks away, on the same street as the mother church, has grown into a great church, with perhaps the largest congregation of any church in the city. The Third-avenue and McFerran Memorial churches went out from Walnut-street, and are now strong churches of several hundred members. Other new churches have drawn heavily on the Walnut-street membership. Notwithstanding this enormous decrease in membership, and

notwithstanding the fact that there were less than seven hundred members when the present pastorate began, there are now seventeen hundred members. A little study of these figures will give some idea of the great work which has been done at Walnut-street.

The great work accomplished in this church is another proof of the value of long pastorates. No man, who is capable of efficient service, can accomplish much in two or three years.

For five years Dr. Eaton taught in Union University (1867-1872). For the work of teaching he is eminently fitted, but it would have been a pity for such a life to have been spent in the school room. His work as teacher, however, enabled him to become a finished scholar, and that has greatly helped him in meeting the polite heresies which he has had to fight in recent years.

Dr. Eaton is a ready, rapid speaker. He drives right at the point, and can make a speech in five minutes when it would take another man a half hour to say the same thing. He has been known to arise in the associations and conventions which he frequently attends, and make a telling speech before the Moderator could declare him out of order. Having said what he wanted to say it didn't matter if he did have to sit down.

He is a strong, pungent writer. He has written several books, such as "The Angels," "Talks on Getting Married," "Talks to Children," "Faith of the Baptists," "Conscience in Missions," etc. He has been editor of the Western Recorder for twelve years. This is one of the greatest Baptist papers in the world, and its influence is felt throughout all the Southern States, and it is a paper that must be reckoned with in any denominational movement. Dr. Eaton has given the paper its strength.

Since the death of J. R. Graves there has been no abler defender of orthodoxy. It was to Dr. Eaton that all the South looked for defense when Whitsittism had unsettled everything. It was Dr. Eaton more than any other man who forced Wm. H. Whitsitt to resign his position in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. It is true that such men as J. T. Christian, J. S. Coleman, J. N. Hall and others contributed largely to the great controversy. S. H. Ford, the historian and scholar, also wrote strong, forceful articles on Whitsitt's vagaries, but it was Dr. Eaton that Dr. Whitsitt feared, and it was he that waged the war that resulted in victory for the orthodox Baptists of the South. Thank God, he is yet a young man (54 years old), and is probably good for twenty-five years of service, and orthodoxy may be sure of a pillar while he lives.

Dr. Eaton is a popular lecturer of no mean reputation. He has delivered lectures on such topics as "Poor Kin," "Women As They Are," "Egotism," "Ideals," "Study of the Classics," "Observations Abroad," etc. Large audiences greet him wherever he goes.

He has traveled extensively in America, Europe, Asia and Africa. His quick eye saw things for itself, and his observations, which he has published in the Western Recorder, and which he gives in his lecture on "Observations Abroad," are not such as are copied from guide books, as the weary public is so often afflicted with, but bright, fresh, original descriptions of what he saw for himself.

He received the title of D. D., from the Washington and Lee University in 1878, and that of LL.D. from Southwestern Baptist University in 1880.

A specimen of his writing is given at the close of this sketch. It is perhaps the best short presentation of the subject of Baptism that has ever been published. We also publish an editorial from the Western Recorder in defense of the Philadelphia

Confession of Faith.

What is Baptism? By T. T. Eaton

Baptists affirm that New Testament baptism is the immersion in water in the name of the Trinity of a believer on a profession of his faith by one duly set apart by a church for such service. Other denominations, while admitting this to be baptism, hold that sprinkling or pouring water upon a person is also valid baptism. But since all admit that the immersion is right, and many insist that sprinkling and pouring are wrong, why cannot all agree to take the immersion? Why be willing to be doubtful when you can be certain? Baptists are not trying to force on others a baptism they repudiate; but others are trying to force on us a baptism we repudiate, and often we are roundly denounced as "narrow" and "bigoted" for objecting to this. We simply ask other denominations to practice what they themselves admit to be valid baptism. This does not involve any surrender of conscience on their part; while for us to accept sprinkling and pouring would require a surrender of our consciences. Let no one say, therefore, that, at least so far as the matter of baptism is concerned, Baptists stand in the way of Christian union.

What is the proper act of baptism is to be determined by an appeal to Scripture. We must of course appeal to that part of the Bible which discusses the subject, and hence we come to the New Testament, since the Old Testament has nothing whatever to say on the subject. Passages of the Old Testament have, however, been cited in the baptismal controversy, one of which we mention. Isaiah 3. 14, 15: "As many were astonished at thee; (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men:) so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider." It is claimed that this sprinkling is a prophecy of baptism, which is to be by sprinkling. Now I admit that if it had been proved that sprinkling was baptism then it might be argued with some plausibility that there was a prophecy of baptism in Old Testament passages which speak of sprinkling; but certainly this cannot be urged as proof that sprinkling is baptism. But the contention vanishes into thinnest air when the passage is studied, and it is seen that the word sprinkle is a mistranslation, marring the sense of the language. It should be astonish or startle, and it is so translated in the margin of the Revised Version. The Hebrew word (nazah) is rendered in this, passage by Gesenius: "So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself; " by Davies: "So shall he startle (or surprise) many nations." These two Hebrew lexicographers give as the first meanings of the word (Davies), "to bound, to spring, of liquid to spurt, Hiph. to cause to leap for strong feeling, to make to start," and this passage in Isaiah is then cited. (Gesenius), "to leap for joy, to exult, to spring. The primary idea is that of sparkling, flying out . . . Hiph. to cause to leap for joy, to cause to exult, to make to rejoice," and then follows the translation above given of this passage. The Septuagint version (made by seventy learned Jews in the time of the Ptolemies and used in Palestine in the time of Christ, translates nazah by the Greek thaumazo, rendering the passage "houto thaumasontai ethne polla ep' auto." "So shall many nations be astonished at him." And this becomes even plainer when we examine the passage in English, "As many were astonished at thee, (his visage was so marred more than any man and his form more than the sons of men " — an astonishing thing — "so shall he astonish many nations: the kings shall shut their mouths at him," — in wonder — "for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider." Thus the passage is made clear and

intelligible, while by using the word "sprinkle" the meaning is obscured.

But the Old Testament has nothing whatever to say on the subject of baptism, and so we come to the New. Baptism began with John the Baptist, who was sent by God to preach and to baptize. We read, Mark i. 4, 5, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Now the act performed by John is expressed in the word Anglicized into baptize, the Greek verb baptizo. Let us see what this word means in this passage. It is an admitted principle of language that the meaning of a word may be substituted for the word in a sentence without at all changing the sense. Let us apply this principle here. There are three English words claimed as translations of baptizo in this passage, viz., sprinkle, pour, and immerse. Let us substitute each of these in the passage and note the results. "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all sprinkled of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." How could a man sprinkle people in a river? He might throw them in or drive them in, but the only way he could sprinkle them in would be first to reduce them to a liquid or powder. We see that sprinkle in this passage does not make sense, and therefore it is not admissible to translate baptizo by sprinkle here. Try pour. "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all poured of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." This is no better. John could not have poured the people in the river without first reducing them to a powder or a liquid. To talk about pouring people in a river is nonsense. And since the sense of the passage is destroyed by the use of the word pour, it is manifest that baptizo does not here mean pour.

Now try immerse. "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all immersed of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." This certainly makes sense. Preachers do often immerse people in a river. I have done it many times myself. Therefore as between the three translations, sprinkle, pour and immerse, in this passage, immerse alone can be taken, because it, alone of the three, makes sense.

When men wish to determine the meaning of a word in any language they first turn to standard lexicons of that language and see what definitions are given, and these are applied to the passages in question. I might give the translations of any number of lexicons, but two will suffice; and since neither of these was prepared by a Baptist, neither can be suspected of any partiality for Baptist views. The standard Greek lexicon at all universities and colleges among English-speaking people is Liddell and Scott's, seventh edition. This lexicon gives the meaning of baptizo as simply "to dip in or under water." It gives as a secondary meaning, "to draw wine by dipping." There is no hint of sprinkling or pouring. At the University of Virginia, at Harvard, at Yale, at Cornell, at Princeton, at Vanderbilt, etc., etc., Liddell and Scott is the standard Greek lexicon. Would it not be a marvel if Messrs. Liddell and Scott were ignorant of the meaning of baptizo? The other lexicon I mention is Prof. Thayer's, based on Grimm's Wilke's German work. This lexicon is the standard in all the theological seminaries of all the denominations and is a lexicon of the Greek used in the New Testament. This gives as meanings of baptism "to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge." A secondary meaning is given, "to cleanse by dipping or submerging," etc., and also, "to overwhelm." But this lexicon gives the following comment under this word: "In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterward by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the nature and contents of their religion (see

baptism) viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of Messiah's kingdom." To the baptism (of which baptism is the Anglicized form), this lexicon gives only two meanings, "immersion, submersion," and under this word defines Christian baptism: as, "according to the view of the apostles, a rite of sacred immersion, commanded by Christ."

Now if baptizo, the word chosen by the Holy Spirit to describe the act of baptism, has any such meanings as sprinkle and pour, is it not passing strange that these standard lexicographers never heard of it? They are not Baptists, and cannot be charged with any partiality for Baptist ideas; and we have seen what they say. Can it be they are mistaken? Could anything have deceived them in this matter? Why are their lexicons used as standards by scholars of all denominations? Either these lexicographers were ignorant of the meaning of baptizo, or else John the Baptist immersed the people of Judea in the river of Jordan, and our Lord was immersed. What Jesus Himself did for baptism He certainly meant for His disciples to do when He commanded them to be baptized; for else He preached one thing and practiced another. It is blasphemy to say that the preaching and practice of Christ were different.

The references to baptism in the New Testament all fit the idea of immersion, and do not fit the notions of sprinkling and pouring. In Mark vii.4, the word rendered "wash" is baptizo, and the meaning is plain. Mark, writing primarily for the Romans, stops to explain the absurd lengths to which the Pharisees carried their cleansings. "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash nipsontai their hands diligently," — the Greek is, with the fist — "eat not, holding the tradition of the elders: and when they come from the market-place, except they wash baptisontai themselves, they eat not: and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, washings baptismous of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels." vv. 3 and 4. Now there would have been no point in Mark's stopping to explain that the Pharisees went to the great length of sprinkling or pouring water upon themselves on returning from market, when they while at home washed diligently, or "with the fist," before eating. That they would go to the length of immersing themselves on returning from market, where Gentiles had touched them, was a remarkable thing and worth explaining to the Romans, who did not know the customs of the Pharisees and strict Jews. Meyer, in loco, says: "In this case ean me baprisontai is not to be understood of washing the hands, but of immersion, which the word in classic Greek and in the New Testament everywhere denotes, i. e., in this case, according to the context to take a bath. Having come from market, where they may have contracted pollution through contact with the crowd, they eat not, without having first bathed." Italics his.

As for the immersing of "cups, and pots, and brazen vessels," that was simply carrying out the ceremonial law, given in Leviticus xi. 32: "And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherewith any work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; then shall it be clean." The cups and pots were of wood, and these with the brazen vessels were to be immersed for cleansing, when they became ceremonially unclean, while earthen vessels were to be broken. The word rendered "tables" in the common version klinon does not belong to the true text and the revisers have very properly omitted it.

It is an interesting and significant fact that in after years, copyists, not understanding the customs of the Pharisees, came to this passage, and thought the word baptizo must be a mistake, since it seemed out of the question that Pharisees

should actually immerse themselves when they come from market. So these copyists ventured to strike out baptizo and insert hrantizo, which means to sprinkle. They never suspected baptizo could mean sprinkle or pour, or they would not have made the substitution.

It is written in John iii.23, "And John also was baptizing in AEnon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized." It is said that the "much water" here consisted of many springs, needed for camping purposes by the multitudes who followed John; but had this been true the passage would have read that "they were encamped in AEnon near to Salim, because there was much water there;" but when, it is stated, "John was baptizing in AEnon near to Salim, because there was much water there," it is evident that the much water was needed for the baptizing.

Turning to Acts i. 5, we find a figurative use of baptizo: "For John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." I note in passing that instead of "with water" and "with the Holy Ghost" in this and all other passages, where these expressions follow "baptize" in the New Testament, the translation should be "in water" and "in the Holy Ghost." The Greek is en, and is the word from which the English in is derived and of which in is the translation. The Revised Version puts in in the margin, and the American revisers went on record as preferring to make the text read "in water" and "in the Holy Ghost" in all these passages. The British revisers did not deny that this was the right meaning, but being more conservative than the Americans, they hesitated to make the correction. That the meaning is "in water" and "in the Holy Ghost" is not denied, so far as I know, by any leading scholar. And, besides, those who practice immersion, immerse with water, using no other element.

But this prophecy of Jesus was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost when "suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii. 2-4. Here the Spirit filled the house where they were sitting and filled them, and this is spoken of figuratively as a baptism, and very appropriately so. Peter in his sermon, however, referred to this gift of the Spirit as a fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts ii. 17), and it is argued that baptism is therefore a pouring. The argument clearly stated is:

The gift of the Spirit at Pentecost is called a baptism.

The same thing is called a pouring.

Therefore pouring is baptism. The absurdity of this argument is clearly seen the moment we apply it to other things, for example:

Christ is called in Scripture a rock.

Christ is called in Scripture a vine.

Therefore a vine is a rock.

or:

Christ is called a lamb.

Christ is called a lion.

Therefore a lion is a lamb.

or:

Christians are called sheep.

Christians are called vine branches.

Therefore vine branches are sheep.

Speaking of the coming down of the Holy Spirit from above, Joel calls it pouring; while speaking of the result on the people — filling the house and filling them — Jesus calls it a baptism. It was the Holy Spirit which was "poured," while it was the people who were "baptized."

The act of baptism is described in Acts viii. 36-39: "And as they went on the way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch saith, Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip; and the eunuch saw him no more, for he went on his way rejoicing." The 37th verse, not belonging to the true text, is very properly omitted in the Revised Version. The description of the baptism, however, could hardly be more complete. Reader, just read over that passage again carefully and ask yourself, what was it Philip did to that eunuch? That was done in the right way. Unless you went down into the water, were then baptized, and came up out of the water, your baptism was not of the New Testament kind. I know it used to be said that where Philip baptized the eunuch was a dry region without water enough for immersion; and it also used to be said that the river Jordan was too small a stream to allow of immersion. But since so many travelers from this country have visited Palestine, intelligent people have ceased such talk. Dr. Talmage immersed a man in the river Jordan, as many other American ministers have done. The river Sorek runs along where Philip and the eunuch went, and Dr. W. M. Thomson, author of *The Land and the Book*, describing that region, says that there is plenty of water there "to satisfy the utmost wishes of our Baptist friends."

Many references to baptism are made in the Acts, without any description, but since so good a description is given in the 8th chapter, it could hardly be expected that it would be repeated. In the 9th chapter, for example, the baptism of Saul of Tarsus is mentioned, with the simple words, "And he arose and was baptized." Had sprinkling or pouring been employed there had been no need of his arising, since already kneeling he was in a position to receive the sprinkling or the pouring. And had the baptism mentioned in the 9th chapter differed from that described in the 8th chapter, the difference would certainly have been pointed out. Moreover, if any man can tell us how that baptism was performed, Paul is the man; and he writes to the Romans (vi. 4): "We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." Conybeare and Howson render this passage: "With Him, therefore, we were buried by the baptism wherein we shared His death [when we sank beneath the waters]: that even as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we likewise might walk in newness of life." They add in a foot-note: "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

A prominent Presbyterian lawyer once said to me: "I have heard my pastor explain Romans vi. 4, and it was never clear to me before." "How did he explain it?" I asked. "Why," said he, "he showed that Christ was not buried at all, that His body was laid on a shelf, in Joseph's sepulchre, and there being no burial in the case, this passage

cannot mean immersion." Whereupon I got a New Testament and asked him to read I Corinthians xv. 3,4: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." "There," said I, "you read that Christ was buried, while you report your preacher as saying he was not buried." "I see;" said the lawyer, "and I suppose my pastor did not know this passage was in the Bible." "It is to be hoped so," I added.

It may be well to mention the baptism of the jailer at Philippi, recorded in Acts xvi. 29-31. Paul and Silas are in the dungeon, with their feet "fast in the stocks." The earthquake comes and arouses and alarms the sleeping jailer who would kill himself but for Paul's voice of warning. Then the jailer "called for lights, and sprang in, and, trembling for fear, fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Here it is written the jailer "brought them out" — let us see where he led them. The narrative goes on: "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. And they spake the word of the Lord unto him and unto all that were in his house." This shows he led them out of the prison into his house, for here they are preaching to all in the house. We read on: "And he took them" — we will see later where he took them — "the same hour of the night," — between twelve and one o'clock — "and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set meat before them, and rejoiced greatly," etc. They were thus taken from the prison into the jailer's house, thence out somewhere in the night, where he was baptized, and then he brought them "up into his house" again. Now is it likely that a new convert would carry the preachers out of the house between twelve and one o'clock at night if what he wanted was to have a little water sprinkled or poured upon him and upon his household? The narrative is inconsistent with the idea of sprinkling or of pouring. And then, too, if this baptism had differed from that described in the 8th chapter we may be sure Luke would have pointed out the difference. But it could not have differed since it is written, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Jesus performed but one act for baptism. He did not submit to sprinkling, pouring, and immersion, all three, and, telling us "the mode is nonessential," give us our choice of the three. No; He did but one thing, and that, as I have shown, was immersion, and that is what He commands all who love Him to do. "If ye love me keep my commandments." "Hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." I John ii. 3, 4.

But it is objected that 3,000 persons could not have been immersed on the day of Pentecost, and therefore sprinkling or pouring must have been used. I answer. First: It is not said that 3,000 were baptized on that day. The language is that "there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls." They may have been baptized at other times. Second: It does not take any longer to immerse a candidate than to sprinkle or to pour water upon him, with the accompanying ceremony. Third: Not only 3,000, but several times that number could easily have been immersed on the day of Pentecost. Three Baptist preachers in six hours in Ongole, India, did immerse 2,222 candidates. According to this the twelve (for Mathias had taken Judas' place) could have immersed 13,332 persons. But there were more than twelve administrators, for it is written that in that upper chamber at Jerusalem there were "an hundred and twenty" present, and on the day of Pentecost "they were all with one accord in one place." It is evident therefore that there is no force in the objection that "three thousand could not have been immersed on the day of Pentecost."

It is argued that John's baptism, to which Jesus submitted, was not Christian baptism, and that our Lord was baptized in order to be inducted into his priesthood. It is urged that since certain sprinklings were in the consecration of the Aaronic priests, John must have sprinkled the water on Christ. It is strange that the same persons should urge both these arguments since they are mutually destructive, and to show this is why they are here mentioned together. If John's baptism was sprinkling and was not Christian baptism then sprinkling is wrong. The passage in Acts xix. 2-5, is relied upon to show a difference between John's baptism and Christian baptism. Those disciples at Ephesus "had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," and yet they claimed to have been baptized "unto John's baptism." They certainly had never heard John preach, since he preached about the Holy Ghost (Matthew iii. 11 and Luke iii. 16). They had probably been baptized by some who had heard John, and who did not understand the matter rightly. This baptism being defective was not valid and these candidates must be baptized. That a man has already received an improper baptism is no reason he should not be baptized rightly.

John's baptism was the only kind Jesus and the Apostles received, and if it were not Christian baptism, then those who established the first churches never received Christian baptism. The very word Christian is Christian, and to say that what Christ did was not Christian is a contradiction. No, the Bible gives no warrant for drawing any distinction between John's baptism and Christian! baptism. Christ did a certain thing and called it baptism; when he commands us to be baptized, He must have intended for us to do that thing.

As for Christ's being baptized in order to be inducted into his priesthood, that is a notion utterly foreign to Scripture, and to the facts of the case. Jesus was not a priest after the order of Aaron at all, but after the order of Melchisedek, and was never "inducted into His priesthood," since He was "a priest forever," "having neither beginning of days nor end of life." No ceremonial consecration was in order, since He was made a priest "not after a law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Hebrews vii. 16. In the seventh chapter of Hebrews, Christ's priesthood is discussed and the distinction between His priesthood and the Aaronic is emphasized. All the Aaronic priests must be of the tribe of Levi, and of the family of Aaron, while Christ was of the tribe of Judah. "For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah: of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." Hebrews vii. 14. And besides, in the consecration of the Aaronic priests there were various ceremonies in addition to the ablutions, shaving, being clad in special garments, etc., etc. Why were all these omitted if Jesus was baptized as a consecration to the priesthood? And it was no part of John's business to consecrate Aaronic priests; that was the business of Caiaphas and Annas.

The early version of the New Testament into Syriac translates the Greek baptizo by *amad*, which means immerse. The great "Thesaurus Syriacus," the highest authority on Syriac, defines *amad*, "descendit, mersus est, baptizatus est" — to descend,, to immerse, to baptize.

In Greece, where the Greek language is still spoken, only immersion is practiced for baptism, and the Greeks laugh at the idea of baptizo meaning sprinkle or pour. If the Greeks do not know the meaning of a Greek word — who does know?

[Extract from Dr. Eaton's book on "Faith of the Baptists."]

DEFENSE OF THE PHILADELPHIA CONFESSION OF FAITH

By T. T. Eaton, 1900

The Philadelphia Confession of Faith is not responsible for the wild interpretations put upon it, any more than the Bible is responsible for the same thing. That Confession is a venerable and, in many respects, a noble document, and we hope the wild interpretations some are seeking to put on it will not bring it into disrepute.

The attempt is made to make it appear that the Philadelphia Confession declares that Christ built "the universal invisible church" on the Rock, which "universal invisible church" should exist in all ages; and also that this Confession opposes the view that Baptists have existed in every age since the Apostles. This is a gross and a groundless misrepresentation of that venerable document. It says: "The Catholic or universal church which, with respect to the internal work of the Spirit and truth of grace, may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one under Christ, the head thereof, and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

Let this language be noted. The Romanists claimed that their hierarchy was "the Catholic or universal church," and these Baptists in Philadelphia contradicted that claim by declaring that only "the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one" can rightly be called "the catholic or universal church." It takes all the elect of all ages to make "the catholic or universal church." Of course, then, the little fraction of them alive at any given time cannot be called the church. Of course, then, this church cannot exist in every age, because its material, except a part of it, and perhaps a very small part, had not come into existence when our Baptist fathers adopted that language. If the world shall continue ten thousand years longer, the last man saved will be part of the "universal church," which this document declares to be composed of "the whole number of the elect that have been, are [A. D. 1742.- B. M. Bogard, editor.], or shall be gathered into one," etc. To talk about all the elect as existing through all ages, is ridiculously grotesque. It is likely that only a small fraction of them have even yet (A. D. 1899) come into existence; and certainly those born since 1742 could not have continued in existence before that date. What, pray, have men born in the 20th century to do with resisting the "gates of hell" in the 10th century? Let it be remembered that, according to the Philadelphia Confession, it takes all the elect of all ages to make "the catholic or universal church" -- not the part of them alive in one age.

Let it be noted also that this Confession makes not the slightest hint that Christ meant this "catholic or universal church" when He said: "On this rock I will build my church." Matt. 16:18, is not quoted at all.

This "universal church" is "invisible" only "with respect to the internal work of the Spirit." It will be visible when it is "gathered into one." Of course, the internal work of the Spirit is invisible.

There is also in this entire Confession not the slightest suggestion that there has been a day since the Apostles when there were no Baptists in the world. On the contrary, all that is said on the subject assumes their continued existence. But since that was not then a matter of dispute, the document is not very full on that point. Thomas Crosby had just issued his great history in which he distinctly claimed, and argued at length to maintain the claim, that Baptists had continued in the world from the Apostles to his day; and these Baptists in Philadelphia took for granted that this was generally admitted among their brethren, and needed not to be specially declared. Nevertheless, this Confession does say: "The purest churches under

heaven are subject to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan; nevertheless, Christ always hath had, and ever shall have, a kingdom in this world, to the end thereof, of such as believe in him and make profession of his name."

In spite of the fact that "the purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error," and some have gone so far astray as to become "synagogues of Satan," yet all of the Churches have not thus gone astray, but "Christ always hath had and ever shall have a kingdom in this world, of such as believe in him and MAKE PROFESSION OF HIS name," i. e., of pure churches which do not become "synagogues of Satan."

Again this Confession declares: "A particular church, gathered and completely organized according to the mind of Christ, consists of officers and members; and the officers, appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the church so called and gathered for the peculiar administration of ordinances and execution of power and duty which he entrusts them with, or calls them to, to be continued to the end of the world, are bishops, or elders, and deacons."

Then there have been, according to this document, particular churches "gathered and completely organized according to the mind of Christ," "for the peculiar administration of ordinances," etc., in all ages; since "according to the mind of Christ" they were "to be continued to the end of the world." And yet we are asked to believe that the Philadelphia Confession is opposed to the idea of the continuity of Baptists through the ages since the Apostles!

=====

Chapter IX J. R. Graves, LL. D.

By Ben M. Bogard

J. R. Graves was born in Chester, Vt., April 10, 1820. He was left a half orphan at the age of three weeks, and his mother had but little of this world's goods to maintain her family. Being left to the sole care of his mother so young in life, and never knowing a father's care, he was forced to a greater degree of self-reliance than is usual for boys, and his whole after life has spoken volumes of what that rigid discipline did for him.

At the age of fifteen he was converted and joined the church in North Springfield, Vt.

After teaching two years in Kingsville Academy, Ohio, he went to Kentucky, where he took charge of the Clear Creek Academy, near Nicholasville. While teaching here, his church licensed him to preach without his knowledge, but he at first refused to enter the ministry, feeling his weakness and unworthiness. In fact, he stated that he felt himself wholly unqualified for his great work.

After praying over the matter, and consulting with friends, he determined to prepare himself for the great work of preaching. For four years he gave six hours a day to the school room, and eight to study, going through a college course without a teacher. Besides making the Bible his principal text book, he mastered a modern language every year, and gave due attention to science, philosophy and literature.

In 1845 he moved to Nashville, Tenn., where he opened a school known as the Vine Street Classical and Mathematical Academy. During the same year he took charge of the Second Baptist church, in that city, as pastor. This church is now known as the Central church. While pastor of this church he became editor of the Tennessee Baptist, in which position he continued for about forty-six years.

Dates and figures cannot estimate such a character as J. R. Graves. We may be able to count his converts or tell the number of sermons preached, and the great debates he held, but no man can know this side of the eternal shores what great things were accomplished by him. His indirect influence (what he influenced other men to do) was a hundredfold, greater than all he ever did directly. One sermon, or editorial, by him would start a hundred influences to work in as many different parts of the country. Who can compute such a life as that?

As an editor, J. R. Graves set the pace for other Baptist papers, and his disciples became their editors. Great men, like Dr. Bright, of the New York Examiner, were so influenced by him that they gave up cherished opinions and doctrines and adopted the ideas of Dr. Graves. No other man has ever had so wide and powerful influence over the Baptists of America, and in that respect he still lives on.

The Tennessee Baptist at one time had the largest circulation of any Baptist paper in the world, and it held that honorable position for years. The matter it contained was of the very best, and on every page shone the spirit of the editor. To read through the files of the old Tennessee Baptist is an education in itself.

As a writer of religious books Dr. Graves stands in the forefront. In the midst of his great labors he found time to write and publish "The Desire of All Nations," "The Watchman's Reply," "The Trilemma," "The First Baptist Church in America," "The Little Iron Wheel," "The Great Iron Wheel," "The Bible Doctrine of the Middle Life," "Exposition of Modern Spiritism," "Old Landmarkism; What Is It?" "Exposition of the Parables," "John's Baptism," "Intercommunion Unscriptural, Inconsistent and Evil

Only," "Denominational Sermons," etc. Besides these he compiled two song books and brought out, reprinted and published, Robinson's "History of Baptism," Wall's "History of Infant Baptism." Orchard's "History of Baptists," " Stewart on Baptism," besides numerous tracts, pamphlets, etc.

In addition to all this he wrote "Seven Dispensations," one of the greatest works on Systematic Theology that has ever been published. While this great book is especially adapted to students, it will be read with interest by any intelligent reader.

These books have all had a wide reading and great influence. His "Great Iron Wheel" had such a powerful influence on Methodism that it resulted in their remodeling their church government so that laymen could be admitted to the General Conference. Hundreds of Pedobaptists, overpowered by his logic and overcome by his appeals, came to the Baptists and have since made useful members. These books are still being circulated, and new editions will be brought out, and thus the great life work of Dr. Graves will go on.

As a preacher, there was but one man in his day 'who ever approached him in power, and that was Richard Fuller. He was pre-eminently doctrinal. He believed that men should be controlled by principle, and he dealt in great principles in his preaching. He placed the greatest emphasis on the greatest doctrines. The doctrine of SALVATION BY GRACE was his great theme. All else centered here. "Blood Before Water, Christ Before the Church," was his motto. His greatest sermon was on the Atonement of Christ. His greatest arguments have been those directed against the idea of church salvation. In his sermon, published in the volume of sermons entitled "Denominational Sermons," on " The Relation of Baptism to Salvation," he is most emphatic in his declarations that baptism has nothing to do with salvation except as it symbolizes the work of grace. Grace is the substance, baptism the shadow. On page 18 in this sermon he says: "A moral nature renewed by the Holy Spirit — a birth from above — is in all cases essential to baptism, and that the rite, among other things, was appointed to symbolize this great fact; that it is the act for the profession of repentance exercised, of faith possessed and regeneration enjoyed." Baptism must, while it is important, stay in its place. Baptism with J. R. Graves was not a saviour, but it did symbolize the work of the Saviour. He placed the emphasis where it belonged. This much has been said concerning the doctrine he preached because a certain slanderer has accused him of teaching that only Baptists would be saved.

As a devotional preacher. Dr. Graves had few equals. He would have his audiences bathed in tears in the midst of one of his great doctrinal sermons. His power over an audience was wonderful. He has been known to cause an audience to burst out in uproarious laughter, and in a moment thereafter have them weeping, and that, too, with, one sentence. Many men have the power to bring laughter or tears from the audience, but they do it with a series of sentences. Dr. Graves frequently did it in one sentence. There was something about him here that cannot be put on paper. The writer has seen him exercise matchless power. Of all the great orators who have ever lived no other was ever known to be able to bring laughter and tears with one sentence at one time.

At Waco, Texas, during the sitting of the Southern Baptist Convention, a few years ago, the house where the convention was held was so uncomfortably packed that it was suggested that preaching be announced for one of the neighboring meeting houses. It was accordingly announced that a certain prominent preacher would, within twenty minutes, preach at the Methodist church, just across the street. A few went out to hear the sermon, but not enough to make a congregation, and all who

went out soon came back. It was then announced that another brother would preach, and still but few left the convention building. At last Dr. B. H. Carroll, at that time pastor of the church in Waco, announced that "Dr. J. R. Graves would preach at the Methodist church in ten minutes." Immediately there was a rush for the doors. It seemed that everybody wanted to get to that Methodist church, and in five minutes' time the large auditorium was packed to the doors and the convention building practically emptied. The president of the convention begged the members of the convention to remain, but nobody could afford to miss that sermon. It was pronounced by almost all who heard it to be the greatest sermon they ever heard. He told of the wonderful grace of God, and the people wept and rejoiced and forgot all else. When Dr. J. B. Searcy returned to his appointed home, which was with a Methodist preacher's family, he heard suppressed voices and subdued weeping in the parlor as he was about to pass by. The Methodist preacher called him in, and, with great emotion, confessed that up to that time he had misunderstood Dr. Graves, and said that he did not doubt that in the next generation Dr. Graves would be quoted as an authority on the great doctrine of Salvation by Grace.

As an evangelist he had few equals. Not only hundreds, but thousands, were converted under his preaching. Some of his notable protracted meetings were as follows: At Brownsville, Tenn., in 1849, in which meeting more than seventy persons were converted. Before he was thirty years old more than 1,300 persons had professed faith in Christ under his preaching. At Bowling Green, Ky., he conducted a meeting for J. M. Pendleton, when more than seventy-five persons were baptized as a result. Thus he went from place to place, preaching the Word.

His ability as a debater was recognized as decidedly superior to any man in his day and only one man (J. N. Hall) has equaled him since. His greatest debate was with Dr. Jacob Ditzler, Methodist, at Carrollton, Mo. This debate has been published in book form and has had a wide circulation. The defeat of Dr. Ditzler was crushing, but the fact of his debating with so great a man as J. R. Graves gave him a reputation on which he has lived ever since.

In one of his debates he wrote the "Puzzled Dutchman," which has since had such a wide circulation, and read it, giving full expression to the German brogue, at one of the hours of the debate. The confusion of his opponent and the effect on the audience was so great that it won him an easy victory.

Dr. Graves was never a ready speaker in conventions or associations, hence he seldom spoke, and sometimes when he did he made a failure. It was when he had command of the situation for a set speech or a sermon, or in the heat of debate, that he rose to the greatness which has made him famous.

As a presiding officer he had good talents. He was frequently elected Moderator of his association and other gatherings. He originated the first Ministers' Institute. He raised, without compensation, an endowment of theological chair in Union University. He originated the Southwestern Baptist Publishing House at Nashville, Tenn.

While engaged in the hard work of editor and that of going from pillar to post preaching, debating, holding meetings, he was offered \$3,000 per year to go to New Orleans and accept permanent work as pastor. The salary was enormous for that day. At that time J. M. Pendleton was getting only \$400 a year at Bowling Green, Ky., and Graves himself was not making for the support of his family a thousand dollars a year. Yet the great salary did not tempt him to leave what he believed was his God-appointed work. By continuing steadfastly in his life work he exerted a powerful influence that would have been impossible otherwise. S. H. Ford said of him in "The Christian Repository" of December, 1899: "There is no question in regard to

Graves' influence over hundreds of thousands of men and women of intelligence — an influence which still remains, at least to a great extent. That there was a power in the man — a power that rallied around him such men as Pendleton, Crawford and Dayton — men of master minds and general scholarship — is admitted by those who feared him while living and misrepresented him when dead. * * * To measure such a heroic soul with the soft-stepping delineator of 'hidden virtues' and 'human progress' and general indifference to truths of the gospel; to weigh such a man's words in the scales of a nicely-balanced logic, and draw inferences contrary to all he believed and taught, is like measuring the winds with a yardstick, or charging some star with the sorrows of one's destiny, or blaming the light of the moon for the failing of a potato crop."

Perhaps the greatest sermon he ever preached was from the text, "The veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom." Dr. S. H. Ford described this great sermon in the Repository, Feb., 1900. At the time Dr. Ford heard it, it was preached in the East Baptist church, Louisville, Ky., during the session of the Southern Baptist Convention, in 1857. The description is as follows: "After describing the 'Holiest of all,' the mercy seat, the high priest's yearly entry, the veil, etc., he directed the thought to the ascent of Calvary, seen from the temple and watched by the priests — the darkened sky, the rending rocks, the earthquake causing the temple and veil to tremble — and then the sudden rending of the spacious veil. It was brief, graphic and touching. He went on to show that the riven veil was a visible, ocular declaration that all priestly forms and all ceremonial impediments or interventions, sacrifices and purifications, were swept away by the death of Christ. The mercy seat was laid bare. Not a church, not a saint or angel, person or preacher, priest or ordinance — absolutely no one, and nothing intervened between the contrite soul and the throne of grace — the blood-sprinkled mercy seat.

"No notes were taken by the writer, but its effect was lasting. The only time in his recollection that his hair seemed to actually rise on his head was when hearing that discourse. It was positively powerful.

"He closed with a burst of eloquence. Pausing, seemingly overpowered with his emotions, or wanting words to express them, with uplifted hands and eyes, he exclaimed:

"O, thou blessed mercy seat, hidden through the ages by the cloud of sin, the veil of wrath, the way to thy holy place is opened, the glory that crowns thee may be approached, and thy blessing obtained. I hear the voice of the Eternal issuing from thy mysterious recesses, saying, Come unto Me — not to angel or saint, or priest, or preacher, or church, or ordinance — come unto Me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth, and O, Lamb of God, I come, I come."

The sermon was heard by the greatest men in the convention, such as Boyce, Jeter, Burrows, Howell, Manly and others, and they pronounced it the best sermon ever preached in their hearing. It formed the subject for conversation for several days thereafter.

Such was J. R. Graves, the greatest preacher, the most forcible writer, the ablest debater and strongest editor of his day. His equal has not yet arisen. When God has need of another like him he will raise him up. One man of that kind each century is as much as the world deserves.

Yet, after all that has been said, together with much more that might be said, there is something felt by all who knew Dr. Graves that cannot be put in writing. This writer well remembers how the whole current of his thought was influenced by J. R.

Graves. When only a boy — nineteen years old — he drove twenty miles in a road cart to hear the great man preach. He heard him for five days, he bought and read his books, and his faith in God was strengthened, his belief in Baptist doctrines solidified, and he has never wavered since that blessed day in his belief of the great doctrines held by the Baptists. This writer is proud to confess himself to be a disciple of J. R. Graves, and he strives to follow Graves as Graves followed Paul and the Christ.

The clear and able discussion of the "Effect of Baptism" at the close of this sketch is commended to the careful study of all who care to know the teaching of the Bible on that subject. The volume of "Denominational Sermons" from which it is taken should have a much wider reading than it has had.

On the 26th of June, 1893, Dr. Graves fell asleep. His spirit is no doubt now in Paradise awaiting the resurrection of the body. He relied on God in life and fought the good fight of faith, and while the Lord let him pass through the deep waters frequently, he always enabled him to triumph in the end.

"Even down to old age, all my people shall prove
My sovereign, eternal, unchangeable love;
And when hoary hairs shall their temples adorn,
Like lambs they shall still in my bosom be borne.
"Fear not, I am with thee; O be not dismayed!
I, I am thy God, and will still give thee aid;
I'll strengthen thee, help thee, and cause thee to stand,
Upheld by my righteous, omnipotent hand."

The sentiment of that great hymn was the actual experience of J. R. Graves.

Extract from Sermon By J. R. Graves, LL. D. On the Effect of Baptism

1. Negatively, it does not procure for us the remission of past sins.

Christ has not proposed two ways for this blessing to be attained, nor is the way proclaimed in the New, different from the one taught in the Old Testament, and that was undoubtedly by faith alone, disconnected with any overt act:

"To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth on him shall receive the remission of sins." (Acts x:43.)

2. Nor by baptism do we wash our sins away, save in a figure, for —

"The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth from all sin." (1 John i:7.)

3. Nor by baptism are we regenerated or born again:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born from above, he can not see the kingdom of God." — Christ.

4. Nor are we made the children of God by baptism:

"For we are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." (Galatians iii:26.)

Nor is baptism even a means or a sacrament by which, or on account of which, we

have access to Christ, through whom we alone obtain every needed grace:

"Therefore, being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom, also, we have access by faith into this grace, wherein ye stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Romans v:l.)

It is constantly asked of Baptists, What good does baptism do if it in no ways secures you salvation?

I answer, Much every way, and chiefly because —

1. By submitting to the act he appointed we obey Christ.

No words or thought can express or conceive the obligations we are under to love Christ and to obey him. The slave that is bought with the gold of the master is under obligations to serve him, or the captive whose life has been saved or redeemed by the sacrifice of another is under weighty obligations to love, and to gratify the reasonable wishes of his redeemer and saviour. The child is under the highest earthly obligations to love and do the will of his father, and for it to refuse is to violate all filial obligations. But Christ redeemed us, when captives, from the enemy of our souls; and when he found us sold under sin he not only redeemed us by laying down his own life for us, but through him we have been adopted into the heavenly family, and made sons and daughters of the Most High God. Our obligations to obey Christ are infinite, and, as certainly as we are his children, we will desire to obey, and we will love to obey; and the language of our hearts will be, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" The characteristic spirit of Christ was that of obedience; and the Holy Spirit saith, "He that hath, not the mind of Christ is none of his." Baptism is the first and most important act of obedience Christ requires of his child — an act without which we can not obey several other important commands of Christ.

2. By baptism we honor Christ.

It is not by our words and professions that we put the highest honor upon Christ. Indeed, if we stop at words and professions he will not accept us. The highest honor we can reflect upon Christ is to cheerfully obey him in all things whatsoever he commands us. He abominates mere lip service. How severe the reproof he gave this class when in the flesh: "Why call ye me. Lord, Lord, and do not the things I command you?" "Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me." (Matthew xv:7, 8.)

What a privilege of being allowed by any act to put honor upon Christ before men and angels! A child of God will consider this his highest joy.

3. By obeying Christ in baptism we secure many and special blessings.

David testified that in keeping the commandments of his God, there was great reward, and that reward is both here and hereafter. If we are a friend of Christ or child of God we desire to honor him. But in no way possible can we honor Christ or offer him more sincere worship than by obedience to his commands; and he has said, "They that honor me will my Father honor." Who can estimate the value and the blessedness of being honored of God before men here and angels hereafter:

"If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John xiv:23.)

"Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you."

What more or greater blessings for time can be desired than are implied in the above

two promises? And then when we meet him at last we hear him say:

"Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

What more of heaven could be expressed than is implied in these words? We may assure ourselves that Christ will not tell an untruth to save any one. The willingly, no more than the willfully, disobedient will hear those words.

Then there is a special blessing promised that none but the truly baptized do enjoy, namely, "The answer — satisfaction — of a good conscience toward God."

Baptism has no part in making a good conscience. The quickening of the Holy Spirit and the enlightenment of the word make a good conscience, that can only be quieted and satisfied when full obedience to Christ's command has been rendered; and therefore no other act for baptism but the one Christ commands will ever satisfy a good conscience. Tens of thousands have testified to this, and thousands yearly, ministers and members, testify that nothing but being buried with Christ in baptism, to show forth his death, burial and resurrection for their salvation, avails to satisfy their consciences.

4. We profess our faith, confess our discipleship, and evidence our friendship for Christ before men.

These acts Christ requires of every friend, — "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies bathed in pure water, let us hold fast the profession of our faith." (Heb. x.)

"If thou wilt openly confess with thy mouth, that Jesus is Lord, and wilt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Heb. x:9, 10.)

"For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory," etc. (Luke ix:26.)

"And whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me can not be my disciple. Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." (John xv:14.) 5. By baptism we are introduced into a local church, and thereby into Christ's visible kingdom:

"Christ has a kingdom on earth, and he has churches. No one of his churches is his kingdom, but each one is an integral portion of his kingdom." — Dr. A. P. Williams.

The visible churches, then, compose his kingdom, and by entering a church we enter his kingdom. We are baptized into a visible church.

On the day of Pentecost three thousand were added to the church by baptism. They were baptized, and there is no intimation of any interfering act. Baptism, then, according to the record, if it is full, was the consummating act. Christ said to Nicodemus, "Unless a man be born of water and [added to the birth] of the Spirit, he could not enter his kingdom." Paul says: "For in one spirit we were all baptized into one body;" i. e., some local church, like that at Corinth; and lest any one might conceive that by one "body" he did not mean a local church, but some one universal, general body, in the twenty-seventh verse, he expressly tells them: "Now ye are a body of Christ and members in part," i. e., fellow-members.

The oldest Articles of faith put forth by our fathers are those of 1120. In the seventh article, after stating that they regarded baptism as an outward sign of an invisible grace, read:

"And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people."

Dr. Dagg says:

"The opinion has been held, almost as a theological axiom, that baptism is the door into the church," and we add, not by Baptists, but by all denominations.

Dr. Harvey's work on "The Church," issued by the American Publication Society, says:

"Baptism is the rite of admission to the church, the public act of separating- from the world and uniting¹ with God's people. It is the door of the house of God."

BAPTISM, BY INITIATING US INTO A LOCAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, ENTITLES US TO ALL THE PRIVILEGES AND RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH, NOT LEAST AMONG THOSE IS THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Christ has placed this sacred feast within, and under the guardianship of his local churches, and no one who has not been duly initiated according to the appointment of Christ, can partake of the Supper without profaning the feast and eating and drinking unworthily, and thereby "eating and drinking damnation to himself" (1 Corinthians xi).^{*} By commanding every disciple to partake of the Supper, he virtually commanded him to qualify himself to do so, by being baptized into His "body" — one of his local churches.

From the above considerations we see that baptism, though not a condition of salvation, is far from being an unimportant or non-essential duty, since it is essential to our obedience to Christ, and essential to his public recognition by us as our Saviour and King — essential to membership in his church and citizenship in his kingdom — essential to our highest usefulness and happiness in this life, and to receiving the highest reward and honor in the kingdom of His glory.

An unwillingness to obey in the manner he has specified, and a willingness to accept a substitute, because suited to our "tastes, feelings, and convenience,"

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF BAPTISM

The question is often asked, and it may be asked by the reader, "To whom should I apply for Christian baptism?" The question is an important one; since, if you are not baptized by the proper authority, let the act be what it may, the act is null and void. A foreigner seeking citizenship in this government must apply to an officer of the government, and the one authorized to give him his papers. He may not apply to any officer, and certainly not to an officer of another government. "How, then," you may ask, "can I know the proper officer to administer Christian baptism?" It certainly is not by an examination of men and their credentials; but it is required of you to find a church that administers the act which Christ commanded, and for the purpose and to the subjects Christ requires, and that church will furnish the proper officer — for it is the church that administers the rite and not the officer, per se — he is but the hand, the servant of the church. The ordinances of baptism and the Supper were not intrusted to the ministry to administer to whomsoever they deem qualified, but to the churches, to be observed by them "as they were delivered unto them." (1 Cor. xi:2.) Every common reader of the New Testament can easily decide between the different religious societies claiming to be churches of Christ, which one of them all

^{*} See Tract by the Author, entitled "What is it to Eat and to Drink Unworthily!" Price. 10 cents. should be convincing proof that our hearts are not in subjection to the Anointed One; that we have not the spirit of Christ, and are none of his.

administers baptism as here set forth; for only one denomination does thus administer it.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTER

From the overwhelming mass of proof submitted, every candid reader must conclude that immersion was the act Christ commanded, and the apostles and primitive churches observed. He can fully appreciate the statement of Prof. Moses Stuart (Pedobaptist), "I can not see how it is possible for any candid man who has examined the subject to deny this," and he will concede that the strong assertion of Prof. Paine, D.D., of the Bangor Theological Seminary (Pedobaptist), is not too strong, viz., "Any scholar who denies that immersion was the baptism of the Christian church for thirteen centuries, betrays utter ignorance or sectarian blindness." This being the established and admitted fact, the following conclusions inevitably follow:

1. If Christ commanded his apostles to immerse professed believers for baptism, in or into the name of the Trinity, he certainly forbade them to sprinkle or pour a few drops of water upon their heads in his name. The commission is the express law for baptism, and is to be construed as any other law. It is a fundamental principle of interpreting law that the specification is the limit of the act.

This maxim is as old as the Julian Code — "Specificatio, unius, exclusio alterius" — the specification of one thing is the prohibition of every other thing.

If Christ specified immersion in water in his name, he as positively forbade any other act, as sprinkling of water upon the subject in the name of the Trinity, which means by the authority of. It is a most daring act for a Christian minister, in open violation of Christ's express command, to sprinkle and pour, and then solemnly declare before God and men that he does it by the authority of Christ! and by the authority of God the Father! and by the authority of the Holy Spirit! I would not do it for a thousand worlds!! And if it could be, worse to sprinkle an infant, a non-believer, when Christ specified a believer, thus positively and expressly forbidding the baptism of an infant, as well as sprinkling for baptism.

This we are all justified in saying — and, if we are the friends of Jesus we are in duty bound to say — that such a human substitution for the act Christ commanded is no baptism, and far worse than no baptism.

But Dr. N. L. Rice (Old School), in his work on Baptism, asserts:

2. The second fact, that where there is no scriptural baptism there can be no churches, no ministers, and no Christian ordinances.

This, then, is the conclusion from which there is no escape; that Pedobaptist societies are not Christian or evangelical churches in any sense, and their preachers, not being baptized, are not members of a church of Christ, and are not ordained, and are without the shadow of authority to baptize others, any more than any other unbaptized men.

3. The third fact is that all who have received the office of "baptism" at their hands by any act, are before God unbaptized. This seems a hard sentence, but it is the fact, just as certainly as immersion was commanded by Christ, which no candid man will deny, and duty to the misled and faithfulness to the truth constrains me to say it. And it is a fact that not less than ten thousand a year, including ministers as well as members, acknowledge the force of it, and come to Baptists for Christian immersion. It is evident, if Pedobaptist ministers are unbaptized themselves, they can not administer valid immersions — can not give what they themselves do not

possess.

4. But if Pedobaptist and Campbellite societies are not churches, because unbaptized, they have, as Dr. Rice says, no Lord's Supper; the rite they celebrate not being that Supper, and, therefore, it is as wrong for any to partake of it as that ordinance, as it would for a company of unbaptized converts to presume to celebrate the Supper without a church and without baptism. No conscientious Baptist could desire, or would presume to participate in such a transaction.

The fact of those societies being unbaptized — and they are as certainly as that baptize means to dip in or under water, as all scholars agree that it does, and never to sprinkle — settles the whole question of intercommunion between the members of those societies and the Baptist churches, or the members of Baptist churches and those societies. Surely to one disposed to accept and to submit to the truth, nothing more need be said on Intercommunion between Pedobaptists and Baptists.

5. But there is another thing the above facts should settle forever in the minds and conviction of all Baptists, viz., the question of

"Alien Immersions"

If Pedobaptist and Campbellite societies are not churches — and they are not if Christ commanded the immersion of professedly regenerated persons in water — they can no more administer valid baptism than they can a scriptural Lord's Supper; no more than could a Lodge of Masons or Odd-Fellows, if every member was a devout Christian.

Dr. Rice says, what every Pedobaptist on earth will agree to, that a body of unbaptized Christians is no church, and can not administer valid ordinances.

Therefore the immersions of all those societies, not scriptural churches, are as null and void as their sprinklings would be, and they can no more be accepted by Baptist churches. No rightly instructed Baptist church will receive the ordinances of unbaptized societies as valid or scriptural.

The Campbellites certainly immerse, but their immersions are no better than those of the Greeks or Roman Catholics, since they immerse for the self-same purpose, i. e., in order to secure the remission of sins, regeneration, and the blessing of salvation, as all know.

The question, "What does baptism introduce the recipient into?" is an open question with some Baptists, and they are principally confined to the South and West. It is urged by these, contrary to the universal practice of the denomination, and their own practice, that baptism introduces into the kingdom only — after which, if the subject desires to unite with a local church, he applies upon his certificate of baptism, and, after examination, must be received, by a unanimous vote, into the church! This feature of the question is purely theoretical as yet. In forty-six years of membership, in four different Baptist churches, in as many different States, I have never witnessed or heard of an addition on this wise, save some few who were irregularly baptized by army chaplains or ministers. In some places, towns and cities, all received into the church by baptism, or letter, since the last communion, just before the administration of the Supper, are called forward by the pastor, and a charge delivered, and the right-hand of fellowship extended by the pastor, sometimes, and it should always be, followed by all the church. This is a purely formal act, not an ordinance, or the completion of an ordinance — the persons having been previously received into the church by baptism or letter. If, to all these, the Articles of Faith and the church Covenant were read, and they were called upon to rise with the whole

membership of the church, to endorse the faith, and to enter into covenant, the practice would be most commendable. This theory is grounded upon the assumption that baptism is an ordinance of the kingdom, and not of the church, and, therefore, it inducts into the kingdom, and not into the church — "the kingdom being the vestibule of the church" (Gardner); but the kingdom, as we have seen (Chapter IV), has neither executive officers nor ordinances, and, therefore, the theory is groundless. The practical evil that is cropping out of the theory, in some quarters, to the great disturbance of the churches, is that ministers claiming to be officers of the kingdom are assuming the control of baptism, and baptizing whom they please, and where they please, whether in a Baptist Church as was the immersion of Dr. Weaver, of Louisville, Ky., by Prof. Jas. P. Boyce. without consulting the church. — or [of] fifty miles away. But the unscriptural-ness of this is evident from the fact that the ordinances, both, or all, were delivered to the churches and not to the ministry; and ministers, therefore, have no more authority to administer baptism, to whom they please, and where they please, than to administer the Supper to whom and where they please. It is a presumptuous and unscriptural assumption of power that does not belong to them. Our churches should be admonished that "Eternal vigilance is the price of their safety," in this regard, as well as others.

Chapter X - J. B. Jeter, D.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

Jeremiah B. Jeter was born in Bedford county, Virginia, July 18, 1802. At the age of nineteen years he joined the church, and was baptized by Elder William Harris.

As he came up from the water he delivered a speech to the congregation, and from that start he continued to preach all his life. His first set sermon was about twenty days after his baptism and in the same community.

Dr. Jeter was exceptionally active throughout life, and the Lord blessed his ministry in the salvation of thousands of souls. During the first ten years of his ministry he baptized over a thousand converts. During the next fourteen years he was pastor of the First Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., and during that time he baptized nearly a thousand into its fellowship. At the close of this eminently successful pastorate he became pastor of the Second Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo., and continued in that office for three years, baptizing one hundred and fifty converts. In 1852 he returned to Richmond, Va., and became pastor of Grace-street Church, where within a few years he had increased the membership from 322 to over 600. Such was the uniform success which attended his ministry.

It was about the year 1865 that he became editor of the Religious Herald. He continued in this work until death took him away. As an editor he has had few equals, and he succeeded in making a great paper of the Religious Herald, which still stands with the very best papers published by Baptists. One of his editorials is published at the close of this sketch. It is a fair specimen of numerous strong editorials that came from his ready pen.

Dr. Jeter was a successful writer of books. In 1837 he published the "Life of Rev. A. W. Clopton," and in 1843 he published "A Memoir of Mrs. Schuck, Missionary to China;" in 1850 he gave the world the "Life of the Rev. Andrew Broaddus;" then followed, in 1854, "Campbellism Examined," which book showed him to be a skillful debater, and still later followed "Campbellism Re-examined." In 1858 he published "The Christian Mirror;" in 1871, "The Seal of Heaven," and, during the same year, he published "The Life of the Rev. Daniel Witt."

Besides these eight books he published numerous tracts, speeches, sermons, etc. When we consider his constant work as preacher, and later as editor, we can appreciate the immense labor it took to produce so many books.

Dr. Jeter was present at the organization of the General Association of Virginia, and he lived to be the only survivor of the membership of that first meeting. He was the first missionary appointed by the General Association, and he was ever afterward a warm friend of the work of the General Association, and perhaps no other man has had so much influence in that body as he.

Among those who were converted under his ministry some have become prominent preachers. There are prominent among these Dr. Garlick and Dr. P. S. Henson. Dr. Jeter has continued to live in these men. In his converts Dr. Jeter still moves and thinks and glorifies God. His works do follow him.

He died Feb. 18, 1880, at the advanced age of seventy-eight years. He no doubt triumphantly joined that host that no man can number.

"O, that with yonder sacred throng,

We at his feet may fall;
We'll join the everlasting song,
And crown him Lord of all."

Distinctive Baptist Principles

By Rev. J. B. Jeter, D. D.

Incidental Points Pertaining to Close Communion

We are often asked by persons, heartily accepting Baptist principles in the main, why the immersed members of Pedobaptist churches and the members of churches practicing immersion are not invited to commune in Baptist churches. We admit, say they, that baptism is a prerequisite to communion; but these believers have been immersed, and some of them by duly qualified Baptist ministers — why, then, should they not be admitted to the Lord's table? The question is important, and deserving of candid consideration.

Faith and baptism are conditions precedent of a participation in the Lord's supper; but they are not the only terms of admission to it. We have endeavored to show that the supper is a feast within, and not without, a church, designed for all its members, and only for its members, or for members of other churches maintaining the same terms of communion. The exercise of discipline and the privilege of communion are co-extensive. In the apostolic churches, none were permitted to commune who were not subject to ecclesiastical discipline. Paul, in the exercise of his apostolic authority, required the church at Corinth to put away from among them the incestuous member; and afterwards, when he furnished proofs of his repentance, to restore him to their fellowship (1 Corinthians v:1-5; 2 Corinthians ii:5-8). This transgressor was, for a time, excluded from a participation of the Lord's supper (1 Corinthians iv:11). By common consent, this act of exclusion from a church is called excommunication; that is, expulsion from communion. So thoroughly is this truth embedded in the popular mind, that communion and church membership are expressions used interchangeably. A member of a Presbyterian or an Episcopal church is called a communicant of the church.

Piety and baptism do not constitute one a member of a Baptist church. He must, in order to become a member of it, seek admission into it, adopt its essential principles, and submit to its discipline. To continue a member of it, he must walk in the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, if not without blame, at least without gross and persistent departures from them. "Now we command you, brethren," said Paul, to "the church of the Thessalonians," "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition which he received of us" (2 Thessalonians iii:6). To walk "disorderly" is to live in vice, or in willful transgression. By "tradition" the apostle meant the doctrine or teaching which he and his associates had received from Christ and imparted to the Thessalonians.

To walk "disorderly" is, we judge, to walk "not after the tradition" received from the apostles. The latter phrase is explanatory of the former. No command can be more imperative than that laid on churches to withdraw from disorderly walkers, who respect not the teaching of the apostles. "We command you," said Paul and his companions, not in their own names, but "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly," c. This

withdrawal was to extend to "every brother" — rich or poor, high or low, kinsman or stranger — who walked "disorderly;" that is, persistently pursued a course contrary to the apostolic teaching. No plea of friendship, ignorance, or expediency can set aside this law.

We must now inquire whether the connection of immersed believers with Pedobaptist churches, or with other religious bodies, deemed unsound in doctrine or irregular in practice, is disorderly walking and contrary to apostolic teaching. In this argument, we must take for granted the truth of Baptist principles. Conceding that churches should be composed exclusively of immersed believers, and that communion at the Lord's table should be restricted to church members, is the course of Baptists in uniting with Pedobaptist churches, or with other bodies, not sound in faith and practice, orderly and according to apostolic "tradition"? We think not. Their course is not in harmony with the admitted principles. They voluntarily withdraw themselves from a church scripturally organized, and give their influence and labors to the support of principles which they admit to be false. In principles, they are Baptists; in profession and influence, they are Pedobaptists. Clearly it is their duty to support and disseminate the principles which they admit to be true. We believe, say they, that only believers are proper subjects of baptism, and nothing is baptism but immersion; but their example is at war with their convictions. In short, they concede that Christ has established one order for the constitution of his church, and they, for convenience or respectability, or from indifference to his authority; follow another. Such a course could not have been pursued in the apostolic times without incurring the charge of walking "disorderly," and "not after the tradition" received by the Spirit of inspiration.

It may be pleaded, in behalf of these inconsistent Baptists, that they are pursuing the course dictated by their consciences. We are not considering specially what is their duty, but what is the duty of the churches in regard to them. We do not judge these irregular Baptists. We consider them in error; but what allowance is to be made for their lack of information, their temperaments, their associations, and their peculiar circumstances, we know not. Their Master will judge them. Let them have due respect for their conscientious convictions. These may govern their own conduct; but they are no guide for the churches. They should be controlled by the Scriptures, honestly and intelligently interpreted and faithfully applied. If these teach that communion should be limited to churches, that churches should withdraw from all disorderly walkers, and that those walk disorderly who abandon churches scripturally constituted, to support those that are defective and irregular in their formation, then the duty of Baptist churches regarding these erring brethren is clear and imperative.

It is a pity that all Christians cannot commune together. We have no sympathy with those who believe that divisions among churches are good. They are evil, and are fraught with incalculable mischiefs. It is certainly to be deplored that all Baptists cannot commune together, according to the inspired order. Their identity of principles, interests, and aims should draw them together; and we wish to address some remarks to Baptists unconnected with regular Baptist churches.

There can be no union and communion between these parties without a yielding on one side or the other. The mountain must go to Mohammed, or Mohammed must come to the mountain. The denomination cannot yield its principles. They are grounded in its convictions, incorporated in its literature, and are the bond of its union. No man nor set of men, no arguments nor influence, can swerve it from its long-cherished doctrines. The mountain cannot go to Mohammed. There can scarcely, however, be any insuperable obstacle to the union of individual Baptists with Baptist churches. These irregular Baptists may deem it their privilege — they

can hardly consider it their duty — to commune with Pedobaptists. There is no divine law requiring them to commune in churches whose baptisms they consider invalid. It is their duty to partake of the Lord's supper in the prescribed order; but surely there is neither precept nor example binding them to commune in Pedobaptist churches. Admitting, for the sake of the argument, that it is their right to do so, still they would violate no law, sacrifice no principle, and do no injury in declining to exercise it. Mohammed can come to the mountain.

As matters stand in this country, a Baptist cannot commune, however much he may desire it, in both Baptist and Pedobaptist churches. He must make his election between them. Either he must unite with Pedobaptists, and give his example, influence, and labors, indirectly, at least, to the support of pedobaptism, or he must join the Baptists and enlist his energies in support of their principles. It is strange that he should hesitate for a moment in making his choice. With Baptists he differs on a single point — the terms of admission to the Lord's table; from Pedobaptists he dissents on the conditions of church membership and on the subjects and act of Christian baptism — principles deeply affecting the form and prosperity of the churches.

A Pedobaptist church is no home for a Baptist. Many years ago, we were conversing with a minister of another denomination, a most fiery advocate of open communion. We said to him: "If I were a member of your church, holding the principles that I do, and deeming it my duty to maintain and make proselytes to them, what would you do with me?" He promptly replied: "We should expel you." "That would be according to your discipline," said I; "but should I unite with a Baptist church, and propose to commune with you, would you admit me to your communion?" He frankly answered: "It would seem to be inconsistent."

The truth is, no earnest Baptist can long remain in a Pedobaptist church. It is only by ignoring his principles or keeping them in abeyance that he can be received into such a church. If he is intelligently convinced of their truth and importance, and deems it his duty — as undoubtedly he should — to disseminate them, he will soon find that he is an unwelcome member. The church will have no use for him, if he speaks in disparagement of infant baptism and pleads for the immersion of believers. They would excommunicate him, as a teacher of false doctrine and a disturber of the peace of the church. There is but one consistent course for a Baptist, and that is to be a member of a Baptist church, and labor, lovingly and faithfully, by all the means within his power, to defend and diffuse his principles.

Chapter XI - Elder S. H. Ford, D.D., LL.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

S. H. Ford was born in Bristol, England, February 19, 1819. He came with his parents to America when he was a child and the family settled in Missouri. His father was a preacher of ability, and soon after coming to Missouri he became pastor at Columbia, where he preached the gospel with good effect for several years.

In early life S. H. Ford was converted and called into the ministry. He entered Bonne Femme College, where he graduated with distinction, and afterwards studied at the State University at Columbia, Mo.

In his senior year at the University he was called to the care of the church at Jefferson City, Mo. Although he was only twenty-five years old, he was even then a great preacher. It was here he began a career which has not been equaled, in many respects, by any other man in America. He has been pastor in Memphis, Tenn., Louisville, Ky., and St. Louis, Mo.

He was for several years editor of the Western Recorder, Louisville, Ky., and for near forty-six years he has been editor of Ford's Christian Repository.

His career as editor, including his connection with the Western Recorder, has been longer than that of any other editor in America. Dr. J. R. Graves had been editor of the Tennessee Baptist for forty-nine years when he went home to Heaven, but S. H. Ford has been doing the work of editor for fifty years and is still wielding an able pen.

Dr. Ford had much to do in founding William Jewell College, and he was the first man to sound the note of warning about the financial basis of representation in associations and conventions, and at one time he introduced an amendment to the Constitution of the Missouri General Association to do away with that unbaptistic clause which demands the payment of money before a church is entitled to admission.

He has written two valuable histories. His Ecclesiastical History and his Brief Baptist History are reliable, clear, and strong. His book on What Baptists Baptise For is the best book of the kind which is now on the market. But, perhaps, his greatest work is THE GREAT PYRAMIDS. This is a scientific work and manifests unusual ability.

The best things he has written, however, have not been published in book form. His strong article on current topics in the Christian Repository shows him to be what he is: ready, strong, accurate. Although engaged frequently in heated discussions, he has never lost his balance, and, perhaps, no other man has been engaged so constantly in the discussion of current theological topics. Conservative, logical, safe, and honest, he has nearly always been found on the side of right and truth. No man has stood more constantly and tirelessly for Baptist principles. He has stood like a great stone wall against every attack on Orthodoxy. No other man has so thoroughly exposed and answered this "Invisible, Universal, Spiritual Church" theory as he. His discussion of that question, in part, is published at the close of this sketch, and the reader may judge for himself how thoroughly he has done his work.

No sketch of Dr. Ford would be complete without mentioning his excellent helpmeet, Sallie Rochester Ford. She has written a number of books which have been widely circulated. Grace Truman has reached at least fifty thousand circulation and its influence has been great — hundreds being converted to Baptist views by it, besides

confirming the faith of many who were wavering. The Dreamer's Blind Daughter, a beautiful story of John Bunyan's afflictions, and other works which have had a wide circulation, as well as her editorial work in the Repository, tell of her great life work. Dr. Ford would not have been the strong man he is if it had not been for the great woman he married and with whom he has lived for more than half a century.

During the civil war Dr. Ford was elected a member of the Confederate Congress. His gift as an orator and his happy knowledge of human nature would have made him a power in politics, but like many other men, he sacrificed all of that for the privilege of fighting the good fight of faith in Prince Immanuel's army.

In his eighty-first year he is still at work, and he will die in the harness.

There are many incidents in his remarkable life which would be of interest to relate here, but one of them will suffice:

While he was pastor in St. Louis, forty years ago, he heard of a sick young man and he went to see him. He found him in a room located where the Repository is now published. He soon understood that the prospect of death was near, and at the request of the sick boy he wrote to his mother, who lived in New England, to come as soon as possible, stating that if she came at once she might get to St. Louis in time for the burial of her son.

It was before the day of fast trains, and the trip had to be made by land and by steamboat. It would take at least three weeks for the letter to reach the mother and enable her to reach St. Louis. The prospect was that he would be dead and buried before the mother's arrival.

Meantime Dr. Ford talked with the young man about his soul and prayed with him, and the result was he became a happy believer in the Lord Jesus Christ. He soon had strength to "arise and be baptized and (figuratively) wash away his sins," and he, with Pastor Ford and a number of the brethren, went to a lake situated exactly where the great Union Depot now stands, for the purpose of being buried with Christ in baptism.

Just as Dr. Ford pronounced the words: "I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and buried the body out of sight in the watery grave, a shout was heard on the shore of the lake, and the first sight that greeted the young convert's eyes was his mother, who threw her arms about his wet body, and said, "O, my son, I came to see you buried, but I was not expecting to see you buried like this." She had arrived just in time to reach the baptizing. Perhaps there never was a more forcible illustration of the truth taught in baptism — death, burial, resurrection.

The grand old man will soon pass over the river, but his work will endure. When he dies it can truthfully be said of him: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." — Revelation 14:13.

The Universal Church — Its Real Meaning

By Elder S. H. Ford, D.D., LL.D.

There is no one word in Christian literature whose primary meaning is so fully agreed upon as the term translated church; and yet there is no word in that literature (not excepting Baptism) whose meaning has been so perverted and made the basis of subversive error.

Ecclesia — from the Greek word (ekkaleo) to call together or convene — simply means a public assembly or congregation. Any one reading the account of the Ephesians gathered in the theater—especially if the word had been rendered as it is when a gospel congregation is spoken of — will at once see the real meaning of ecclesia; as correctly and clearly as though he or she had consulted a pile of lexicons. We read (Acts 19:32): "Some therefore cried one thing and some another, for the (ekklesia) assembly was divided." Suppose it had been rendered "for the church was divided" (a church of maddened idolaters!), would this have been as correct as the translation of the same word "the church in thy house" or "tell it to the church?" Yes. It is the same word; it has the same meaning and is in every other case rendered church in the versions of the New Testament.

But no elaborate proof of the meaning of this word translated church is necessary. That its primary or literal meaning is an assembly, is undisputed. And it should have been so rendered wherever it occurs — especially when Stephen said: "This is he who was in the (ecclesia) assembly in the wilderness," — not church in the wilderness. And also in the quotation from Psalms 26:12 and 68:2: "In the midst of the church will I sing praises unto Thee." In the version of the Old Testament the same word ecclesia occurs, and in our English version this is rendered "in the midst of the congregation." Why was it not rendered congregation in the New Testament? The translators were forbidden to do so for a purpose. The revised version puts congregation in the margin, while the American revisers insisted on having it in the text.

But, we repeat, it is settled that ecclesia means an assembly, and that a gospel church is a called out assembly of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. This description of a church is given in unmistakable language in the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England: "A church is an assembly of faithful men where the word of God is preached and the sacraments rightly administered."

And now let it be remembered, that nowhere in God's word is such ecclesia (church) distinguished by any appellation distinguishing it as a universal or general or local church, except the place where it assembled. Thus is mention made of "all the churches of the Gentiles" (Romans 16:4) which included nearly all the churches then on earth, but they are not called the universal church to distinguish them from the one which Paul immediately mentions: "Greet the church which is in thy house."

But while assembly is acknowledged to be the primary or literal meaning of ecclesia the question occurs, has it other meanings? Does it mean the aggregate of believers or the saints of all ages — "a universal, invisible assembly?"

Let us calmly, in the light of Scripture and fact, examine and answer these questions.

The language of that great philologist, William Carson, in regard to the meaning of the word baptize, will apply with double force to the meaning of the word church. He says: —

"Parkhurst gives six meanings to the word baptizo. I undertake to prove it has but one; yet he and I do not differ as to the primary meaning of this; word. I blame him for giving different meanings when there is no real difference in the meanings of this word. He assigns it figurative meanings; I maintain that in figures there are no different meanings of the word. It is only a figurative application. The meaning of the word is always the same. Not that any one need to have a figurative application explained in any other way than by giving the proper meaning of the word."

In other words, baptism has but one meaning. It always means dip. But it has figurative application, such as baptized in the Holy Spirit, in which figurative application there is a resemblance to an immersion.

Now church has but one meaning — an assembly. But it has figurative applications, such as the "church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven," in which figurative application there is a resemblance to a church or called out assembly. It is not a church in fact, no more than the bestowment of the Holy Spirit was an immersion in fact. It is a figurative application of the word to an ideal gathering of the redeemed.

This will appear more evident and edifying if we turn to the meaning of other words or things which are figuratively applied to the aggregate of believers and also to the "whole number of the elect that have been or shall be gathered in one [assembly] under Christ" (London Confession of Faith). They are called —

The Bride — The Lamb's Wife

When John the Baptist was told of the increase of the Lord's disciples he answered: "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." Having direct reference to those who believed on the Son and had everlasting life. Paul, addressing the Corinthians, wrote: "For I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." And then in Ephesians, where he uses the word church in its figurative application more than it is used in all the New Testament besides, he changes the figure abruptly (we may say) from a woman to an assembly. "Husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for it."

He compares the redeemed to a wife, and then to an assembly, or church. He drops the personal figure, and says, "that he might present it a glorious assembly without spot or wrinkle." The basis of these figures are the redeemed — an ideal bride, wife, assembly.

And so in Revelation 19:7: "Let us be glad and rejoice and give honor to Him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come and His wife has made herself ready." An ideal bride, as John A. Broadus called the invisible church, "an ideal assembly of real Christians."

Now a bride, a wife, a virgin, each means a woman, and means nothing else. Literally, that is really, believers in the aggregate, or "the whole number of the elect," are not a bride, a wife, or a woman. They are individual persons. These terms have not two meanings, the one a woman, the other meaning the believers or the elect. No; it is simply and plainly a figurative application of the word bride, just as is the figurative application of the word church. The believers in the aggregate, the elect of all ages, are no more a universal church than they are a universal bride, and making this figure a fact as Rome has done, using the term Mother Church, and representing the imaginary thought as she with personal individual attributes and actions, is a monstrous error. But we have just as much right and warrant to call the redeemed the universal bride or wife as we have to call them the universal church. They are neither in fact, but only in figure.

The Redeemed are Compared to a House

"In whom ye also are builded for an habitation [dwelling house] of God through the Spirit." Ephesians 2:22. The imagery of a building or house runs through the New Testament Scriptures.

Wherever our word edify is met with, the idea of a building is represented. And we venture the remark that "the aggregate of believers" and "the whole company of the elect" are more frequently represented as a building or house, than they are as an assembly, that is, church. But we know that a house is a material structure. The redeemed or believers are not a house in fact, they are only so by a figurative application of this word or thing. And to build a theory or draw a distinction, or teach a doctrine on the ground that "all believers" or "the elect" are called a "spiritual house" is a mischievous perversion.

We might go on to mention the many other figurative applications of liberal terms, to the redeemed. They are called a city, as in some respects they resemble one, with its walls, its watchmen, its gates, and its towers.

They are called a garden, a flock, an army. But surely it need not be urged that they are in fact none of these. A universal garden, a universal flock, a universal army, or a universal house, or bride, is no more a figure of speech than is a universal church — that is, a universal assembly. There is no such thing in fact. It is a figurative application.

It is frequently said the church is compared to a bride. We deny this, and challenge the production of a single instance where the church is compared to any of those objects to which the redeemed are likened. It is the saved who are compared to an assembly, or ideal church, and to a bride, and to a building, not the church or a church. But by a strange deception, (we might say) a mental strabismus, the redeemed are compared to an assembly, and then this figurative application of an assembly (as though it were literal) is made the basis of another figure of speech, as bride or house; that is, one highly-wrought metaphor is made the groundwork of another highly-wrought metaphor. We repeat it: God's redeemed are figuratively likened to an assembly, but that assembly is never compared to a bride or a wife or a house. It is the redeemed ones themselves that are so compared; and not one figure compared to another figure.

As well might we take the metaphor of a lamb as figuratively applied to the Lord Jesus, and make this the basis of like figurative application of another. He is called the Lamb of God; but the Lamb is never called the door. He has these various figurative names — the Lamb, the Lion, the Shepherd, the Vine. But to say that the Lamb is compared to a Lion, or a Vine, or a Door is like calling by a metaphor the redeemed a bride and then calling the bride an assembly or church, or a house, or a garden. It is Jesus personally who is figuratively, not really, a Lamb, a Door, a Vine, is Bread. It is the redeemed personally who are figuratively, not really, called a bride, a house, a church. And it is misleading as it is wrong to make the figure a fact and build a theory on the perversion.

The Redeemed are Called Christ's Body

This image assumes the form or thought of a reality more frequently than any of the other collateral figures by which believers are pictured to the mind.

This word, like all others, has but one literal or ground meaning — a material organized substance. But it has many figurative applications, which are called definitions. One of these is a reality as opposed to representation, as "the shadows

of things to come, but the body is Christ."

Not that those shadows had a body — that is, a material substance by which a shadow was cast, but just as a shadow must have a substance to cause it, so Christ was the substance or cause of "the shadows of things to come," and as literally rendered "but the body is Christ."

But especially is this word used to describe the redeemed of all ages. We read in 1 Corinthians 12: "For as the body is one [that is, of course, the physical body] "and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also Christ is one."

Here is simply taught the oneness of Christ and His redeemed. The language is addressed to the members of the church of Corinth, "the sanctified in Christ Jesus." They were in Him and are therefore pictured as a complete body. But surely it is but a picture — a figurative application of the word body; and stripped of its figurative language is simply this: "All believers are one with Christ." But not a real universal body, no more than a real universal church.

The Apostle says: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." But first the Spirit does not literally baptize the believer; and secondly, we, cannot be literally immersed into a body, especially as it is a human, or real body, that is figured.

The body of the Lord Jesus is at the right hand of God. That glorious body is distinct from anything else in the universe. No being can become an actual or real part of it. It is impossible. And yet the believer is said to be a member of "His, body, His flesh, and His bones," and the redeemed are said to be a body of which He is (not the body itself), but the head. Surely any one who will exercise the reasoning power God has given him will see and know that "the aggregate of believers," or "elect of all ages," are not a BODY, are not the LORD'S BODY — that there is no such a body as that in all God's universe; but it is a figurative application of the word body, just as it is the figurative application of the term bride, or building, or vineyard, or city, or flock, or church.

The term MYSTICAL applied to body or church is also misleading. It is (to use an obsolete word) mystigological. It properly means "obscure," and then unrevealed, and then emblematical or figurative. It is in this last sense that it is applied to the body of Christ. We speak of the mystical body of Christ, we do not (or cannot properly) mean the Lord's body really, but something else which His glorified body represents. So that when we use, or see used, the term mystical before body or bride or church, let us at once understand that it is a supposed or figurative body — something that does not really exist at all — that is presented, but which is an illustrative picture of the redeemed of all ages.

In conclusion we hope to be pardoned for repeating with all the emphasis we can give, that:

A "church," like a body, is a literal, actual thing. It is a real assembly. To speak of a universal assembly or church — having the supposed functions or "notes" of it, as of a real literal church, is just as illogical and as unwarranted as to speak of the universal body having the supposed functions or "notes" of it as of a real literal body. Body when applied to the redeemed is a figure, not a reality. Church when applied to the redeemed is a figure, not a reality. There never has been in fact anything of the kind. A church is a company of baptized believers joined together for the service of God — a real, actual, veritable assembly, and nothing else is a church.

In view of these facts, and of the mischievous errors into which the perversion of the

meaning of church has led, surely when men of discrimination — teachers of the people — are speaking of the aggregate of believers, of all times and climes, and of all the elect of all ages, they should use these terms and not the misused words "UNIVERSAL CHURCH."

Is There a Catholic or Universal Church?

As an appendix to the foregoing article we affirm that there is no such a thing in existence as a catholic — that is, universal, church. Church means always an assembly. It means nothing else. If the persons supposed to constitute it have never assembled it is not an assembly or church. The thing is absurd. There cannot be a meeting until persons meet. There cannot be a convention till persons convene or come together. There cannot be a church until (to coin a word) persons are churchied, that is, assembled. There never was a universal assembly of professed Christians, or, as the expression is, the aggregate of believers on earth.

The term is not found anywhere in God's word. The inspired apostles use no term that is its equivalent. It is foreign to the New Testament. It has no real meaning.

The term is found in the so-called Apostle's creed. But while it is certain this was not composed until centuries after the apostolic age, it is also true that the word catholic was inserted in it long after it appeared, and change after change occurred in it till at length it assumed its present form, I believe in the Holy Catholic Church. The word is for the first time used, or found, in the very questionable epistles of Ignatius. In his supposed epistle to the Smyrneans he says: "Wherever the bishop (pastor) shall be seen let the people also be, as where Jesus Christ is there is the catholic church." Here it is evident it is a real assembly, a local church, the one body with its pastor worshipping at Smyrna, to which he refers. It was not a universal or supposed assembly, or the churches in Asia Minor, or the aggregate of believers; but the one real assembly or church. But it soon obtained a different meaning. The churches, as the apostles called them, were made or conceived to be one church — the church; and thus received the name catholic. Words govern things, and the word catholic has been a governing, a misleading word, prolific of soul-ruining error, and of terrible oppression.

The term catholic is affixed to some of the epistles, as Peter, John, James, and Jude. But no such word is found in any of the old manuscripts; and it is well known that the term was prefixed to them in the year 1549 by the famous French printer, Robert Stephens. It is rendered in King James' version "general" before these epistles; but is omitted in our revised version as unauthorized. () means universal. Catholic church means a universal church. We repeat there is no such thing. And the fact that the Philadelphia Confession of Faith adopts this word gives it no weight. For that confession says in its 31st article: "We believe that laying on of hands with prayer upon baptized believers as such is an ordinance of Christ, and ought to be submitted to by all such persons as are permitted to participate of the Lord's Supper." But Baptists never have been unanimous in regard to this. Danvers, shortly after the confession was issued, wrote a treatise in opposition to it. The Philadelphia Confession adopted it. But it has been almost universally abandoned. Indeed, Baptists have no authorized confessions. But though this London and Philadelphia Confession says, "The catholic church or universal church consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one in Christ," they affirm of these elect, that "they are called out of the world through the ministry of the word," and "Those Christ, called He commanded to walk together as particular churches." The members of these particular churches are saints by calling, "visibly manifesting and evidencing in and by their profession," "and willingly consent to

walk together according to the appointment of Christ."

So that while, as the confession says, "The catholic or universal church — the elect that ever have been, are, or shall be only with respect to the eternal work of the spirit and truth of grace — may be called universal, these elect are commanded to walk in particular societies or churches, visibly manifesting their call by walking together in their professed subjection to the ordinances of the gospel." Thus it is. Catholic church is all the elect; the elect are called to particular churches in subjection to the ordinances, and the only universality is "the internal work of the spirit " whose operation is as the viewless wind.

What is there in this resembling a positive, a real, a veritable universal church? — an assembly which never assembled? It is the "baseless fabric of a vision."

[Published in Christian Repository, September, 1899.]

Chapter XII - Elder J. M. Pendleton, D.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

James Madison Pendleton was born at Twyman's Store, Spottsylvania county, Virginia, November 20, 1811. His father was an admirer of President Madison, hence the middle name, Madison.

In the autumn of 1812 his father moved to Christian county, Kentucky. James was just one year old the day his father reached the neighborhood which was to be his future home.

James Pendleton's educational advantages in youth were limited, but notwithstanding his poor opportunities he became a most accurate Latin and Greek scholar, and his ability to write and speak pure English was marked. Few men have ever lived who could express themselves so clearly and forcibly as he.

The first school he attended was in a little log house in the neighborhood, with his father as teacher. His father was well educated for his day, but his education would now be considered entirely too limited for a school teacher. Pendleton, in his book, "Reminiscences of a Long Life," has given the following description of the school house and the school:

"It was built of rough logs, the chinks between which were imperfectly filled and daubed with red clay. There were no windows worthy of the name, but parts of logs were cut out to let in the light, and panes of glass were so adjusted as to keep out the cold. The floor was of dirt, and the chimney had a fireplace six feet wide and four feet deep. The benches were made of slabs, and those were the outside of sawed logs. There were no backs to the benches, and everything seemed to be so arranged as to keep the feet of small children from reaching the floor. This, though not so designed, was the refinement of cruelty. Not less than six hours a day were spent in school, and during that time the small children had no support for their backs and feet. I know of no epithet that can describe the injustice of this arrangement, and will say no more about it.

"I think I must have been nine or ten years old when I first went to school, though I had learned a little at home. I was required to devote especial attention to spelling and reading. Noah Webster's 'Spelling Book' was used, and when I got as far as 'Baker' I thought my progress considerable, but when at the end of the book I was able to spell and define from memory, 'Ail, to be troubled,' and 'Ale, malt liquor,' I supposed myself very near the farthest limit of scholarship. The course of reading embraced 'Murray's Introduction to the English Reader,' the 'Reader' itself, and then the 'Sequel' to it. No other book was read in the school. In due time Arithmetic, as far as the 'Rule of Three,' 'Geography and Grammar' were studied, but not thoroughly. My studies were often interrupted, for, when necessity required, I had to work on the farm."

This was the school and this was the manner in which J. M. Pendleton made his start!

James had the care for some time, David-like, of his father's sheep. One of the ewes died, leaving a lamb which was given to him, and he raised it, "feeding it milk with a spoon." When it grew up he sold it, and with the money bought a Bible, the first purchase of any kind he ever made. This was only an incident, but it looks like a prophecy of the future life of the man.

From earliest childhood he was taught to believe as true the statements of the Bible. He states in his Reminiscences that he never doubted in his life any of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. Besides this, there never was a time in his memory, before his conversion, that he did not fully intend to some day become a Christian. He fully resolved, at the age of fifteen years, to seek the salvation of his soul. His idea of salvation was to escape Hell. It never occurred to him that salvation was from Sin, not from Hell. The sense of his sins became more and more acute until he saw he was too great a sinner to make amends for what he had done. He plainly saw that he must have help or he would be lost. He then resolved to do his best and ask the Lord to supply his deficiency. The sense of his wickedness grew on him, and from reading the Bible he found that it would be just and right for God to refuse to save him and to let him perish in Hell. He could not understand how God could justly save him. He did not want to be saved at the expense of justice. How then could he be saved? Was there any way by which he could satisfy justice? Here I will use his own words:

"While in this state of mind I read a sermon by Rev. Samuel Davies from I Corinthians 1:22-24: 'For the Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness,' etc. This sermon, delivered in 1759, which I have recently read, is an excellent one, and Mr. Davies was an admirable sermonizer. In the discourse now referred to I was specially impressed with his remarks on the union of mercy and justice in the salvation of sinners through 'Christ crucified.' This was shown to be happily possible through the atoning death of Christ, whose obedience and blood 'magnified the law and made it honorable.' Having read this sermon I went into the forest to pray, and while kneeling by a tree I had new views of the way in which sinners could be saved. I saw that mercy could be exercised consistently with justice through Jesus Christ. I felt a lightness of heart to which I had been a stranger for about two years. Strange to say, the joy I felt was not on my personal account. I was glad that other sinners could be saved, but did not think of myself as a saved sinner. I knew faith in Christ was indispensable to salvation, but I ignorantly thought that to believe in Christ was to believe myself a Christian."

Converted! Saved! and that through the reading of a sermon! What a power is the consecrated printed page! Let writers of religious books take courage, and let the colporters and book agents magnify their office. J. M. Pendleton was converted by the reading of a sermon! If a soul is converted by the reading of one of the sermons in this book the author will be well paid for his work, for "there is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth."

On the second Sunday in April, 1829, at the age of eighteen years, he united with the Bethel Church, Christian county, Kentucky, and on the 14th day of the same month was baptized in the creek near the meeting house by Eld. Jno. S. Willson. Thus he began his Christian life by submitting to the "beautiful ordinance of baptism, which commemorates the burial and resurrection of Christ, symbolizes the believer's death to sin and his rising to a new life, while it anticipates the resurrection of the saints at the last day."

In February, 1830, at the age of nineteen years, he was licensed to preach by Bethel Church. His first efforts were miserable failures. He tried to teach a country school, and was asked to give it up by the directors, and he quit teaching and went home.

He attempted to preach his first sermon at West Union Church, in Christian county, near the line of Trigg county, Ky. He made a failure, and was advised by good brethren to give it up and quit trying. His own account of his first efforts is as

follows: "During the years 1831 and 1832 I accompanied different ministers on their preaching excursions. Sometimes they gave me an encouraging word, and .at other times what they said was not complimentary. One of them, in referring to my attempts to preach, said: 'You certainly could do better if you would try.' Another said: 'You are scarcely earning your salt.' The language of the third brother was: 'You say some pretty good things, but your preaching is neither adapted to comfort the saint nor alarm the sinner.'

"Of course those good men, now in heaven, did not know how depressing the effect of their words was, and how my spirit was crushed."

This was the start of J. M. Pendleton as a preacher. But he became the strongest preacher and writer, in some respects, that the Baptist denomination has produced, and he lives on after he is dead.

In 1831 he sought a higher education. He entered a private school at Russellville, Ky., and studied under Rev. Robert T. Anderson. He made a special effort to become proficient in Latin and He was kindly assisted by the brethren and sisters in Russellville as to his board, and by their assistance was enabled to spend ten months under so able a teacher as Anderson.

In 1833 he became a student in an academy at Hopkinsville, Ky., and prosecuted his studies under James D. Rumsey, who was a fine classical scholar. During this year he was pastor of Bethel church for half time at a salary of one hundred dollars a year, and he also preached for the Hopkinsville church for half time at a salary of one hundred dollars a year. This enabled him to pay his board and buy his books and pay tuition and keep himself well clothed while he sought a higher education.

While in this situation he preached every Sunday and two Saturdays in the month, making ten sermons a month, and recited his lessons five days in the week. It was more work than any man ought to do, but out of such conditions come great men. During the first year at Hopkinsville he was ordained to the full work of a gospel preacher. It was on November 2, 1833.

After spending three years in school at Hopkinsville, during which time he preached every Sunday, he was called, in 1836, to the care of the church in Bowling Green, Ky. He began his labors in Bowling Green, Jan. 1, 1837, and continued as pastor for twenty years, with the exception of a few months that he preached in Russellville, Ky. His salary for a number of years in Bowling Green was four hundred dollars a year, and that was the largest salary paid to any preacher in all that part of the State.

His labors in Bowling Green were blessed in the conversion of souls, and the church became one of the strongest, and continues to be one of the strongest, churches in the South. While in this pastorate he had the assistance of the celebrated J. R. Graves in a protracted meeting which stirred the whole town and resulted in seventy-five additions to the church by baptism. At this meeting a friendship began between Pendleton and Graves which lasted as long as they lived. Pendleton became a regular contributor of the Tennessee Baptist, and thus began his career as newspaper and book writer.

Dr. Pendleton was in the organization of the first General Association of Kentucky in October, 1837, and was made one of the secretaries of the body. He was married on March 13, 1838, to Miss Catherine S. Garnett, and was permitted to live with this excellent woman for over fifty years, and she survived him. Their devotion to each other was beautiful.

The other pastorates held by Dr. Pendleton were for five years in Hamilton, Ohio, and for eighteen years in Upland, Penn. He also preached two or three years in Murfreesboro, Tenn. In every pastorate his work was successful and he gave eminent satisfaction to his people, unless it was at Hamilton, Ohio, which, probably, was a comparative failure.

Dr. Pendleton is well known as a Landmark Baptist — some even charge him with being the father of Landmarkism, but that is not true, since Landmarkism is as old as the Baptists, although it was not named until Pendleton wrote his book on "An Old Landmark Reset." His influence was widely felt, and but few men have made a more lasting or, more wholesome impression on the Baptists than he.

Dr. Pendleton was a great writer, and he states that he used the greatest care in whatever he wrote and that he never revised any of his manuscripts. He says : "I may have carried this thing to a greater length than most writers, for I have written nothing a second time. All my books have been written once and then printed." This constant care in composition made him a powerful writer — a model for simplicity and force.

During the years, beginning with January, 1857, just preceding the civil war, he was Professor of Theology in Union University, now located at Jackson, Tenn., and known as the Southwestern Baptist University. This great school was then located at Murfreesboro, Tenn. While he was teaching theology in the school he served the Murfreesboro church as pastor.

The war drove him to the North, as he was a strong Union man. He was not an Abolitionist, but he was an Emancipationist. The difference between an Abolitionist and an Emancipationist was that the Abolitionist was in favor of setting the Negroes free at once, while the Emancipationist favored a system that would gradually free the Negroes. This would avoid revolution and give the people time to adjust themselves to the great change. But his views were hateful to the Southern people and it was not safe for him to remain in Tennessee, and he therefore made his way to the North and that led to his pastorates in Ohio and at Upland, Penn.

Pendleton was not noted as a revivalist. He was a great teacher — a seed sower, while other men reaped where he had sown. Yet he was blessed with the conversion of hundreds of souls under his preaching, and a few times he held great protracted meetings.

The most notable revival under his ministry was in Upland, Penn. This meeting lasted two months; he preached every night in the week except Saturday night, and for nine Sundays in succession there was baptizing in that church and there were two hundred additions to the church.

At the age of seventy-one years he resigned the care of the Upland church. During the last year of his ministry there, with no ministerial assistance, he baptized over forty converts. This fact teaches us that an old man may be an effective preacher and pastor and that long pastorates are generally the best.

During his stay at Upland he did most of his work as the author of Denominational books. He also served on the Committee of Publications of the American Baptist Publication Society, and it was his duty to read the manuscripts submitted to the Society for publication and decide whether the manuscript was worth publishing. This work required a great deal of his time. He says, in his Reminiscences, that, "I can safely say that I read ten thousand pages of manuscript, and I often wished that some persons could write more legibly."

We are indebted to Dr. Pendleton for the following excellent books: "An Old Landmark Reset," which has reached a circulation of about sixty thousand copies. It is a small pamphlet and is published at the close of this sketch. "Three Reasons Why I Am a Baptist," which has reached a circulation of about fifty thousand copies. "Church Manual" has become a standard Baptist work, and not less than fifty thousand have been sold. "Distinctive Baptist Doctrines" has reached a good circulation, though not so large as it deserves. "Christian Doctrines or a Compendium of Theology " is a most valuable book and has had a wide circulation and is still selling well. He lived to see eleven thousand copies circulated, and since his death as many more have been sold. In 1883 he wrote a brief commentary on the New Testament, beginning with Acts. Dr. Geo. W. Clark wrote a brief commentary on the Gospels, and the works of the two were published in one volume by the Publication Society under the title of "Brief Notes on the New Testament." This is a very helpful book for Bible students. "The Atonement of Christ" was written in 1885 and has had only a small circulation, but it is a strong book and well worth reading. In 1886 the Publication Society issued his "Notes on Sermons," which in fact are well arranged short sermons. This book has had as wide a circulation as such books usually have.

After his resignation at Upland he came South, and, after visiting in Bowling Green, Ky., and at Austin, Tex., and in Nashville, Tenn., and then back to Upland, Penn., he settled for the remainder of his days at Bowling Green, where he wrote, just three months before his death, his "Reminiscences of a Long Life," which was published by the Baptist Book Concern. During this time of visiting among his children at the places mentioned, he wrote constantly for the Baptist periodicals. He was never idle.

In Bowling Green, Ky., he was taken sick, and the doctors pronounced his sickness unto death. He talked of death calmly. Some of his death bed testimony is worth preserving.

He said: "I just expect to go into eternity, saying, Lord, here I am, a poor, weak, sinful creature, having no claim, and the only hope of being saved is that Jesus Christ died in the place of sinners." Again: "I believe what I did sixty years ago, just exactly." " My prayers have been that my descendants to the remotest generations may be found among the servants of God." "You may say that I have never had the first regret that I devoted myself to the ministry." "My object has been to be an accomplished debater, claiming nothing unjust, yielding to nothing unjust."

On the fourth day of March, 1891, he closed his eyes in death, in his eighty-first year. He died as he had lived, a Landmark Baptist. He stated in his Reminiscences, page 104, that he did not think his position on that question had ever been answered, and that he was of the same opinion in 1891, the year of his death, as he was in 1855, the time he wrote it.

He was laid to rest in the cemetery at Bowling Green, Ky., March 6; Eld. T. T. Eaton, D.D., conducted the funeral exercises in the Baptist Church. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." (Psalm 116:15.)

"O, sweet is the season of rest,
When life's weary journey is done,
When the blush spreads over its West,
And the last lingering rays of the sun.
"Though dreary the empire of night,
I soon shall emerge from its gloom,

And see immortality's light
Arise on the shades of the tomb."

I became a regular contributor to the Tennessee Baptist, a weekly sheet published in Nashville, J. R. Graves, editor. I wrote on various subjects and was requested to write several articles on this question: "Ought Baptists to Recognize Pedobaptist Preachers as Gospel Ministers?" I answered in the negative, and wrote four articles which were afterward published in pamphlet form under the title, "An Old Landmark Re-set." Bro. Graves furnished the title, for he said the "Old Landmark" once stood, but had fallen, and needed to be re-set. So much for the name. This tract had a wide circulation, for the copy now before me has on the title page the words, "Fortieth Thousand." - J. M. Pendleton, Reminiscences of A Long Life, 1891, pp. 103-4.

An Old Landmark Reset Ought Baptist to Invite Pedobaptists to Preach in Their Pulpits?

By J. M. Pendleton, D. D.

In the discussion of this question opinions which have originated from our feelings and partialities should, as far as possible, be discarded. An honest and an earnest desire to know the truth should gain ascendancy of the heart; for then there will be a willingness to adopt the conclusions to which the truth leads. "Buy the truth and sell it not," is the language of reason as well as revelation. There is no advantage in error. So far from it, it is mischievous, hurtful, pernicious. A false principle in science operates injuriously until its unsoundness is detected. An error committed in laying the foundation of a government diffuses its influence throughout the superstructure reared on that foundation. Error can never be harmless, and even should it be apparently so, it is owing to the counteracting presence and operation of truth. There is no truth so important as that which God has revealed in his word. All other truth yields to the superior value of truth divine. The injunction — "Buy the truth and sell it not" — is eminently wise. The truth is a jewel of such transcendent worth that it ought to be bought at any price and sold at no price. Let him who secures this jewel retain it. Let him not consider its alienation from him a possible thing. Let life be surrendered rather.

The question, Ought Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers? must receive either an affirmative or negative answer. It does not admit an ambiguous response. The truth is in the affirmative or negative. And the writer will aim to show that truth requires the question to be answered negatively. Some, perhaps, will say there is great uncharitableness in my object, and that nothing but bigotry could prompt me to attempt the execution of such an object. Others in their sudden astonishment will probably say, "He is beside himself." And others still may exclaim, "He is throwing himself beyond the circumference of the sympathies of all evangelical denominations." "But none of these things move me." "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of man's judgment: he that judgeth me is the Lord."

To present the subject as impressively as possible, and especially to propitiate Pedobaptists to a calm examination of it, I avail myself of some extracts from the

celebrated letter of Dr. Griffin on "Open Communion."* Dr. G. was for many years the distinguished President of Williams College. No Pedobaptist Rabbi of New England had a more enviable reputation. He died beloved and lamented. In his letter he says:

"I agree with the advocates for close communion in two points: **1.** That baptism is the initiatory ordinance which introduces us into the visible church; of course, where there is no baptism there are no visible churches. **2.** That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and, of course, are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians. Should a pious Quaker so far depart from his principles as to wish to commune with me at the Lord's table, while he yet refused to be baptized, I could not receive him; because there is such a relationship established between the ordinances that I have no right to separate them; in other words, I have no right to send the sacred elements out of the church. The only question then is, whether those associations of evangelical Christians that call themselves churches, and that practice sprinkling, are real churches of Christ; in other words, whether baptism by sprinkling is valid baptism.

"If nothing but immersion is baptism, there is no visible church except among the Baptists. But certainly God has owned other associations of Christians as churches. He has poured his Spirit out upon them in their assemblies, and what is more decisive, at the table of the Lord; and has communed with them, and built them up by means of that ordinance, which, were they not churches, it would be profanity to approach.

"What is a church? It is a company of believers, in covenant with God, essentially organized according to the gospel, holding the essential doctrines, and practicing the essential duties. If you demand more, you may not find a church on earth."

It is seen from the foregoing that Dr. Griffin fully admits that "where there is no baptism there are no visible churches." This is the belief of Baptists. Indeed, the declaration may be considered a scriptural axiom. We can reason from it. He says: "The only question then is, whether those associations of evangelical Christians that call themselves churches, and that practice sprinkling, are real churches of Christ." This is the question, plain to those who wish to understand it, but Dr. G. gives it a simplifying touch, and makes it too plain to be misunderstood. He brings the whole matter into this narrow compass — "whether baptism by sprinkling is valid baptism."

No one who deserves the name of Baptist will hesitate to answer, NO. I use Dr. G.'s expression, fully aware of the solecism couched in the phrase, "baptism by sprinkling." It is as philologically objectionable as the phrase, immersion by sprinkling.

It is the universal belief of Baptists that the action of sprinkling or pouring, so far from being baptism, does not bear the remotest resemblance to it. They cannot imagine how any analogy can be detected even with the aid of a theological microscope. Robert Hall, who is considered a liberal Baptist, and whose argument for "mixed communion" is an ingenious web of magnificent sophistry, endorses immersion as the only baptismal action. He communed with Pedobaptists with the express understanding that he believed them unbaptized. And if he so regarded them every other Baptist certainly does.

"The only question," says Dr. Griffin, "is, whether baptism by sprinkling is valid baptism." It would be very easy to show that it is not, were this the time and place

* *This letter may be seen in J. G. Fuller's work on Communion, pp.243-249.*

to enter into an investigation of the matter. However, this is unnecessary; for the object of the writer is not so much to convince Pedobaptists that they are in error, as to fasten on Baptists the conviction that they ought not to countenance that error.

Dr. Griffin concedes that if sprinkling is not baptism Pedobaptist organizations are not visible churches of Christ; for, says he, "where there is no baptism there are no visible churches." From this premise, laid down with admirable clearness and candor, every Baptist is irresistibly and inevitably led to the conclusion that there are no visible churches of Christ among Pedobaptists. To show that I do not misconceive or misrepresent Dr. Griffin's view, I again quote the following: "If nothing but immersion is baptism, there is no visible church except among the Baptists." "Nothing but immersion is baptism," say the Baptists of Asia, Europe, Africa, and the isles of the sea, while in America, from Maine to California, the same declaration is made beside a thousand streams, filling the valleys with its delightful echoes, and making the hills vocal with its triumphant reverberations. Baptists must, therefore, Dr. G. being judge, look alone among themselves for visible churches of Christ.

The unwarranted substitution of sprinkling for baptism of itself invalidates the claim of Pedobaptist societies to be considered churches of Christ. But there is another fact which renders that claim utterly worthless. It is the element of infant membership in those societies. Why is the distinctive epithet Pedobaptist applied to them? Because they practice what is called infant baptism. They seem, in the judgment of Baptists, at least, to make a specific effort to subvert the foundation principles of New Testament church organization. They introduce unconscious infants into their churches falsely so-called — thus practically superseding the necessity of personal repentance, faith and regeneration in order to membership. If it were the object of Pedobaptists to thwart the purposes and the plan of Jesus Christ in reference to the organic structure of his churches, I cannot conceive how they could do so more effectually than by making infant membership the predominant element of their organizations. It is the predominant element. This arises from the well-known fact which secures an increase of population, namely, that there are more children than parents. How then can it come within the limits of the wildest possibility for a Pedobaptist society to be a church of Christ, when the infant enters more largely than the adult element into its composition? True, the members of such a society say they are in favor of believers' baptism. This, however, is a mistake. It is transparent sophistry. For let the sprinkled infant become an adult and believe on Jesus Christ— then when Baptists insist on the baptism of such a believer, behold Pedobaptists wish the sprinkling of the unconscious infant to be received instead of the baptism of the believer! Yet, they say, they are in favor of the baptism of believers! Greatly in favor of it, truly! They allow the sprinkling of a babe to supersede the baptism of an accountable agent! And they know, too, that if their principles should universally prevail, the baptism of believers would be banished from the world. It would become an obsolete thing. There would be only a historical knowledge of it.

Pedobaptists, then, so far as an overwhelming majority of their subjects of baptism is concerned, have no baptism. They have improper subjects, even if the action were right. But the action is wrong. They sprinkle or pour water, refusing to do what Christ commanded. This remark applies to the great body of Pedobaptists. Some of them, it is true, will immerse rather than lose valuable accessions to their societies. But the opposition to immersion is becoming very decided. May the day soon come when Pedobaptist societies shall universally refuse to practice it. Then the parties in the baptismal controversy will stand in their proper places.

If Pedobaptists fail to exemplify the precepts of the New Testament in reference to the subjects and the action of baptism, they have no churches among them. They

have their organizations, but they are not gospel organizations. It will be said that there are good, pious men among Pedobaptists. This is cheerfully conceded, but it proves nothing as to the evangelical nature of those organizations. There are good, pious men in Masonic Lodges, Bible Societies, Temperance Societies, and Colonization Societies; but Masonic Lodges, Bible Societies, Temperance Societies, and Colonization Societies are not churches of Christ. Nor are Pedobaptist societies.

In this day of spurious liberality and false charity much is said about evangelical denominations and evangelical churches. What is an evangelical denomination? A denomination whose faith and practice correspond with the gospel. What is an evangelical church? A church formed according to the New Testament model. Pedobaptist denominations, therefore, are not evangelical. Pedobaptist churches, as they are called, are not evangelical. There is supposed to be a wonderful virtue in the epithet evangelical. It is used as a balm for many a wound, as a plaster for many a sore. Its application to a denomination is thought to bring the denomination at once within the pale of respectability and fellowship. It is used with injurious latitude of meaning. It gives currency to many doctrines and practices which deserve emphatic condemnation. "Evangelical Alliances," so called, may, for aught I know, have done some good work; but there is danger lest they infuse greater vitality and energy into the errors of those who enter the co-partnership. The religious nomenclature of the age requires serious revision. It is high time to call things by names expressive of their properties. The language of Ashdod should not be heard within the precincts of Zion. Nor should the language of Zion be employed in describing what belongs to Ashdod. More, perhaps, is meant by "the form of sound words" than most persons imagine. But to return from this apparent parent digression.

If Pedobaptist societies are not churches of Christ, whence do their ministers derive their authority to preach? Is there any scriptural authority to preach which does not come through a church of Christ? And if Pedobaptist ministers are not in Christian churches, have they any right to preach? That is to say, have they any authority according to the gospel? They are doubtless authorized by the forms and regulations of their respective societies. But do they act under evangelical authority? It is perfectly evident to the writer that they do not. It would be strange indeed for them to act under a commission, some of the injunctions of which they utterly disregard. The ordinance of baptism in its action and subject they pervert. They change the order of the ascending Saviour's last commission, and administer what they call baptism to infants who give no proof of discipleship, and who are naturally incapable of going through the process of discipleship. Are we at liberty to bid those men "God speed" and aid them in deceiving the world, by acknowledging their societies as churches, and themselves as veritable gospel ministers, who invert the order established by the Head of the church?

Would Pedobaptists recognize as a minister of Christ a good man whom they consider unbaptized, and consequently disconnected from what they would term every "branch of the church?" They would not. They would say to such a man, "We would not judge your heart — we do not deny your piety, etc., but we cannot countenance you as a preacher as long as you remain unbaptized and sustain no ecclesiastical relation." This is in substance what they would say, and I ask if Baptists should not look on Pedobaptist ministers just as the latter would look on unbaptized men who might choose to go forth and preach? If Pedobaptists are unwilling to recognize as ministers of the gospel men who, in their judgment, have never been baptized, why should Baptists be expected to do so? Consistency, so far from requiring it, requires the very opposite. Pedobaptists cannot reasonably complain of

us, for in this we act on the principle which their practice sanctions. Believing their preachers unbaptized, we cannot with the shadow of propriety recognize them as gospel ministers. If Jesus Christ intended that his ministers should be the servants of the church — and have the sanction of the church in their work — who can be a minister of Christ, according to the gospel, without belonging to the church? No one will say that a church can send forth a man to preach who does not belong to her body, and over whom she has no jurisdiction. The writer does not say there are not pious, devoted men in the Pedobaptist ministry, but he denies that they have scriptural authority to preach. He denies in reference to them just what they would deny in reference to a pious Quaker minister. The so-called baptism of a Pedobaptist preacher is no more authority for preaching than the no-baptism of a Quaker. The former is as evidently out of the church as the latter. It is as well to discard an ordinance altogether as to pervert and caricature it. Neither Pedobaptists nor Quakers have baptism among them, and "where there is no baptism there are no visible churches."

Now, if Pedobaptist preachers do not belong to the church of Christ, they ought not to be recognized as ministers of Christ. But they are so recognized wherever Baptist ministers invite them to preach or exchange pulpits with them. As to calling on them to pray, it is a different matter; for men ought to pray whether they are in the church or not.* But they ought not to preach unless they have membership in the church of Christ. To this all will agree, who have scriptural baptism, as well as those who substitute it for that which is no baptism. Baptists and Pedobaptists differ materially. Their views are totally dissimilar as to the design of baptism, the elements that enter into the composition of a gospel church, the form of government, etc. These differences are by no means nonessential; but a recognition of Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers is a virtual proclamation of their non essentiality. The people so understand it. They are ready to say that there can be no material differences between the views of ministers who exchange pulpits and perform other acts of ministerial recognition. And thus the custom of exchanging pulpits, originating, as it probably did, in the excess of an unscriptural charity, has a tendency to obliterate the line of demarcation between truth and error. Many a man no doubt has become a Pedobaptist because Baptists have so acted as to make the impression that there is no great difference between them and their opponents. Alas, that there are some Baptists whose disposition to compromise with adversaries leads them to act as if they were not only ashamed of their distinctive principles, but wished everybody else to be. I am heartily ashamed of such Baptists.

If it is not absurd to suppose such a thing, let it be supposed that there were persons in the apostolic times corresponding to modern Pedobaptists. Can any Baptists believe that Paul, beholding the practices of such persons — seeing the sprinkling of infants substituted for the immersion of believers — would recognize the ministers of such sects as ministers of Christ, acting according to the gospel? Surely not. Paul would have protested against such a caricature of the Christian system. He would have said to such ministers, "Will ye not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The great apostle would have done nothing that could have been construed into a connivance at error. And why should Baptists now?

* But to invite them into our pulpits to pray, is to recognize them before the world as gospel ministers, since custom consecrates the pulpit to acknowledged gospel ministers, and therefore, when we act with them in a ministerial capacity, speak of them as gospel ministers, or receive their acts as those of gospel ministers, we plainly and "more loudly than with trumpets," proclaim them gospel ministers, and consequently their societies as gospel churches and if so why not, commune with them? - J. R. Graves.

We have reasons "to thank God and take courage" that our number in the United States is now over 4,000,000 members, and that it is constantly increasing. But would we not have been much more numerous than we are if we had had no more religious intercourse with Pedobaptists than in the days of the persecution in Virginia and Massachusetts? There cannot be a rational doubt of it. All compromises with Pedobaptists have been disadvantageous to Baptists, and they will always be. These dishonorable compromises have ever involved an implied understanding that Baptists were not to preach the whole truth on the subject of baptism. The teachings of the New Testament on this subject are held in abeyance. No man, it is true, can preach the whole gospel and leave baptism out; but in these Union Meetings it is thought best to leave it out for the sake of harmonious cooperation. It is to be hoped that the day of these Union Meetings is passed away, never to return. It is time for it to be understood that Baptists and Pedobaptists can not "walk together," because they are not "agreed." The impossibility of "walking together" without agreement was recognized in the days of the prophets, and why should there be a vain effort to make an impossibility then a possibility now? Every such effort is unwise, and involves on the part of Baptists a sacrifice of principle.

It is often said by Pedobaptists that Baptists act inconsistently in inviting their ministers to preach with them, while they fail to recognize them at the Lord's table. I acknowledge the inconsistency. It is a flagrant inconsistency. No one ought to deny it. Booth, in his "Vindication of the Baptists from the charge of Bigotry in refusing to commune with Pedobaptists at the Lord's table," does not and cannot refute this charge of inconsistency. It defies refutation, and the only way to dispose of it is to take away the foundation on which it rests. Let Baptists cease to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as ministers of the gospel, by inviting them to preach, and the charge of inconsistency will be heard no more.

Our refusal to commune with Pedobaptists grows out of the fact that they are unbaptized, and out of the church. We say they have no right to commune as unbaptized persons. Pedobaptists, however, have as much right to commune unbaptized as they have to preach unbaptized. That is to say, they have no right to do either. The Baptist argument on "Communion" possesses great power, but it is paralyzed whenever Pedobaptists can say, "You invite our ministers to your pulpits, but you do not invite us to commune with you." Let Baptists repudiate the inconsistency that most of them have been guilty of for half a century, and then their Defense of Close Communion will be perfectly triumphant. It will stand a tower of strength, against which Pedobaptists will vainly turn their artillery. No Baptist who recognizes Pedobaptist preachers as ministers will ever write a consistent Treatise on Communion. It is high time for all our brethren to know this. Consistency requires that while we fail to invite Pedobaptists to the Lord's table, we should not maintain ministerial intercourse with their preachers.

And another thing follows: The official acts of Pedobaptist preachers have no validity in them. Their falsely so-called baptisms are a nullity — their ordinances are a nullity. Immersions administered by them ought to be repudiated by Baptists. How is it? Pedobaptist ministers are not in the visible kingdom of Christ. How then can they induct others into it by baptism? Can they introduce others where they have not gone themselves? Would it not be a violation of all governmental analogies to allow those to act as officers of a kingdom who are not citizens of that kingdom? It may be argued that in case of necessity an irregular act is not an invalid act. As to immersions by Pedobaptist preachers there is no necessity, and never was. There are Baptist ministers enough to administer baptism, and they love to do it. It is high time for those who ridicule immersion and yet perform it rather than lose a valuable

member, to be discountenanced. They deserve the contempt of all honorable men. They are willing, for selfish and sectarian purposes, to perform an act in the name of the Sacred Three, and yet make light of that act! Such men I leave in the hands of a merciful God.

I have now attempted to establish the position that Baptists ought not to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers. Whether I have accomplished my object, I leave for others to say. In conclusion I will notice some of the objections which will probably be urged against the view here presented. Pedobaptists will say, This doctrine repels us from our "Baptist brethren." The time has been when this would have been a recommendation of, rather than an objection to, the doctrine. In other days repulsion from, was considered more desirable than attraction to, "Baptist brethren." The sentiment was once fearfully prevalent that Baptists were more worthy of prison, fagots and death, than of pulpits and communion tables. What country has not witnessed their martyr-sufferings? What soil has not been stained with their blood? They have been persecuted by Rome Pagan and by Rome Papal; for the latter inherited all the cruelty of the former. Rome has ever found FIRE her most effectual argument.

In the early part of the sixteenth century the light of Luther's Reformation began to dawn on Europe, and Baptists probably began to flatter themselves that the days of their persecution were ended. But this was not so. Luther was not their friend — Zwingli thought them worthy of death — and the true idea of religious liberty never penetrated Calvin's mind. These eminent Reformers were in several respects more nearly allied to Romanists than to Baptists.

And who does not know that Protestant England has had a prominent agency in the work of persecution? Who does not remember the inhuman saying of Rogers at the burning of a Baptist? "Burning alive," said he, "was no cruel death, but easy enough."

It seems from testimony not to be disputed* that Edward Wightman was the last person "that suffered this cruel kind of death [burning] in England; and it may be remarked that William Sawtre, the first that suffered in that manner for his religious opinions, was supposed to have denied infant baptism so that this sect had the honor both of leading the way, and bringing up the rear of all the martyrs who were burnt alive in England, as well as that, a great number of those who suffered this death for their religion, in the two hundred years between, were of this denomination."

This is Pedobaptist testimony, and let it speak for itself.

Who has not read the story of Baptist suffering in the Colony of Virginia before the Revolution? There are persons now alive whose ancestors preached through prison grates in that renowned Commonwealth. And the sterile soil of Massachusetts has been enriched with Baptist blood. Puritans shed it—men who braved the dangers of the deep that they might enjoy religious liberty. This is perhaps the most paradoxical fact recorded in history. The Revolution established the principle of religious liberty, and since then Baptists have so risen in the scale of respectability that sects, which once looked on them with disdain, now court alliance with them. Beware, Baptists, beware. Whipping and fining and imprisonment are not the only methods by which you can be injured. There is the embrace of apparent love which is the embrace of

* See the *"Religious World Displayed,"* vol. 3, p. 66. By Rev. Robert Adam, Minister of the Church of England.

death. Error loves to ally itself with truth and the interests of truth suffer by every such alliance.

It will probably be said the position of the author of this treatise is in conflict with the charity of the gospel. If so, "it is a grievous fault." There is no term used more frequently than charity—there is none more strangely misunderstood. A man of charity is generally supposed to possess what are termed "liberal principles," and those who have these liberal principles, in nine cases out of ten, have no fixed principles at all. Charity rejoiceth IN THE TRUTH." That is a spurious charity which does not recognize truth as a jewel of priceless value. It is a misfortune that the severance of truth and charity has ever been considered a possible thing.

True charity will prompt Baptists not to connive at the errors of Pedobaptists, but to protest perpetually against those errors. And this is done most effectually by a decided advocacy of the truth and an emphatic condemnation of whatever militates against it. How can Baptists utter a consistent, sensible, effective protest against the many errors of Pedobaptism if they recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers? It cannot be done. But a refusal to recognize them in this capacity is an impressive condemnation of their errors. True charity prompts this course.

Some faint-hearted Baptists may say that if the sentiment advocated by the writer is made practical it will bring great unpopularity and odium on the Baptist denomination. This objection is scarcely worthy of consideration. The question refers not to unpopularity and odium, but to right and truth. What is right? is the inquiry. What does a jealous maintenance of truth demand of us? Popularity is a bauble, dependent for its existence on the capricious direction public opinion takes. Jesus our Saviour was unpopular. His doctrines were unpopular. The first Christians were unpopular. We shall have illustrious predecessors in unpopularity. And the advantage of our consistency will more than neutralize the disadvantages of unpopularity.

Odium! What Baptist is afraid of odium? If our people are not yet familiarized with it they ought to be; for the very day Paul was taken a prisoner to Rome our sect "was everywhere spoken against." There has been time enough and opportunity enough from then until now to learn to bear odium patiently. We see the law of adaptation illustrated all around us. Light is adapted to the eye — sound to the ear — birds to the air — fishes to the water and Baptists to odium. There is no cause of complaint.]

It will probably be said that the tendency of these views will be to interfere with the social relations of neighborhoods and communities. The writer thinks otherwise. Why should there be any rupture of social ties? There is no necessity for it. I will illustrate: The officers of Masonic lodges are not invited into Odd Fellows halls and vice versa. This is no interference with the social relations of the two orders.

Episcopal preachers do not recognize the preachers of other denominations as gospel ministers, nor do I know that the social relations of neighborhoods are affected thereby. There is no good reason why they should be. I would have Baptists, as neighbors and citizens, to exemplify every social virtue; but let them not do that which will inevitably be construed into a connivance at what they deem material errors. The question of questions must be, WHAT IS RIGHT? AND THEY MUST DARE TO DO RIGHT, LET CONSEQUENCES BE AS THEY MAY.

Of Reformers, ALIAS Campbellites, I have said nothing, because, as they reject infant baptism, they cannot be placed in the same class with Pedobaptists. Important arguments, conclusive against the latter, would be without force or pertinency in their application to the former. I take it for granted that ministerial and religious intercourse between Baptists and Campbellites would be utterly unjustifiable. They

differ fundamentally in their views of repentance, faith, regeneration, justification, the influence of the Holy Spirit, the design of baptism, etc., etc. They are not "agreed," and they cannot walk together. An attempt to do so would involve deep hypocrisy and a culpable sacrifice of principle.

If, for the sentiments presented in this treatise, the author should be stigmatized as a bigot, while the justice of the charge is positively denied, he is willing, if need be, to wear the stigma till death shall efface it.

APPENDIX

The doctrine of the "Old Landmark" has been written against and repudiated by able men. If the many efforts that have been made to prove it false have been unsuccessful, the fact of itself furnishes prima facie evidence that it is true. This little treatise has certainly undergone a severe scrutiny. By some objectors its leading views have been emphatically condemned; by others they, have been virtually sanctioned, though the author's conclusions from those views have been disavowed. I ought, perhaps, to feel myself complimented that so many distinguished Doctors have considered the "Landmark" worthy of their consideration. Drs. Waller, Burrows, Cossett, Hill, Lynd and Everts have employed their pens against it, while Prof. Farnam has had no small share in the discussion. I know of no gentleman more worthy than he of the title LL.D. Others have written against the "Landmark" to whom I shall not refer particularly, because their objections will be met in the response to the individuals named, and because some of them have written over fictitious signatures.

It will be remembered that the "Landmark" was first published in the Tennessee Baptist, and when about to be issued in pamphlet form it was advertised with other productions under the caption of New Issues. Nothing was meant by the phrase, "New Issues," except new publications. I refer to this little matter that the reader may fully understand the allusions of Dr. Waller in the Western Recorder, September 20, 1854. Referring to the views presented in the "Landmark" he says: "These views are something new under the sun. They are published as 'New Issues.' They are not the sentiments of those Baptists who, in the dark days of Popery and persecution, are now regarded as the witnesses of the truth, when the whole world 'wondered after the beast.' The Baptists who, in England, when Presbyterianism had the ascendancy, and who were sent to dungeons and to death because they were Baptists, it is well known never taught such doctrine. Nor did the Baptists of New England, nor the Baptists of Virginia, when persecuted in every way that ingenuity could invent or malice could inflict, by Puritan and Episcopalian bigotry, assert these 'new issues.'"

Dr. W. died in about one month after writing the foregoing. He never had an opportunity to explain some things which need explanation, and to enlarge on some points which certainly require amplification. It is useless now to conjecture what he would have written had he lived. There can be no reasonable doubt that the work of demolishing the "Landmark" would have been committed chiefly to his hands. His success in that work would have been another matter.

What are the "views" contained in the "Landmark?" That Pedobaptist societies are not gospel churches and that Baptists should not, therefore, recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers. It is strange if these "views" were not entertained by Baptists in the dark age of Popery. "Were the opposite views entertained? Was it then believed that the Pedobaptist societies were gospel churches? Where is the evidence? Were Pedobaptist preachers then recognized as gospel ministers? Where is

the proof? Had Dr. W. lived he would no doubt have sought for the proof, but he would, I imagine, have sought in vain.

It is stranger still if the English Baptists when "Presbyterianism had the ascendancy" and consigned them "to dungeons and to death BECAUSE THEY WERE BAPTISTS," were opposed to the views set forth in the "Landmark." Presbyterian preachers, be it known, had much to do in instigating the persecution which drove Baptists into "dungeons," etc., and did those Baptists recognize those preachers as gospel ministers? Did they while musing in prison feel reconciled to their lot because members of gospel churches had decreed that lot? Were their chains less galling because fastened on them by order of the members of a so-called EVANGELICAL church? When they were "sent to death because they were Baptists," (Dr. W. intimates no other reason) did the fires burn less severely because they were EVANGELICALLY kindled? Did those Baptists say the men who have instigated this persecuting policy and deem us fit for the stake Simply BECAUSE WE ARE BAPTISTS, are gospel ministers, and it mitigates the agonies of death to know that they are inflicted with the approbation of the members of gospel churches! I venture to say such views as these never alleviated the excruciating pains of a Baptist martyr.

But it is strangest of it all if, when Baptists of New England and Virginia were "persecuted in every way that ingenuity could invent or malice inflict," they considered their persecutors members of gospel churches, and the most influential of them gospel ministers! Can credulity itself believe this?

Did those Baptists in New England who were whipped until the blood ran from their lacerated backs to the ground say that it was all done in accordance with the wishes of an EVANGELICAL church? Dr. W.'s grandfather preached through the grates of a Virginia prison. "Episcopalian bigotry" would not allow him to preach elsewhere, and was unwilling for him to preach there. Did that persecuted man of God look on Episcopalians as "a branch of the church of Christ?" No, he regarded the Episcopal hierarchy as a part and parcel of Babylon the great. How could the persecuted Baptists of Virginia recognize the "parsons" of the "Old Dominion" as gospel ministers To me it is inconceivable.

Dr. Waller, to make out a strong case, insists that Baptists when suffering the most cruel persecutions have recognized Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers — have so recognized them when those preachers have had a prominent agency in the work of persecution. I dissent emphatically from this view, but suppose I were to concede, for argument's sake, what Dr. W. contended for. What then? I would urge most strenuously that such a belief on the part of Baptists would have prevented all the persecutions they ever suffered from so-called evangelical Pedobaptists.

Why were they persecuted by Pedobaptists? Because they could not conform to views and practices of Pedobaptists. They were punished for nonconformity. Why could not they conform? And why? Because they did not consider Pedobaptist societies gospel churches, and did not recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers. They saw not in Pedobaptist organizations the elements of which a New Testament church is composed. They saw in every such organization a departure from the teachings of Christ — a departure which they could not sanction, even though their blood was the price to be paid for their refusal to do so. But they could have sanctioned anything they deemed evangelical — they could have fraternized with any preachers they considered set apart to the ministry according to the gospel. The very fact that Baptists have been persecuted by Pedobaptists proves that there are material and fundamental differences between them.

Would the latter have persecuted the former for differences considered immaterial?

Would the former have submitted to the persecution of the latter for unimportant differences! Surely not. They would have yielded all points of difference had they been considered nonessential. On the other hand, the persecuted Baptists regarded the views and practices of the Pedobaptists so contrary to the gospel that conformity to those views and practices was looked upon as more fearful than stripes, imprisonment and death. HENCE Baptist blood was poured forth like water. HENCE the numerous martyr-fires that have burned so brightly in times past. Indeed, it may be said for substance, that Baptists have been persecuted by Pedobaptists because they considered themselves and were considered by their persecutors "Landmark" men.

How to reconcile the quotation I have made from Dr. Waller with his article on the "Reformation," as published in the first volume of the Christian Repository, I do not know. In that article he says: "We have shown from the Scriptures, as interpreted by the Reformers themselves, that the Papism is neither THE church nor a BRANCH of the church." Nor is this all. He refers to the Lutheran, Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, so-called, as daughters of the "mother of harlots," and argues that in the evidence of Baptists (that is, those holding Baptist views, though not always called Baptists), from the days of the Apostles, is illustrated the truth of the Saviour's declaration, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," that is, the church.

Again says Dr. W., "If the Romish church was the true church, then the founders of the Reformed churches were deposed and excommunicated; and if She was not, then they have no ministry, no ordinances, no ecclesiastical existence. If she was not the Church of Christ, then they are not the churches of Christ, themselves being witnesses." Let it be remembered that the Papism is neither THE church nor a branch of the church." Then it follows irresistibly from Dr. W.'s logic that "the Reformed Churches are not the churches of Christ." Aye, he says, they have NO MINISTRY, NO ORDINANCES, NO ECCLESIASTICAL EXISTENCE." This sentence is, to say the least, as sweeping and denunciatory of Pedobaptist organizations as anything in the "Landmark." How its author could have opposed the doctrine of the "Landmark" without retracting this sentence (and indeed the whole of his article on the "Reformation," I profess not to understand. If Pedobaptist societies have "no ministry," ought their preachers to be recognized as gospel ministers? The question really amounts to this: Ought they to be recognized as being what they are not? And the substance of this question is, Ought hypocrisy to be practiced? which everybody will answer in the negative. If Pedobaptists have "no ordinances," are we to recognize their ordinances, so-called, as gospel ordinances? Surely not. Again, if they have "no ecclesiastical existence," shall Baptists recognize their societies as churches of Christ — churches organized according to the gospel? This would be absurd; for it would be recognizing as a fact a thing that has no existence. So much for Dr. Waller's opposition to the "Landmark."*

Dr. Burrows, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Richmond, Virginia, and editor of the Baptist Memorial, notices the "Landmark" in his paper of February, 1855. He is opposed to the doctrine it inculcates, because he says, "There is no necessary Scriptural connection between baptism and preaching. We shall adhere in this matter to the broad license given in our authorized standard, 'Let him that beareth say come.'"

* I have considered it due to the interests of truth to make this reference to the writings of Dr. Waller. His very name is regarded by multitudes as a "tower of strength." I think in his article on the "Reformation" he appears as a "Landmark" Baptist.

When I saw this notice of the "Landmark" I proposed to Dr. B., through the Tennessee Baptist, a series of questions, to which he courteously responded in the March number of his paper. The first five questions had reference to the Scriptural priority of baptism to preaching. Hence Dr. Burrows answers them together. He says: "To the first five we reply, that in all probability there were no unbaptized preachers in apostolic days. There was no controversy on the manner of baptism, and consequently all who united with the churches were immersed 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'"

If this is not an abandonment of the position that "there is no necessary Scriptural connection between baptism and preaching," I do not understand the force of language. If preachers in apostolic days "were baptized—if "all who united with the churches were immersed" what Scriptural authority have unbaptized men to preach now? Must not the rule which governed THEN govern NOW? Or are we left without rule? There is a Scriptural connection between baptism and preaching. Jesus was baptized before he preached; and in this, as in other respects, he left us an example that we should follow his steps. I will not here enlarge on this topic, for I consider Dr. B. as having surrendered the point he first made. As to the expression, "Let him that heareth say come," it is difficult for me to attempt SERIOUSLY to show that it contains no authority for an unbaptized man to preach. It has no more reference to preaching than it has to praying or singing or shouting. Let the opposite view be taken, and it follows that when a wicked man, an impenitent sinner, hears, he must preach! "Let him [whether saint or sinner] that heareth say come." A wicked father may with propriety speak to his children of the "great salvation," but he must not become a preacher. Who will say that he ought?

One of my questions to Dr. B. was in these words: "Had there been Pedobaptist preachers in the apostolic age, would Paul have recognized them as gospel ministers?" His answer to that: "If Paul did rejoice when wicked men preached the gospel 'through envy and strife,' he would doubtless have rejoiced too to know that it was preached by a godly Pedobaptist, if such an anomaly had been known in his day."

This answer does not fully meet the question. Paul's rejoicing that the gospel was preached was one thing — his recognizing those who preached it as gospel ministers was another thing; otherwise he must have recognized those "wicked men" who preached "through envy and strife" as gospel ministers, which is absurd.

Dr. B. says: "We cover the ground of the whole series as well as the last three questions by the following lessons from the inspired word: 'And John said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followed not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not, for there is no man who shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part.'

'Some, indeed, preach Christ, even of envy and strife, and some also of good will. What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.'"

And what have these Scriptures to do with the recognition of Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers? Nothing, absolutely nothing. Dr. B. must concede this; for he thinks a "Pedobaptist" would have been an "anomaly" in the apostolic age. It would be well for the editor of the "Memorial," when he writes on this subject again, to inform his readers how what would have been an "anomaly" in the days of the apostles can be metamorphosed into a gospel minister in the present age. I think it will be generally admitted that though Dr. Burrows has made an attempt to remove the "Landmark" lie has not succeeded. It still stands.

Dr. Cossitt, a prominent Cumberland Presbyterian, and a Professor of Theology in the Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee, has been pleased to employ his pen against the "Landmark." He attempts to show that a "rejection of Pedobaptist ministers and churches is inconsistent with the right of private judgment in matters of religious belief."*

I take pleasure in saying that, as a courteous controversialist, I know of no one who excels Dr. Cossitt. It need not be feared that a discussion will, on his part, degenerate into those personalities which are so offensive to good taste. I recognize him as an elevated and a refined gentleman.

While I cheerfully say all this, and would by no means treat Dr. C. with disrespect, I shall occupy but little space in replying to him because the proposition he aims to establish is, as it seems to me, self-evidently untenable. How can a refusal to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers, and Pedobaptist societies as gospel churches, be "inconsistent with the right of private judgment in matters of religious belief?" Inconsistent with the right of whose private judgment? That of Pedobaptists? How so? They are left to think for themselves. There is no interference with any right of private judgment or public action. Baptists have the right of private judgment as well as others, and if) in the exercise of that right, they come to the conclusion that they ought not to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers, must they not act out their convictions? How can they as honest, Christian men do otherwise? They have the right of interpreting the Scriptures for themselves, and this right involves the kindred right of acting in accordance with their interpretations.

How the sentiment of the "Landmark" is "inconsistent with the right of private judgment," c., utterly defies my comprehension. If it interferes in the least with the right of private judgment in Baptists or Pedobaptists, it is to me strangely inconceivable.

As to the effort of Dr. C. to construe my repudiating sentiment " (as he pleased to term it) into a persecution of Pedobaptists, I have only to say it is singular persecution! Do we persecute men by letting them alone? O that the millions of Baptist martyrs had only been persecuted in this way — BY BEING LET ALONE! Dr. C. does not consider himself a persecutor of Unitarians, Universalists, etc., because he has no religious intercourse with them. And he is not. How then can he make me a persecutor because I do not recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers? Will he say Unitarians, Universalists, etc., are errorists? So I say of Presbyterians, Methodists, etc. I do not believe that the errors of Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., are so serious as those of Unitarians, etc. There are gradations in error. But as to the principle involved there is no difference. Dr. C. refuses to recognize a Unitarian preacher as a gospel minister. Why? Because in the exercise of the rights of private judgment he decides that the errors of such a preacher require and justify the refusal. This is true of me in regard to Presbyterian preachers. Dr. C. remonstrates against this, but in so doing he only condemns in me what he allows in himself. And in condemning me he ought to take care lest he infringe on "the right of private judgment," of which he is so jealous.

The truth is, there is no room for controversy between Dr. C. and myself, except on the baptismal question. We both believe that baptism is a prerequisite to membership in a visible church of Christ. We also believe that church membership is a prerequisite to a scriptural consecration to the work of the ministry. Wherein, then,

* *See Tennessee Baptist, February 17th and 24th, 1855.*

do we differ? As to the question, What is baptism? and who are entitled to it? With his views he supposes persons baptized and in the church whom I regard unbaptized and out of the church. He therefore considers those eligible to the ministry of the gospel who in my judgment are scripturally ineligible. The difference between us is about baptism, and as this is not the place for a discussion of this topic, I take a most respectful leave of Dr. Cossitt.

Dr. Hill, editor of the Presbyterian Herald, Louisville, Ky., has expressed his opposition to the "Landmark."

He admits, however, that the position advocated is consistent with Baptist principles — that the logic is with what he terms the "Baptist High Church party" — that the error of "Landmark" men is not in their conclusions, but in their premises — the same premises which lead to close communion, etc. I can but be gratified that a gentleman of Dr. Hill's learning and intelligence makes these admissions. As I have addressed a letter to Dr. H. which will be found in Appendix No. 3, I say no more of him in this connection.

Dr. Lynd, President of the Western Theological Institute, and one of the leading Baptist ministers of Kentucky, has identified himself with the opponents of the "Landmark." He has expressed his regret that the little treatise was ever written, and seems to think its author will regret it too. Dr. Lynd's decided opposition to the "Landmark" is very remarkable in view of the following facts:

In the "Cross and Baptist Journal" of April 15, 1836, he expresses himself thus: "I assume the position that Baptists and Pedobaptists differ on ESSENTIAL points, ESSENTIAL to the honor of Jesus Christ and the future prosperity of the churches. And I would have the community understand it. Have Baptists forgotten the ground which they occupy? Have they forgot that the difference involves the constitution and government of gospel churches?" Again, "I have feared for some time that the union of Baptists with other denominations would prove to be an alliance of much ultimate evil.

Who would have thought that after writing thus Dr. L. would oppose such a separation between Baptists and Pedobaptists as the "Landmark" recommends? But this is not all.

In the Western Recorder of January 10, 1855, Dr. Lynd uses the following language: "The constituents of a church, according to primitive model, are such persons as have been baptized upon a credible profession of repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." In the same paper of April 25, 1855, he says: "Churches organized, according to primitive usage, are those in which the constituents are immersed believers, called the saved and the sanctified. Ministers of the gospel were appointed by the churches, and recognized, fellowshipped, and set apart to full official authority, by the elders of the churches."

From this definition of a gospel church, it follows irresistibly that Pedobaptist societies are not gospel churches. They are not composed of 'such persons as have been baptized upon a credible profession of repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.' The "constituents" of these societies are not "immersed believers." From the premises of Dr. Lynd, as well as those of Dr. Waller, the conclusion is inevitable that Pedobaptists can lay no valid claim to "ecclesiastical existence." This is the doctrine of the "Landmark," and why is it worse in me to publish it than in Drs. Lynd and Waller?

But, says Dr. L., "ministers of the gospel were appointed by the churches," etc. The persons appointed were of course members of the churches, or otherwise the

churches would have no jurisdiction over them. If they were members of the churches, they were, according to Dr. L.'s definition of a church, "immersed believers." So be it. Then it follows that in apostolic times none were appointed "ministers of the gospel" who were not church members, and consequently "immersed believers." And here the perplexing question arises: Can men now be ministers of the gospel who are not members of churches formed according to the gospel? I say they cannot; and, therefore, they ought not to be so recognized. This is the position of the "Landmark."

Some, however, have made a distinction between a minister of the gospel and a preacher of the gospel. They say a minister must belong to a gospel church, having been immersed on a profession of faith, but that a preacher does not of necessity belong to a gospel church, and that immersion on a profession of faith is not a prerequisite to preaching. But can it be shown that unbaptized men — and consequently sustaining no church relation — were, in primitive times, permitted to preach? Was there a class of men analogous to modern Pedobaptist preachers who were not recognized as ministers of the gospel, but were considered preachers, and invited to preach, and allowed to immerse, though never immersed themselves? The truth is, there is no scriptural authority for making a distinction between a minister of the gospel and a preacher of the gospel. Paul speaks of himself as a "minister" and a "Preacher," and says to Timothy, "Preach the word," and in the same chapter, "Make full proof of thy ministry." Dr. L. says that "Ministers of the gospel were appointed by the churches." I ask if preachers preached without such appointment? To suppose they did is an absurdity. We have only to read the Acts of the Apostles to see the priority of church-membership to preaching the gospel.

After reading the preceding extracts from Dr. Lynd, the reader will be surprised to know that in the Western Recorder of May 16, 1855, he says:

"I have never denied that Pedobaptist societies are churches, or that their elders are gospel ministers. I hope I never shall, be it orthodox or heterodox." Dr. L. had lost his usual equanimity when he wrote this. For him to hope never to make a certain denial, though it be heterodox not to make it, is doing injustice both to his head and heart.

How Pedobaptist "elders" are "gospel ministers," when, in apostolic times, "ministers were appointed by the churches," and the churches were composed of "immersed believers," is too much for mortal comprehension. I could as easily understand how two and four make twenty. Dr. L., however, kindly prophesies in the Recorder of June 6, 1855, that when I shall have "taken a wider theological range" I will change my position. Alas, that so many take a "theological range" wider than the New Testament! If I reason from premises that Dr. L. has laid down I must conclude that the doctrine of the "Landmark" is true; if I conclude that it is false, I must first repudiate his premises, and then take a "theological range" beyond the limits of truth. From taking such a "range" I must be excused. I protest most earnestly and solemnly against it.*

* To understand fully the references to Dr. Lynd the reader will remember that several communications from him and the author of the "Landmark" have been published in the Western Recorder.

Dr. Everts, pastor of the Walnut Street Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, has perhaps written at greater length against the "Old Landmark" than any other individual. His views may be seen in the Christian Repository for January, April and May, 1855. In the January number Dr. E. thus expresses himself: "In its Scriptural and primary distinction, a church is an assembly of believers, called out of the world." Then it follows that baptized infants constitute no part of the church of Christ. They do not enter into its composition at all. Pedobaptists, however, say they do. Dr. E. then must of necessity admit that Pedobaptist organizations are churches in a sense which they themselves do not recognize. For we shall see that he concedes these organizations to be churches. Again, says Dr. E., "As believers they are naturally combined under some form of discipline and ordinances." What "form of discipline and ordinances?" I ask. Must it not be the "form" which the Scriptures enjoin? Believers, in their regeneration, are called out from the world in one sense, and in the most important sense, too. God looks upon them as separate from the world. But then there is to be a visible separation from the world. There is to be the combination to which Dr. E. refers. How is the visible separation to take place? How is the combination to be effected? Is it not by baptism? And if so, can there be a church organization without baptism? Let all the Doctors of Divinity in Christendom answer. Dr. Griffin said truly, "Where there is no baptism there are no visible churches."

"But" says Dr. E., "the regimen or discipline does not enter into the essence of the church. Without these they [believers] may be saved, or belong to the church universal." Yes, but the discussion is not about the "church universal," but about visible churches of Christ. There is no universal visible church; and if the universal invisible church, composed of all the saved, has what Dr. E. calls "form," it is impossible to know what it is. We have no idea of "form" apart from visibility.

Of Pedobaptist societies Dr. E. says: "They are churches, but churches imperfectly organized and disciplined; churches in partial error and disobedience; churches irregular and unscriptural in their ordinances and polity. What shall I say to this? We can learn from the Scriptures alone what a church is, for the Scriptures alone prescribe the materials of which it is composed, its form of organization, etc. How then there can be churches "UNSCRIPTURAL in their ordinances and polity" I cannot conceive. To say that the Scriptures provided for the existence of UNSCRIPTURAL churches is an absurdity. Dr. E. first speaks of Pedobaptist communities as "churches imperfectly organized and disciplined" then as "churches in partial error and disobedience" and lastly, as "churches irregular and unscriptural in their ordinances and polity." Thus he ends the sentence, but it is incomplete, and always will be, till he adds that "unscriptural churches" are not churches at all. A visible church without baptism. How can this be? The various sects of Pedobaptists themselves say it

cannot be. Baptists once said, whatever they may say now, that a church is composed of persons baptized upon a credible profession of faith in Christ. The day has been when Baptists had never heard or thought of a visible church without baptism — nor had Pedobaptists. The times are now changed, and Baptists may be found who are determined on having Pedobaptists in the visible churches of Christ without baptism — a thing that Pedobaptists themselves consider impossible.

Dr. E. says again "Though we look for visible churches only where there is baptism,

or intended baptism," etc. I need not quote further. This is the first time I have known a Baptist minister to make "intended baptism" answer the purpose which baptism answers! "Tell it not in Gath!" lest Presbyterians rejoice and Methodists triumph! What is this "intended baptism?" It is of course not baptism. It is intended as baptism. What does the intention amount to? If Christ commands believers to be immersed, as he certainly does, and they intend ever so sincerely to obey him by submitting to the sprinkling of water, do they obey him? This is the question. In other words, does sincerity of intention in doing a thing make it right? If so, Saul of Tarsus did right in doing many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

After all, Dr. Everts' conceptions of a church seem to be confused; for in the Maynumber of the Repository he speaks of "Pedobaptist communities" as "in a scriptural sense Christian congregations or churches," and yet he says, "We do not regard Pedobaptist communities churches organized according to the gospel." To reconcile these two declarations is a task I have no capacity to perform. How communities not "organized according to the gospel" can be, "in a scriptural sense, Christian congregations or churches," is more than I ever expect to know. The thing being impossible, cannot be known.

Dr. E. does me injustice — unintentionally no doubt — by representing me as making a distinction between "churches of Christ," and "churches organized according to the gospel." I make no such distinction. I use the phrases as synonymous. Indeed, where Dr. E. quotes from me I use no phrase as explanatory of the other, which shows that I regard them as equivalent. The effort of Dr. E. to prove Pedobaptist societies "churches of Christ" is generally regarded among Baptists (so far as I have learned) as a signal failure. This being the fact, I shall not enlarge on the topic. There is another point made by Dr. E., namely, that "preaching the gospel is not exclusively an official act;" but as I shall have occasion to notice this in meeting Prof. Farnam's objections, I here take leave of the pastor of the Walnut Street Church.

Prof. Farnam is, in some respects, superior to all the opponents of the "Landmark" who have yet taken part in the discussion. He has a deeper penetration and superior logical acumen. He thinks more closely. This, at least, is my opinion. It would be very difficult to have his professorship in the Georgetown College more ably filled.

As to the discussion on the "Landmark" question between Prof. F. and myself in the Tennessee Baptist, I shall not now refer to all the points directly and indirectly presented. Nor is it necessary; for Prof. F. in the Baptist of August 18, 1855, (which contains his last article) says: "I have argued this question with him on the hypothesis that Pedobaptist societies are not gospel churches." Again, referring to me, he says: "The proposition which he ought to have proven in the outset is, THAT NO UNORDAINED CHRISTIAN HAS THE RIGHT TO PREACH!" I marvel at this from so acute a logician. What makes it my duty to prove a negative? Men may, if they choose, attempt the proof of a negative, as I did in writing the "Landmark," but the laws of logic do not demand it of them. Why did not Prof. F. prove that private Christians have a right to preach? He is in the affirmative, and if he can establish this proposition the "Landmark" falls aye, more than this—it will follow that our churches, from the days of the apostles, have performed a work of supererogation in setting men apart to the ministry. It is important in this discussion to have a definite conception of the word PREACH. There are not less than six terms in the original Greek of the Acts of the Apostles which are translated PREACH. This word PREACH must be a remarkable one if it conveys all the ideas expressed by six Greek terms. One of these terms means TO PREACH — TO PROCLAIM PUBLICLY — TO CRY AS A HERALD; and there is but one that does. A second term means TO COMMUNICATE GOOD TIDINGS, and it may be done publicly or privately. A third term simply means

TO DECLARE, a fourth To REASON, a fifth TO SPEAK, and the sixth TO SPEAK BOLDLY. Yet they are all translated PREACH. I am concerned in this controversy with the first two of the six terms. The first of the two is used, Mark xvi.15, Luke xxiv. 47: "PREACH the gospel to every creature" — "that repentance and remission of sins should be PREACHED," etc. The word here certainly means to proclaim publicly. It is used Acts viii. 5:1, "Philip went down to the city of Samaria and PREACHED Christ unto them." But it is not used in the fourth verse of the same chapter, where it is said, "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere PREACHING the word;" nor is it used in the 35th verse of the chapter where Philip is said to have "PREACHED Jesus" to the Ethiopian. In these two verses the second Greek term is employed which means TO COMMUNICATE GOOD TIDINGS. The first of these terms is KERUSSO, the second EUANGELIZO.

It will throw some light on the subject to ascertain how the first of these terms is used in the Greek version of the Old Testament. It is employed Genesis xli. 43, "And they CRIED before him, Bow the knee," etc. It is used Jonah i. 2, "Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it," etc.; also iii. 2, 5, 7: "PREACH unto it the PREACHING that I bid thee." "And he CRIED and said," etc. "So the people of Nineveh believed God and PROCLAIMED a fast." "And he caused it to be PROCLAIMED," etc. Here we have the terms CRY, PREACH and PROCLAIM, but in the Greek version one term, and that the one employed by Christ, Mark xvi. 15. It is evident, therefore, that the word in the Septuagint means to PROCLAIM PUBLICLY. And that it has the same meaning in the New Testament, may be seen from a variety of passages in which it is translated to preach, and from Revelation v. 2, "And I saw a strong angel PROCLAIMING with a loud voice," etc. This word in the New Testament is first applied to John the Baptist, Matthew iii. 1. It is used also Matthew iv. 17, From that time JESUS BEGAN TO PREACH," etc. And this passage, as Elder J. S. Baker has argued, shows very clearly the distinction between TALKING, CONVERSING on divine things and PREACHING. Jesus had TALKED ON divine things, to say the least, from the time he was twelve years old, but he began to PREACH after he was baptized.

And this is a very significant fact. If Jesus did not BEGIN to preach till he was baptized, what authority does the New Testament give any unbaptized man to preach?

My position is that, according to the gospel, authority to preach must, under God, emanate from a visible church of Christ. Hence members of a visible church alone are eligible to the work of the ministry; for a church has no control of those who do not belong to it. But Pedobaptist societies are not visible churches of Christ. How then can they confer gospel authority to preach? Prof. Farnam, however, argues the "Landmark" question on the hypothesis that Pedobaptist societies are not gospel churches, and he refers to illustrious Pedobaptists who, he has no doubt, were called of God to preach. This presents no difficulty; for God's call must, according to the gospel, be succeeded by a church's call, and recognized in the credentials given by that church to the individual called. I go farther and say, that if God were, with an audible voice, as loud as heaven's mightiest thunder, to call a Pedobaptist to preach, we would not be justified in departing from the Scriptures, unless we were divinely told the utterances of that voice were intended to supersede the teachings of the New Testament. Such information would intimate the beginning of a new economy, and I am writing of the present dispensation.

I need not enlarge. Prof. F., to maintain his position, must not only show that the lay-members of a visible church have the right to preach, but he, must show that unbaptized persons (and consequently in no scriptural sense, members of a visible

church of Christ) have the same right. This, I am sure, he can never do, and because he cannot do it, the "Landmark" stands, and is, I think, likely to stand.

I have now noticed the most prominent objections, that have been made to my little Tract; and though some of them at first view may appear plausible, yet when analyzed, not one of them, as it seems to me, is valid.

Chapter XIII - John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

John Albert Broadus was born in Culpeper county, Virginia, January 24, 1827. He was of Welch descent, and the name was once spelled Broadhurst, and later Broaddus, and with John A. it began to be spelled in its present form.

His father was a member of the Virginia Legislature for a number of years, and was held in high esteem among his people.

John A. Broadus was educated at the University of Virginia, and that institution conferred on him the degree of Master of Arts in 1850. He was, in some respects, the best scholar in the South, and his knowledge of Greek was as thorough as that of any man who has lived since the language was a spoken language.

In 1851 he was elected Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek in the University of Virginia, which position he held for two years. He was during the same time pastor of the church in Charlottesville, Va., and continued as pastor of that church until 1855, when he was elected Chaplain of the University, which position he held two years, and then returned to the pastorate of the Charlottesville church. He continued in that capacity for two years, making seven years as pastor of the church and two years as Chaplain of the University, and nine years in all of public religious work in that town.

In 1859 he was elected Professor of Homiletics and New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, which position he held until his death, except for two years during the civil war, when he preached, as missionary in General Robert E. Lee's army, with great success.

Dr. Broadus was one of the truest and safest of men. His judgment was mature, and his advice was eagerly sought. It was the confidence the people had in Drs. Broadus and Boyce that gave the Seminary its standing and influence. Orthodox, safe and sensible, the people relied on him.

He was a Baptist in the true sense. He was opposed to alien immersion (immersions performed by others than Baptists), and so expressed himself in a letter written to a brother who had asked for advice, and this letter was widely published in the denominational papers. In a lecture to his class on one occasion, at least (perhaps on other occasions also), he announced that he was not in favor of pulpit affiliation (inviting preachers of other denominations into Baptist pulpits). This lecture was quoted and the quotations published in the denominational papers.

However, he was not offensive in the advocacy of his Baptist views. He never engaged in debate; perhaps he was not by nature a debater, but he did teach sound Baptist doctrine to the students who sat under him in the Seminary.

Dr. Broadus was a preacher of the front rank. Wherever he preached the house was packed, frequently hundreds being turned away at the doors. Only one other man in his day could draw so large crowds as he, and that was that prince of theologians and orator, J. R. Graves. His language was simple, so simple that a child could readily understand; his thought was deep, so deep that a wise man would need to think — a strange and rare combination. His sermons, like the words of Scripture, were so simple that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein, and yet there was depth sufficient for the most thoughtful.

During his connection with the Seminary he was at different times pastor of several

small country churches near Louisville, Ky., and he took as much delight in preaching the gospel to those plain country people as he would when standing before a great audience in Louisville, New York or Boston.

At one time when the Southern Baptist Convention met near his boyhood home, he was appointed to preach in one of the large city churches, but declined in order to have the pleasure of going out into the country to his childhood home and preaching to the plain farmers, many of whom knew him when he was a boy. The brother who went with him to that country church declared that it was the greatest sermon that Dr. Broadus ever preached.

Dr. Broadus wrote a number of helpful books. He published a volume of sermons, and wrote a Commentary on Matthew, which have had a wide circulation. He wrote the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, which has had the widest circulation of any book of the kind ever published. It is used as a text-book in nearly all the Baptist theological schools, and is adopted by the Methodists and its study made compulsory on all Methodist preachers. It is used as a text-book by the Campbellites in their theological school at Lexington, Ky. It is an able, clear and helpful book. It is a sacred rhetoric and would be helpful to literary students of whatever class. He has also published a number of smaller books, viz: History of Preaching, Shall Women Speak in Mixed Religious Assemblies? Immersion Is Christian Baptism, Glad Giving, etc. We publish his tract on Glad Giving at the close of this sketch. He also wrote a Memoir of J. P. Boyce.

Giving is a Baptist doctrine, and it is announced as a Baptist doctrine in our Confessions of Faith and Church Covenants, and no other man has made so plain a statement of that Baptist doctrine as Dr. Broadus. For that reason we publish it in this connection.

Dr. Broadus died of pneumonia in Louisville, Ky., March 16, 1895. His mantle did not seem to fall on any other man. There was only one of him, and until we shall see him in Heaven we do not expect to look upon his like[ness] again.

The picture published in this connection is as good as any he ever had. He did not take a good picture. Yet this picture gives an idea of how he appeared in his strongest days.

Dr. Broadus was "gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Timothy 2:24-25.

The Louisville Times said of him as he lay at the point of death: "As gentle Izaak Walton said of the strawberry, it may truthfully be said of Dr. John A. Broadus, who is now being gathered as one of Reaper Death's richest sheaves, that the good Lord might in His omnipotence have made a better, greater man, but it is by no means assured that he ever did. Meek as Moses, wise as Solomon, patient as Job, dauntless and eloquent as Saul of Tarsus, lovable as John, the beloved disciple, upon him every god doth seem to have his seal to give the world assurance of a man. After he shall have been gathered to his fathers it will be long before his church, his city, his country shall again look upon his like. Gentler than a woman, braver than a lion, more learned than Erasmus, he walked the straight path with head bent in humble obeisance to his God, but lowered his crest to no mortal man. That a light so luminous, so radiant, so mellifluous must go out in the deepening of the shadows of Time, and be swallowed up in the effulgence of Eternity, can but overwhelm the finite mind with questions to which come no replies, with sorrows for which there is no earthly solace."

Glad Giving A Sermon by John A. Broadus

"God loveth a cheerful giver." — II Corinthians 9:7

One of the greatest privileges of human life on earth, is to give. Who has not felt the joy of giving? It may be personal attention that you gave, or instruction and counsel, or property, or the most convenient form of property for giving, money. To give is a far pleasanter thing than to receive. We have all found it gratifying to receive gifts of personal help, or pecuniary aid, when we really needed it, but more delightful still to give to others. You need not raise any objection to this position of mine, because I can support it by the highest authority. Did you ever notice that there is a striking saying of the Founder of Christianity, which is not recorded in the gospels? The Apostle Paul, at the end of the twentieth chapter of Acts, says to the Christians whom he is addressing, that they must "remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." Literally translated, this would be, it is a happier thing to give than to receive. Now I am quite sure, friends, that many of you have found this true in your experience from childhood until now. But our social usages and our Christian labors involve a great variety of occasions for giving. Many good men and women, interested in pushing some particular benevolent enterprise, besiege their friends and acquaintances with frequent entreaties to give. Our churches take many contributions for many objects. And so you will hear some persons say, "I don't like to go to such and such a church, they talk too much there about giving." Now my dear friend, please don't say that any more, because you remember that the Saviour said, — "He himself said," — It is a happier thing to give than to receive.

When the Western or Latin Christians began the practice of observing a certain day in commemoration of the Saviour's birth, a thing which we first find mentioned about two centuries after that event, and had settled upon the last week of the year for that purpose, they very naturally transferred to this celebration some old Roman customs which had for many centuries attached to the feast called the Saturnalia, observed by the Romans in connection with the winter solstice. And none of the other customs which gradually became connected, in different countries, with this celebration have proved more agreeable. The practice of lighting many candles was borrowed from a Jewish feast held about that time. The Yule log, or Christmas log, — some of you older gentlemen remember what a happy ado we used to make over the Christmas log when we were boys on the plantation, — this came from the Scandinavian tree-worship. But from the Roman feast they took at the beginning the practice of allowing holiday to slaves and school children, and that families and friends should make gifts to each other. And so this has come down to you and me, and your children and mine, as a delightful custom. Perhaps I may suggest about it, in passing, that when money is scarce and there are so many other things to be done with it, we may compensate for making the gifts less expensive than usual by taking more than ordinary pains in the way of adapting them to the particular persons. The loving care we thus show may give more pleasure than would be given by greater financial cost.

Since giving is so delightful and every way so desirable a thing, we are not surprised to find much about it in the Bible. The Old Testament speaks often of giving to the poor. The Saviour especially urged giving. And here in the 8th and 9th chapters of II Corinthians we find reference to a quite remarkable transaction. It had long been the custom for wealthy and generous Jews living in foreign countries to send

contributions to Jerusalem for the support of poor Jews who lived there, many of whom had themselves come from foreign countries to spend their last years and find their graves at the holy city. Now when any of these poor Jews became Christians, they were at once cut off from all share in such contributions. And that was one occasion of the magnificent outburst of Christian generosity which occurred in the first years at Jerusalem, when the brethren regarded their property as held by them for each other's benefit and would not say that it was their own, and some of them even sold real estate and brought the money for the support of the needy. Such a plan as this was of course a temporary thing. But as Christianity became diffused in foreign countries, and a good many Gentiles became Christians, the idea very naturally arose, that these Gentile churches might send contributions to Jerusalem for the support of the Christian poor, as the Jews had been wont to do for the Jewish poor. Soon after the Apostle Paul's first great missionary journey, when a conference was held at Jerusalem about the relations of the Gentile and Jewish Christians, some of the other apostles suggested to Paul that his churches ought to remember the poor, — meaning the poor Christians at Jerusalem, — and the Apostle says that he himself was also forward to do so. Now a few years later, we learn from these chapters of II Corinthians that he has not merely been doing this on a small scale, but has for a year or more been organizing a general contribution among the churches which he and his associates had founded in three or four great provinces of the Roman Empire, — certainly in Galatia, which was in the center of what we call Asia Minor, and in Macedonia, which included the northern part of what we call Greece, and in Achaia, which was the southern part of Greece, and probably also in what the New Testament calls Asia, the district of which Ephesus was the capital, — he had been making personal appeals and sending representatives, and he refers to the subject in several of his inspired letters. We can see that great moral benefit came from this wide-spread contribution, apart from the immediate practical help given to the community. This large and general gift of Gentile Christians for the benefit of Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, served to show that these Gentiles had real Christian love, and to break down the Jewish prejudice. Besides, the independent and scattered churches in these great Roman provinces were thus brought into active co-operation for an object of common interest. What a blessed thing it would have been if in the growing centuries Christians had only left all this where the Apostle placed it, — independent churches, but gladly co-operating and thus maintaining the sense of free Christian unity?

Now as to the various means of promoting this great collection, we find the Apostle devoting a portion of his second epistle to the Corinthians to that subject. He gives a variety of reasons why the Christians in Achaia, of which Corinth was the capital, should gladly contribute for this great object. He does not say anything about their furnishing money to support their own worship. You may have noticed that there is nothing on that subject in the New Testament. I suppose that was merely taken for granted. Of course people would support their own worship — the meetings of their own church. The Jews were familiar with this idea in their synagogues, for which they erected buildings and supported officials, and the Greeks and Romans had a great variety of societies, educational or literary, social or religious, and were familiar with the idea of contributing for the support of any such organization to which a person belonged. So that might be taken for granted. And reasons why they should give for objects far away would apply at the same time to the propriety of gladly contributing for the support of their own church.

Now I wish to gather out of these chapters viii. and ix., first, a number of reasons for giving; and then some directions as to the manner of giving.

I. Reasons for giving.

(1) It is a very notable thing to observe how promptly the Apostle states one of the great reasons for glad giving, namely, imitation of Christ. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich."* My Christian hearers, do you not feel moved by the thought of imitating Christ? At a bookstore, yesterday, while anxiously searching for books I could afford to buy and give to friends, I observed, as I have often done in past years, what a great number of copies they had in different size and binding, of the famous little book called "The Imitation of Christ." The very name of the book attracts attention and awakens interest. What a privilege to have such an example! What a duty to walk in his steps! But sometimes people are discouraged at the very elevation and perfection of the example. They say: "How can I hope to imitate the Divine Redeemer in all his unspeakable sacrifice, in all that he gave up, and all that he endured to accomplish the salvation of men?" Well, we are often stirred by notable examples of persons in very different circumstances from our own. Every college lad, when he makes his speech, likes to quote:

"Lives of great men all remind us

We can make our lives sublime."

Every generous youthful spirit is stirred by that thought, yet they do not expect to be all conquerors, or sovereigns, or philosophers, or inventors. A great example standing high on a lofty pedestal does not dishearten us by its elevation. And oh! shall we not arouse our souls and earnestly strive to imitate our Saviour? to imitate him in many ways, and among them, to imitate him in self-sacrificing generosity for the benefit of others? Though he was rich, oh how rich! yet for your sakes he became poor, oh so poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich.

(2) We ought to give through love to our fellow-men, and especially to our fellow-Christians. One of the great leading ideas of the Christian religion is love. The Old Testament enjoined it. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But there was room for a quibble, as to what was meant by neighbor, and we find that the Jewish teachers had become accustomed to limit the term. They would say: "An enemy is not my neighbor. A hateful Samaritan, a dog of a Gentile, is no neighbor of mine." And so they were accustomed to quote this great precept with an addition of their own. Our Lord refers to this in his sermon on the Mount. "Ye have heard the saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." The last was stuck on, and he at once tears up their distinction by the roots: — "but I say to you, love your enemies." An enemy too is a neighbor, in the sense of the law. On a later occasion, when a man was thinking of the same Jewish distinction — a sharp lawyer he was — and said to Jesus: "Ah, but who is my neighbor?" the Saviour told a beautiful and touching story of a good Samaritan who showed himself neighbor to a Jew that was in trouble. He thereby pointed out that even a Samaritan was a neighbor in the sense of the divine precept. Thus the Saviour broadened out the Old Testament teaching into a yet wider universal application. We must love our fellow-men. At the same time he taught his disciples that they ought to have a peculiar love for one

* This was no doubt said for the purpose of awakening gratitude, as well as of exciting to imitation. The former topic will be introduced further on.

another, declaring this to be a new commandment which he gave them, and that all men would know them to be his disciples by their mutual Christian love. So then the Apostle appeals to those sentiments of Christian love, and at the close of the eighth chapter bids the Corinthians to give "the proof of their love" by gladly contributing for the benefit of their brethren. Thus we have seen two of the reasons for giving which he presents. Now notice two others.

(3) They must give in emulation of other givers. When he first introduces the subject, at the beginning of the eighth chapter, he tells the Corinthians about the zealous liberality of these Macedonian Christians among whom he is staying at the time of writing. "We make known to you, brethren, the grace of God which has been given in the churches of Macedonia" — you see it is not mere human goodness, it is the fruit of God's grace — "that in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded — or overflowed — unto the riches of their liberality." By this example he would stir the Corinthians to like zeal in giving. And, notice, it is the example of the poor. The Macedonian Christians were comparatively poor, and their generosity was on that account all the more impressive an example. Ah, if all Christian people would only be stirred by Christian love, to give! The example of the poor would often cause those who are rich, or who are going to become rich, to give, and thus some gift very small in itself might become the occasion hereafter of great and mighty gifts. Let not the poor stand back. Let them do their duty and enjoy their privilege as a personal matter, and remember also that their example may have great power. The Apostle wishes those whom he addresses to emulate these Christians around him. Emulation is a very powerful tendency in human nature, easily corrupted into envy, but in itself a healthful and useful tendency. Whenever we see other people doing some handsome thing, it ought to awaken in us a desire to do likewise. This is natural, and we ought to encourage and control so helpful a disposition. There are many known to us who give generously, some who are rich, and some who are poor. Let us gladly emulate their noble example.

(4) On the other hand, we ought to give out of self-respect, knowing that other people have a right to expect it of us. In the beginning of the ninth chapter, the Apostle says that he had stirred up these Macedonians by telling them that the brethren in Achaia and Corinth had long before been zealous in this matter; and this example had been quite helpful in Macedonia. Now then he says, I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they may go and have your contribution all ready sure enough, according to the good account I gave of you: for otherwise, if I come, and some of these Macedonians with me, and it appears that after all you are not ready. I don't say that you will be ashamed, but I know that I shall. "Well, well," says some Christian hearer, "is it possible that the inspired Apostle appeals to such motives as these? I thought we ought to give simply and alone from a sense of duty, and that to think about emulation, and pride, and shame, would be all wrong." Yet you see the inspired Apostle does appeal to these motives, to emulation on the one hand, and to self-respect on the other hand. These are not the highest motives, but they are real and powerful, and, rightly used, they are valuable. Human nature is a complex affair. I wonder if any person ever performs any action from only a single motive. Usually, beyond question, we act from a variety of motives, and if the greater motives are only in their due supremacy, then these other considerations will be helpful. Christianity proposes to take hold of the entire man, with all his complex constitution, and to subordinate and consecrate his whole being to the benefit of mankind and to the glory of Christ.

(5) Two other reasons for giving remain to be mentioned, as presented by the

Apostle. One is the hope of divine reward. Notice this: "He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." He promises that God will reward them for generous giving in behalf of their needy brethren. Now if a man were to give simply for the sake of such a reward, he would not get it; just as we all know if a man makes happiness the exclusive object of his efforts, he will not get happiness. But if his attention is turned mainly to duty, and he tries to do his duty, the happiness comes along unsought. And so if we are influenced in giving mainly by other considerations, it is not wrong to remember, it is a comfort to remember, that we shall be rewarded. We shall be rewarded in this life. What a comfort it is to know that we have been able to help others. And we shall be rewarded amid the great and blessed and perfect rewards of the life eternal.

(6) And now comes the last and greatest of all these reasons for giving, with which the Apostle closes and completes all that he has to say on this subject, — "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." What an impressive conclusion to all these exhortations! We are called on to give, and to give gladly, and the highest of all motives for so doing is gratitude for God's unspeakable gift. I suppose there can be no doubt as to what gift is here referred to. We have many things to thank God for, many gifts of his providence, many yet richer gifts of his grace, and when we are tempted to repine at the ills of life we cannot remedy, at the burdens we are called to bear, better occupy ourselves with thanking God for all his many mercies. But when the Apostle says, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," you know what he must mean. "God so loved the world that he gave," — that he gave, — Oh, what did he give? Oh, heaven and earth! do ye know? Oh, time and eternity! can ye ever fully tell? "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but might have eternal life." Let this great gift lift up our souls to look upon all Christian giving as a privilege and a delight.

II. Now we turn to what the Apostle says in this same passage about the manner of our giving.

(1) We must give according to our ability, and sometimes more. Observe what the Apostle says at the beginning of the eighth chapter, about the way the Macedonians are giving: "For according to their power, yea, and beyond their power." Now people ought always to give up to their ability. They ought not usually to give beyond their ability. That would not be prudent, and would soon cut off their opportunity of giving largely. But sometimes it is commendable to give beyond one's ability, and the Apostle does warmly commend these Christians for so doing. There is a still more notable example. Only yesterday I was reading with my class the story of the poor widow, who, as Jesus declared, put in more than all the rich people. It was but two little coins, the size of a fish-scale, and the Greek word used in Mark signifies "fish-scale coin." The two together amounted to much less than half of a cent in our money, but they would have bought something there — and this was all she had to live on. It would not be right, as a rule, for people to give all they have to live on, but sacred enthusiasm might sometimes make this justifiable, and the Saviour commends her for it. Look at her as she draws near to the contribution box! See the glow on her face, of devout zeal. She is very poor, she can't do much, but she wants to do all she can. Dear old woman! she doesn't know who is looking at her. Ah! how little she imagines that one is looking on who knows the depths of her heart and the whole story of her life, and appreciates her love and enthusiasm! She does not know who is looking at her — one more than mortal, more than man, more than the high angels. I wonder if he does not look now at people who make contributions. He has

not changed. He is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." He must look on now with like interest and like understanding, as to the relation of our gifts to our means, of our actions to our motives.

Dear old woman! she does not know that all the world will hear of her, that her story will go down embalmed to the coming ages. Better, doubtless, that she does not know. Leave her alone in her simplicity and sincerity, and let us lay to heart the lesson which through her the Great Teacher has taught to us all. It is sometimes right, in a holy enthusiasm, to give what would generally be sheer imprudence.

(2) We must give systematically, yet sometimes make an extra gift outside of the system. In his previous epistle to the Corinthians, near the end of it, the Apostle expressly enjoined on them that they should systematically lay up money for the purposes of this contribution. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store." This was the day on which the Christians had begun to worship, the first day of the week, on which their Saviour arose from the dead; and on this day of worship and gratitude they should lay by something, thus once a week making a contribution. This is not directly an injunction to contribute money at church on the day of worship, for in this case it was to be a fund laid up in the man's own charge, and gradually accumulating until the Apostle came. But it involves the principle of systematic giving, and obviously suggests the propriety of giving weekly on the first day. Let us beware of thinking that we shall do our duty by mere occasional and impulsive giving, when some strong feeling sweeps us away. Let us have system in our giving, and, in the good sense, make a business of giving. But then when system is established and the habit assured, it will sometimes be proper to give outside of the system, just as it is about praying. I hope that each one of you has regular times for prayer, and when the time comes, then you must pray, whether you feel like it or not. If you feel like praying, it is of course proper that you should do so; and if you do not then feel like praying, it is all the more important that you should pray, beginning with the confession that you do not feel as you ought to, and asking that you may be enabled by divine grace to feel your need. So then pray when the time comes, and be regular and systematic about it. But besides that, whenever any special occasion arises for prayer at some other time, or any strong impulse stirs your soul, making prayer necessary or natural, then do not wait for the time to come, but pray at once. Now just so as to giving. Have your system about giving, and follow your system, but be willing to give sometimes outside of your system, when you see special need or feel any special interest.

(3) We must give cheerfully, for "God loveth a cheerful giver." Let us tutor ourselves to regard giving as not simply a duty, but a high privilege. Let us remember that all the reasons for giving at all are reasons for giving gladly. Let us think how we owe all things to God, and that what we give to others is in the highest sense giving to God. Let us remember how the Saviour will say on the great day, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me." Let us not be satisfied to give grudgingly, but educate ourselves into giving cheerfully. Some people pervert this saying. I once heard a man say: "'God loveth a cheerful giver.' I can't give this cheerfully, and so I had as well not give it at all." Suppose a boy should try that. His father, as he leaves in the morning, tells John of certain work he wants him to do. After he has gone, John dawdles and frets, and his mother says: "John, you ought to do this work cheerfully, to please your father. Your father doesn't want you to work with fretful complaining; he wants you to work cheerfully." Suppose the boy seizes on that, and says, "Well, I can't work cheerfully, as father wants me to do, and so I reckon I had as well not do it at all." Wouldn't he catch it that evening when father comes home? He ought to catch it, but boys nowadays don't always catch it as often

as might be good for them. Ah, fellow-Christians, children of the great and loving Father, shall we thus trifle with him? Shall we not recognize the duty and the dear privilege of giving, as in his sight and in his service? Shall we not rebuke ourselves if ever tempted to neglect this privilege, or to perform it grudgingly? Shall we not learn to give gladly, and always remember with grateful hearts that "God loveth a cheerful giver?"

Chapter XIV - Elder James S. Coleman, D.D., Ph.D.

Pillars of Orthodoxy, 1900

By Ben M. Bogard

During the excitement preceding the Revolutionary war a young German and his new wife sailed for America, where he hoped to have for his own a thousand acres of land. He first settled in Pennsylvania, near Lancaster. Not being able to secure the thousand acres in Pennsylvania he started out again in search of a home. He, in a rude craft, dropped down the Ohio river, and after making numerous attempts to land, and being prevented by Indians, he finally made a safe landing near where Owensboro, Ky., now is.

The young couple, with a few cooking utensils and a small camping outfit, made their way through the wilderness to a little fort, on a little stream called the Rough, about fifteen miles from where it runs into Green river. Here he found the coveted one thousand acres, and he built a log cabin and began to make a home.

The country was full of wild animals, and the beaver was so plentiful that they had built a dam across the little river, and the place was, therefore, named Beaver Dam.

A son was born and he was called "Heinrich" (Henry), and "der kleiner Heinrich" (the little Henry) was the pet of the settlement. In this son was embodied the hope of the fond parents, and as, the sequel. will show they were not disappointed in him.

When the young couple started from Germany, some one gave them a copy of Luther's translation of the Bible in German, and the young "frau" (wife) found time to read it in her wilderness home, and it brought her to Christ. Her surrender was complete and she, therefore, desired to obey all of the commandments. She understood what the German word, "taufen," with which Luther translated the Greek word "baptizo," meant, but just how she could be "getauft" (baptized) was a hard question, as there was not a preacher in all that country.

The command was so plain and unmistakable that she felt that she must obey, and she went to the stream near her door and dipped herself "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The news of this strange act spread, not only in that settlement, but it reached other settlements as well, until it came to the ears of Eld. Benjamin Talbott, and he saddled his horse and started in search of the woman who had baptized herself. He hunted from settlement to settlement until he came to Beaver Dam and in front of her very door. He told her his business, and with a bounding heart she dispatched little Henry and others in every direction and sent out the announcement that a preacher was at her house and would preach there. A large congregation - almost everybody in the settlement - gathered, and a meeting was held, and a number of converts were baptized, and among others the woman who had baptized herself. Eld. Talbott had explained to her that such a baptism was not valid, although her intentions were the best, and she with little Henry and her husband were baptized. This was the beginning of the Beaver Dam church, which is still serving the Lord, and this church is the mother of all the rest in that part of Kentucky.

The name of this interesting family was Kohlmann," and is now spelled Coleman, and the woman who baptized herself is the great-grandmother and little Henry the grandfather of the subject of this sketch, Elder J. S. Coleman, D.D., Ph.D.

James Smith Coleman was born at Beaver Dam, Ky., Feb. 23, 1827, and is now in his seventy-third year. He is affectionately spoken of as the "Old War Horse."

Early in the year 1838 he was awakened to a sense of his sinful condition by reading Watts' old hymn, "That awful day will surely come," etc. His conviction was so deep and strong that, after wrestling for two or three days, he proposed to God that if he would let him serve God in Hell that he would give up all hope of Heaven and cheerfully go there. The surrender being complete, he was instantly made to rejoice with a sense of acceptance. He was baptized into the fellowship of Beaver Dam church, March 10, 1838, age eleven years.

He soon felt that he was called to preach the gospel, and in his attempt to throw off that impression he became careless and left off secret prayer and his habitual Bible reading and plunged into a career of worldliness from which only the grace of God could deliver him.

At this point in his life he sought an education to fit himself for a political career. After alternating for some years between teaching and going to school, he married Miss Rachel Chapman, who proved to be an excellent helpmeet.

After marriage he plunged deeper into worldly matters, and he prospered in these things beyond expectation. Everything he touched turned into gold. He became a candidate for Sheriff of his county and was elected by a big majority, although his party (the Democratic) was not as strong in that county as the Whig, against which he ran. He served two terms as Sheriff, succeeded well, made money and grew in favor of the people.

Under the then existing military laws he was elected Brigadier General of the Second Congressional district, and in this capacity he was offered, by his party, the nomination for a seat in Congress, which was equivalent to an election. But just here the whole current of his life was changed.

On a matter of business he attended a service in a revival meeting in a neighboring church. When he went into the community he had no thought of attending church, and his going was a mere accident, so far as the human side of the matter was concerned, but God used it to powerfully stir up the former impressions to preach the Gospel. So great were these impressions that he forgot the business he came to transact and went home swearing eternal submission to the Lord's will, and on the next Sunday night he preached in the old home church, Beaver Dam, his first sermon, and he continued to preach from church to church and from house to house. From his first effort there were conversions every time and everywhere. He gave up his office to his deputies and at the next church meeting he was licensed to preach, and a short time after was, ordained and made missionary of the Gasper River Association, and within four years' time he had baptized about one thousand persons.

His entering the ministry was like a clap of thunder in a clear sky to the great majority of people. Some smiled, some scorned, some cursed, some said he was crazy, and others shouted the praises of God.

His entering the ministry is an answer to those, who sneer at the ministry and say that "men become preachers when they find they can't do anything else." When such men as J. S. Coleman, Major W. E. Penn, J. B. Moody, J. N. Hall and hundreds of others who have been pre-eminently successful in politics and business, enter the ministry, it is proof that to be a successful preacher a man must be able to do almost anything else.

Dr. Coleman is one of the first orators in the ministry. His style is peculiar, but it has a power scarcely equaled by any other man. Some excel him in grace and culture, some excel him in diction, some may have a more melodious voice, but in that mysterious thing called power he scarcely has an equal.

Perhaps no man has done more in distributing Baptist literature than he. He has been a book agent all his life. When he holds a meeting he leaves as many books and papers behind as possible, and their silent work goes on through the years. He has a colportage work now, all his own, and his agents are selling Baptist literature in several counties of Kentucky.

The man to whom Dr. Coleman owes more, perhaps, than to any other, man is the late Dr. J. M. Pendleton. To Pendleton he went for instruction and advice, and he could not have gone to a grander or better man. Would to God that all our preachers had such a counselor. The chairs of theology in our seminaries are now largely filled with boys whose theological setting is somewhat uncertain, and it is to be feared that few such men as J. S. Coleman will be turned out by those schools.

To use Dr. Coleman's own words, he is "an old Landmark successionist, denying the claims of all other churches." His unparalleled success in pastoral and evangelistic work proves that holding these rigid Baptist doctrines does not interfere in the least with soul-winning. Whenever an anti-landmarker can show anything like such success for his work as can be shown for Coleman's work, then it will be time to cry down landmarkism as hurting the usefulness of those who hold to it.

Dr. Coleman is living with his second wife, who is a worthy woman and a true helpmeet. They have been living together for twenty years, and in their old age are serving the Lord as husband and wife in a way that is beautiful to behold.

The churches he has served as pastor have been as a rule small country churches. He was invited to the Walnut-street Church, Louisville, Ky., with a view to the pastorate, but declined. He was called to Sacramento, California, and declined. His Superior ability would have secured him almost any church, but he preferred to remain in the Green river country and work with the small country churches. He has never lived over thirty miles from Beaver Dam, and he is now living on a part of that thousand acres which his great-grandfather purchased, and near the place in the stream where the woman baptized herself.

He organized the church in Greenville and served it for a part of his time for thirty years. He was pastor for one year of the First Church, Owensboro, Ky., during which time there were two hundred and fifty additions, and the Walnut-street Church was planted that year, which has become a strong, aggressive church. He held a meeting in the Walnut-street Church and there were three hundred and fifty professions of faith. At the end of this meeting he was paralyzed and was not able to preach for a year, and hence he gave up his great work in Owensboro. After he recovered from his paralysis he returned to the Walnut-street Church and served it about four years, during which time there was built an elegant brick house.

At Whitesville, Daviess county, he served for a part of his time for thirteen years, and he held one protracted meeting in which there were one hundred and thirty-two additions to the church, and in another, one hundred and five, still another, seventy-five additions. No other pastor in Kentucky has had so great success in evangelistic work.

He organized Hartford Church in 1869, and preached for that church for half time for fifteen years. In 1886 he held a meeting there which resulted in over one hundred conversions.

He organized the church in Madisonville, Ky., in 1870, while acting as State Evangelist for the General Association, and he has served that church since that time one year, 1898.

In every pastorate he has filled the congregations have steadily increased, and the capacity of the house has frequently limited the number of hearers. These churches have been built up in number and efficiency. The smallest number he ever baptized as a result of a meeting was twelve. The average preacher is generally satisfied if he can baptize so many at any time, but as God does not make all trees or rivers the same size, neither does he make all men great alike. By the grace of God we are all what we are.

Dr. Coleman is a doctrinal preacher. He constantly emphasizes the peculiarities of the Baptist faith, and as a result he has baptized, in round numbers, one thousand from other denominations. Those who are opposed, to doctrinal preaching may learn a lesson here. He hardly ever preached a set sermon on Baptist peculiarities; but he has woven it into almost every sermon. A fair sample of his preaching may be seen in the sermon at the close of this sketch on "The Work of Baptists An Urgent Work."

He has preached, in round numbers, fourteen thousand sermons, witnessed, under these sermons, ten thousand professions of faith, and has baptized exactly five thousand and twelve converts. The majority of the other converts were baptized by other pastors, and some went to other denominations. Whenever some liberalist, who decries Landmarkism, can meet that record, then, and not till then, will it be even considered possible for liberalism, pulpit affiliationism, and such like, to be as effective as uncompromising Baptist doctrines.

He has assisted in organizing fifty churches, and has laid hands on fifty-five preachers, dedicated seventy-seven meeting houses, solemnized the rites of marriage two thousand times and preached two thousand funerals. He has made special addresses on temperance, education and denominational enterprises about one thousand. He has baptized over two thousand persons when ice had to be removed from the surface of the water; he has forded streams and waded through mud roads, "enduring hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ."

Dr. Coleman has been a great debater. His greatest victory in debate was with Wm. L. Caskey, Methodist, at Calhoun, McLean county, Ky.

Having studied effectiveness all his life, he set about preparing the best possible answer to the household baptism argument always used by Pedobaptists in debate. He knew that by the next day Caskey would undertake to prove infant baptism by the household baptisms spoken of in the New Testament. He carefully read the account of each of these household baptisms, and he discovered that no infant was mentioned, and he knew plainly that the whole argument was based on inference. So he concluded to meet inference with inference. He set about to see what he could infer to offset Caskey's inferences, and that he succeeded grandly will appear as follows.

Caskey made his speech as Dr. Coleman expected, and argued that since households were baptized by the Apostles, and that it is reasonable to infer that infants were in these households, that infant baptism was scriptural. That was the sum of his speech.

Dr. Coleman, in his reply, spoke as follows: "I am surprised at Bro. Caskey's limited information concerning Lydia's household. He has inferred that Lydia had children, under the age of accountability, and that, therefore, these children were baptized. I am surprised, sir, that you do not know that Lydia was a widow, and a

traveling cloth merchant, and that she never had but one child, and that was a daughter, who had married a red-headed, one-eyed shoemaker, and had moved off to Damascus, and had not been at home for years, and that her household at that time consisted of herself and servants, who assisted her in her business. I am surprised, sir, that you did not know this." Caskey, in his confusion, spoke out and said: "Dr. Coleman, how do you know what you have just said?"

In a lion like voice the reply came: "I inferred it, sir, just like you inferred that there were children in the household."

This was too much for the audience, which broke out in uproarious laughter and applause. When Caskey arose to speak the very sight of him would be enough, and the laughing, half-suppressed, would be so continual that it was with great difficulty he could proceed, and every time he would make the slightest reference to household baptisms the vision of that "red-headed, one-eyed shoemaker" would come into mind and the audience would break out in uncontrollable laughter, which could not be suppressed by the Moderator. Caskey gave it up as a bad job and cut the debate short one day and left.

A Methodist class leader by the name of Yeaman was converted to the faith of the Baptists by this debate, and he has since become one of the leading preachers of the West. That class leader is now Elder Pope Yeaman, D.D., LL.D., Ph.D., twenty years Moderator of the General Association of Missouri, and he has been pastor of some of the greatest churches in the West.

Dr. Coleman has for thirty-seven years served the Daviess County Association as Moderator, and for nineteen years he has been Moderator of the General Association of Kentucky. He is getting old, and as his picture, published in connection with this sketch, will show, he is feeble, but his energy will not let him rest. He is serving two weak, struggling churches, Grand Rivers and Morgantown, Ky., and when he falls it will be with the harness on.

He can truly say: "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith," and with equal truth we can say for him that a crown of righteousness awaits him. 2 Tim. 4:7, 8.

Bethel College conferred on him the title of D.D., and Hartford College that of Ph.D. He edited and published the Green River Baptist during the civil war, and he was at one time connected with the Western Recorder.

It was Dr. Coleman who introduced the first resolution in the Southern Baptist Convention suggesting that the Whitsitt matter be looked into, and he was made chairman of the investigating committee. It was he who offered in the General Association of Kentucky that memorable resolution which brought on that great discussion, on the floor of the Association, that gave Whitsitt his death blow, and in a few days thereafter the notorious Professor resigned. Dr. Coleman was dreaded by Dr. Whitsitt and his followers as but few men were.

Brethren, while we sojourn here,
Fight we must, but should not fear;
Foes we have, but we've a friend,
One that loves us to the end.
Forward, then, with courage go,
Long we shall not dwell below;

Soon the joyful news will come,
Child, your Father calls, - come home.

The Work of the Baptists an Urgent Work

By Elder J. S. Coleman, D.D., of Hartford, Ky.

[Sermon delivered before the Daviess County Baptist Association, August 14, 1888.]

"The King's Business Required Haste." — I Samuel 21:8

Notwithstanding their distinguishing independent, democratic form of church government, their personal liberty and freedom of soul, yet Baptists are not free in the sense that they have a right to do as they please, unless they please to act in conformity to the will of their King, for they have a king; but they have but one king. He is a living and a reigning king: "The LORD of LORDS and the KING of KINGS," possessing an inalienable right to reign and rule over His servants, whom He has purchased by the shedding of His own blood.

Yes, Baptists are the subjects of one Master, one Lord, one King, who is their only authoritative lawgiver and exemplar, and to whom they acknowledge supreme allegiance; and as the first qualification of a loyal subject is obedience to the King's authority, Baptists should constantly illustrate their fealty to Christ by their unswerving fidelity to His government.

I. Our high calling as Baptists is to attend to our King's business.

We are not our own. We are bought with a price, that price having been paid by our King. Hence our first and paramount concern in life should be to do His bidding, by consecrating all our powers and all our resources to the promotion of His Kingdom among men.

1. Whatever brought our King into the world, also sends us out into the world, "The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost." Our business, as his servants, is to seek and to save the lost, in the use of the agencies and instrumentalities that he puts within our reach. Each should employ his abilities, as God has endowed him, to their uttermost for the accomplishment of the object of Christ's mission to this world.

2. Our King came into the world to bring the world back to his Father. The whole world had gone away from God, insomuch there were none that "Sought after God," "none that did good, no, not one," "all had become unprofitable."

Our business is to bring the world, even the whole world, to Christ the Son of God, that He may, according to the covenant made before the world was, bring the world back to His Father again. What a grand mission is ours! To work with Christ to bring a lost world to God, "that the world through Him might be saved." Does it not invoke and deserve the consecration and devotion of all our ransomed powers? And shall any of us prove recreant to our high calling by employing anything less than the full measure of our several abilities in our endeavors to achieve the purposes of our King, in his mission to this sin-cursed earth of ours? "She hath done what she could" was the grandest encomium ever pronounced by Divinity upon humanity, and yet it only expresses the true boundary of Christian obligation and duty. What we possess ability to do, we can do, and what we can do, the law of Christ makes it our duty to do, that the world through Him may be saved. How exalted and how sublime is our

high calling.

II. Our King proposes to save this world through the agency of organizations which He denominates His churches, and by the instrumentality of the people of whom He has been pleased to compose His Churches.

1. The first of these churches was organized by our King himself, and to that church, through His Apostles, was the law given teaching them how to institute or organize other churches. This law we denominate "The Great Commission," which is more fully quoted by Matthew than by any of the Evangelists. (See Matthew 20:18-20.) This statute of our King contains and confers all the power, all the authority and all the prerogatives necessary to be employed by His people, in all time to come, for the fulfillment and consummation of His and their mission in the world. No need of any further legislation, by way of amendments, changes, substitutions or otherwise; it being the simple duty of all church builders, in all the ages to come, to strictly adhere to the pattern here given, by executing the plan and exercising the authority herein conferred. To this people, thus called, qualified and sanctified, and their successors, who shall possess similar endowments, both spiritual and ceremonial, is this great statutory law given, by the King, and to none others. It is not the right of every ecclesiastical adventurer, or every church cobbler, who may choose to experiment in holy things, to come along and assume to institute organizations under the authority of this law, and dignify them by calling them churches. Such authority belongs only to such people as possess such qualifications as distinguished those to whom it was first given.

If this world is ever evangelized, and saved from the pollution and guilt of sin, and the thralldom of religious superstition and error, it must be done through the agency of such organizations as the first church, and the labors of such people as those who composed the first church. The task enjoined in this commission is such an one that no other institution or people can hope to accomplish.

3. But the question arises in the mind of some (not in ours), where are such organizations and such a people to be found in this age?

We answer without doubt, wavering or equivocation that such organizations and such a people can alone be found among the baptist churches and Baptist people of the present age. If proof is demanded, here it is: (1) This is a commission which enjoys first the making of disciples. (2) The baptizing of those who are made disciples. (3) Their instruction in all the subsequent duties pertaining to their profession.

From this brief analysis of the commission it must be seen that the Baptists are the only people whose practice is in accord with its requirements, and hence they are the only people who can execute it without the destruction of their own theory and practice. If this is a commission to baptize believers or the regenerated only, which seems to be clear, then it follows inevitably that those who baptize in order to the remission of past sins, and those who baptize unconscious infants, cannot be the people who are authorized to act under this commission, nor can they execute it in harmony with their views of the subject and design of gospel baptism. Moreover, if the baptism enjoined in this law is immersion, as we unqualifiedly hold, then it follows that no people who hold that baptism is rightly administered by sprinkling, or pouring, can be the people to whom Christ has entrusted the responsibility of converting this world under the provisions of this law.

For these reasons, and many others that we might mention, we hold, and believe, that the commission to evangelize this world was given by the Lord Jesus Christ to

an organization and a people, who are now only rightly represented by BAPTIST CHURCHES AND BAPTIST PEOPLE.

In taking this position we are not to be understood as either holding or saying that there are no Christians outside of Baptist churches. We cannot if we would hold such a position, since we insist that every one must first be made a Christian before he can scripturally receive baptism, or become a church member; hence we are the last people under the sun to be accused of unchristianizing any one because he is not a Baptist, since we hold that none are fit to become Baptists who are not first made Christians. Therefore we recognize the claims of all who profess to be Christians, especially if they illustrate the fact in their lives, and for them we cultivate Christian fellowship, but we do not admit their claim as constituting gospel churches, or as possessing the right or scriptural authority to administer under the commission, whose provisions and requirements they both ignore and contradict; nor do we believe that such institutions or societies can ever succeed in the world's conversion. With what awful and solemn responsibility are we as Baptists invested, if it be true that to us the great King has intrusted the great enterprise of bringing a lost and ruined world back to God and eternal salvation. And yet it is upon this ground that we are compelled to stand, by the very force of the doctrines that we hold and teach. May the Lord make us "sufficient for these things."

III. The King supplies His people and His churches with all the means necessary to the accomplishment of His business.

1. Are numbers necessary to success? While we need not insist that our strength consists in numbers, for our King can make the few and the weak equal to any task He may assign them, yet we must not ignore the fact that there is a degree of power in numbers. Well, these we have in ample sufficiency; if they were only properly and earnestly consecrated to their work, what might we under God achieve?

Here in our own beloved District Association we have nearly six thousand communicants, where forty-eight years ago a few feeble churches, with only about six hundred members, associated themselves under the name of the Daviess County Baptist Association. "What hath God wrought in our very midst?"

We have here in our own boundary numbers sufficient to occupy every inch of our territory with Baptist preaching, Baptist Sunday-schools, and Baptist churches, were we only devoted to our Master's business as we should be.

But how is it in our old beloved and honored Commonwealth? The same may be said of our own association. From only about thirty-five thousand fifty years ago we have increased to 1,818 churches and 202,264 communicants, while we baptized in the last year in Kentucky alone 12,426. With this mighty force we should occupy every valley and hilltop, while the praises of our King should sweep and sway the mountains of Eastern Kentucky like a breath from Heaven, and every desert and solitary place be made to bud and bloom like a rose.

Then extend your survey to our Southern sunny land, and see two millions and a quarter of our brethren and sisters composing 14,874 white churches, with a net increase last year of 528 churches, and a net increase of membership of 50,105; while the total number of churches, white and colored, in the South, is 24,205, and the total number of baptisms last year 121,578.

Now extend the width of your observation and embrace the United States and we find 31,891 churches aggregate nearly three millions membership.

Then widen your view and take in the world and learn that we have 37,354 churches,

comprising a. membership of almost four millions, constituting by far the largest converted membership of any sect or denomination on the face of the earth.*

2. Are learning, gifts, talents and genius necessary to enable us to accomplish the business of our King?

These we have now in full proportion to our numbers. Once in this country we were branded with such epithets as "low," "ignorant " and "vulgar" by the aristocrats of the State establishment, who arrested us, and imprisoned and whipped and fined and banished us, adjudging us far more worthy of such treatment than of church privileges and communion tables, but now the complaint is that we will not recognize their churches and ordinances and commune with them. What a change has come over the spirit of their dreams.

Now we have not less than 125 chartered institutions of learning in this country, with property valued at more than twenty-five millions. We have also in this country not less than one hundred religious and denominational newspapers and periodicals, read, it is estimated, by nearly or quite half of the entire population, while the attainments of our scholars, and the gifts, talents and genius of our orators and ministers would lose nothing in comparison with the most polished and gifted sons of this continent.

3. Is wealth necessary to the world's conversion? We have it also in full proportion to our numbers. Baptists own more acres in the bounds of the Daviess County Association than any other people. They possess greater wealth than any other denomination in the State, while in the whole South there is no other sect that can compare with us in the extent of our worldly possessions. What we want is not more wealth, but a higher, deeper and stronger consecration to our King's business, in a more liberal use of the means that He has given us.

4. Is it necessary that our principles and practices be universally admitted by other religious sects in order that we lead a fallen world to Christ? This we enjoy in a measure, and to a degree that no other party in religion can boast. What is it that we hold and teach in religion that is positively denied by any of the so-called evangelical sects?

Can you call to mind just one of our denominational peculiarities which is not admitted to be true by any of our sectarian adversaries? When we affirm our doctrines and practices, who is it that says we are wrong? Let us recall just a few of our most prominent peculiarities in teaching and practice, that we may see how the case stands.

What is it more than anything else divides the so-called orthodox sects? It is the question of baptism as it relates to the subject and action. What do Baptists affirm, or rather what are they required to affirm on these points? Certainly nothing more than what they believe and do. Well, what do they believe touching the subject of baptism? They affirm that a true and penitent believer in the Lord Jesus Christ is a scriptural subject of Christian baptism. Who says they are not? Not one, since all agree that a believer ought to be baptized according to the Scriptures, and hence all religious sects which practice water baptism baptize believers whenever and wherever they have the opportunity.

* *These figures have been greatly increased since this sermon was-preached. There are now full 5,000,000 Baptists in the world [BMB, 1900].*

Take next the action of baptism, upon which Baptists are objected to because of the narrowness of their opinions. What do they affirm concerning the mode or action of baptism? Why, simply that immersion in water is scriptural baptism. Where is one to be found, whose opinion is worth a farthing, who does not admit the truth of what we affirm? He that would negative this proposition is either ignorant or dishonest; hence in either case his opinion would not be entitled to respect. In confirmation of our positions on the subject and action of baptism we might quote a volume of the admissions of those who baptize infants and substitute sprinkling and pouring for baptism, but neither time nor space will allow. Suffice it to say, however, that our religious adversaries do not object to what we believe and do in these matters, but rather to what we do not believe, and to what we do not practice. Therefore, in all controversies with, Pedobaptist sects we have never yet found one sufficiently presumptuous to negative what we affirm on these questions. Hence we see the high advantage ground occupied by the Baptists, made doubly strong by the universal admissions of our opponents. These admissions greatly facilitate our work in bringing the religious world back to correct religious opinions and practices.

5. Is a united Christian sentiment necessary to the accomplishment of our King's business in the world? We answer frankly that such seems to be the emphatic teachings of the Word. Our Lord's great intercessory prayer, as we have it in the 17th chapter of John's gospel, is full of this sentiment; hence such petitions as the following abound in that prayer: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are" — John 17:11. "That they all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," "And the glory which thou hast given me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me" — John 17:21, 22, 23.

From these passages it is easily inferred that it is the great desire of the heart of our King that His people shall be one, and that He conceived such unity among His people would facilitate the world's conversion. Hence the subject of our present inquiry is eminently pertinent, which is "a unified Christian sentiment necessary to the accomplishment of our King's business." Now, in view of what has been said in the preceding arguments, and in order to obviate the necessity of a protracted argument here, we will simply affirm, and leave the reader to make the application and the investigation, that the Baptists are the only people on the face of the earth who hold such principles of faith and practice in religion as enable them to present such terms of union to all true Christians as all can accept, and that, too, without the least sacrifice of principle or conscience. Here we might illustrate elaborately, but content ourselves by simply asking what sacrifice has a true Christian to make in accepting and doing that which he already admits is true and right? In asking others to become Baptists we are only suggesting that they take such a step toward the unification of the Christian World, as they already declare to be right, and therefore cannot involve themselves in the slightest sacrifice of principle. Baptists are accused of great bigotry and selfishness, in that they are opposed to all Christians communing together. We are not opposed to the communion of all Christians, but we first desire the union of all Christians in principle and practice, and then there would be a scriptural consistency in our communion at the Lord's table; "for how can two walk together except they be agreed?" So far from our being opposed to the union of all true Christians, we will make a proposition looking to a universal union of all God's children, which no other denomination will dare make, which is, that if all the Pedobaptist sects will only agree among themselves upon two questions, and that said agreement shall be reached without a solitary dissenting voice, then the Baptists

will pledge their sacred honor to accept the agreement thus reached by Pedobaptists themselves as the basis of union among all Christians for all time to come. The two questions which they must settle, and that as a unit, and which, when once agreed upon, will insure a perfect and consistent union among all Christians, are these: (1) WHO OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED? (2) HOW SHOULD THEY BE BAPTIZED? Let the Pedobaptist world agree upon these two questions and the Baptist shall not ask a question, but simply accept the situation.

And now if Pedobaptists refuse to accept and act upon this proposition, we shall have just grounds upon which to doubt their sincerity in so frequently insisting upon uniting in communion. Now we serve notice upon all Pedobaptists that they must either accept our proposition for union, which all must admit is most reasonable and liberal, or they must forever hereafter close their lips and hush their pretentious howl against Baptists about close communion. Now let us have peace either in one way or the other. We shall see What we shall see, and if we see anything, we shall see all true, consistent and unprejudiced Christians coming into the Baptist churches, since it will be found to be a moral and utter impossibility for Pedobaptists ever to agree upon the two questions propounded, among themselves, without being forced upon Baptist ground. Pedobaptists are not agreed upon these two questions, nor have they ever been, nor can they ever be, without becoming Baptists.

6. Is access to the nations of the world necessary to success?

Only a few years ago most of the nations in heathen lands were locked up against the gospel, while only partial protection was enjoyed by our missionaries in any of the foreign fields.

We asked God to unlock the doors of the heathen in distant lands, and he has done it. There is now scarcely a nation under the sun to which our missionaries cannot go, and enter and dwell there with reasonable and comparative security so far as the governments and rulers are concerned. Of course there are yet difficulties to encounter after legal obstructions have been removed, arising from the ignorance, superstition and barbarism of the people, but the nations are now accessible to the herald of salvation, so that many of the trials and sufferings encountered and endured by Carey and Judson are now unknown. What hath God wrought in answer to our prayers!

Now nation after nation is wheeling into line and becoming the intelligent and loyal subjects of our King, while still other kindreds and tribes are stretching forth their hands unto God, crying, "Come over and help us." And while God has opened wide the doors to the nations, by His special providences, and in the exercise of His discriminating grace and power, He is beckoning and bidding us to enter. How certainly is God making us to feel that His business requires haste. How thankful we should be that our King has given us access to the nations.

7. Are educated, pious, consecrated, willing, God-fearing and soul-loving young men necessary both at home and abroad, in order to the success of our King's business in the world?

How deeply we felt this need in the early years of our missionary operations, both in this land and in heathen fields. How fervent and earnest were the prayers of our people only a few years ago to the God of the harvest that He would send more and better qualified laborers into His harvest, but especially that He would put it into the hearts of young men and women to enter the fields that were already white to the harvest; and how wonderfully has He also answered our prayers by inflaming the hearts of so many pious young people with burning desires to go forth bearing the

precious seeds of the gospel. Hundreds of such are saying, in the language of young Samuel, "Here am I, send me." Instead of our having to hunt and seek diligently to find a suitable one to send here, there, or elsewhere, now many noble young men and women, with souls aflame with a holy zeal for God and humanity, are voluntarily offering themselves for the numerous fields which God, in His providence, has thrown open before them. All that now prevents us from sending a missionary into every open door is the lack of more consecrated Baptist pocket-books and Baptist property. O! that the King may open the hearts of His subjects in this country as He has the doors of the nations and the hearts of our young people.

IV. Baptists have the strongest assurances of Divine favor to encourage them in the conviction that it is the King's fixed purpose that they shall take the lead in every grand movement that shall ultimately result in this world's evangelization.

Let it not be thought that this proposition annunciates merely a vain or fulsome declaration, in the absence of well-grounded reasons to sustain it. "We are not mad, but speak the words of truth and soberness." From the first dawn of the gospel era, and from the first day of the introduction of the gospel dispensation, we have full and incontrovertible proof of this purpose upon the part of the Great Founder of our faith.

1. The first gospel preacher the world ever saw was a Baptist missionary; a Baptist not only in name, but also in profession, faith and practice. The evidences of this fact are sufficient to carry conviction to all unprejudiced minds. His preaching was Baptist, requiring those who received his baptism first to give evidence of conversion in such penitence as indicated the genuineness of their repentance. No others were baptized by him. When the proud and self-righteous Pharisee and the self-important Sadducee came clamorously demanding baptism at his hands, founding their claim to the ordinance upon flesh and blood qualifications, they were promptly rejected, and unqualifiedly denounced as a "generation of poisonous reptiles," seeking ingress into a spiritual kingdom upon the ground of natural descent.

It must be clear to every one that the Baptist harbinger did not baptize his subjects in order to the remission of their sins, nor did he administer the sacred ordinance to unconscious infants.

Now of all the church builders that have succeeded him through the centuries, where can one be found steadfastly adhering to John's example, save the Baptist? This being a fact of fundamental value, ought to be sufficient in itself to establish the truth of my proposition, but other proofs of the same fact are not wanting in a still further investigation of John's ministry. The places whither he resorted for the purpose of administering baptism, and his actions, and that of those who received baptism at his hands, seem to indicate that he must have been a Baptist. His resort for the administration of baptism was the Jordan, a flowing river, and to "Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Rivers and places where there was much water have, through the ages, been the favorite resorts for Baptists. Why go out into the wilderness, and not only to the river, but down into both the river and the water that was in the river, as our King must have done, for "He came up out of the water," if baptism could have been properly administered by either pouring or sprinkling a few drops upon the forehead? Who can believe that John baptized in any other way than in the way Baptists now baptize? Well, if he preached like Baptists preach, and required the same qualifications for baptism that Baptists require, and then baptized his converts as Baptists now baptize their converts, why was he not a Baptist? And if he was a Baptist, then it is a thing made out that God designed that

Baptists should lead in the great enterprise of converting the world. If this was His purpose then, it is His purpose yet; hence it is vain for others to undertake a work that God intends shall be done by the Baptists.

Moreover, Jesus Christ, the founder of the Baptist denomination, was also a Baptist missionary, as is evidenced by his preaching, by the character of those baptized in connection with his ministry (for they were first made disciples), by the manner in which he himself was baptized, and finally by the great commission he gave for the government of his people in all their movements in the great affair of bringing a lost world to salvation. That commission is the strongest Baptist document, and the most thorough digest of Baptist polity that the world ever saw. The whole of this law of the New Testament is but a divine enunciation of Baptist principles and practices.

2. The first revival at Pentecost, after the giving of the commission, was simply a Baptist missionary meeting, held in Jerusalem only ten days after the ascension of our King from the top of one of the high mountains of Galilee, as is easily inferable from the transactions of that memorable occasion. See Acts 2, chap. —. For proofs of the truth of this statement we need only to compare the transactions of that occasion with the manner in which Baptists usually conduct their meetings. (a) The public services were introduced by the preaching of the gospel. (b) By the power of the gospel thus preached, and attended by the Holy Spirit, those who heard were convicted of sin, and anxiously asked "What shall we do?" (c) Then they were instructed, just as we now instruct the convicted sinner, that was, to repent, confess, obtain the remission of sins, and then be baptized in testimony of the fact that their sins had been washed away by the blood of Jesus, (d) That such only were baptized on that occasion as "gladly received the word " is further proof of the character of the meeting; that is, none were baptized who did not or could not receive the gospel "gladly;" hence they were not baptized in order to the remission of sins, nor were there any unconscious infants baptized. (e) That there was not a word uttered about the Lord's Supper until after the converts were baptized, added to the church, had enjoyed her fellowship, and exhibited their steadfastness in the faith. If this was not a Baptist meeting, then pray tell us what sort of a meeting was it? And if it was a Baptist meeting, then it supports our claim "that it is God's fixed purpose that we shall take the lead in the propagation of the gospel."

3. As another proof of this same fact it is most certainly worthy of mention that God sent an angel by night and liberated Peter and John from the common prison and brought them forth and said, " Go stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." — Acts 5:18, 19, 20. Let it be remembered that Peter and John were two of the Baptist preachers who were engaged in the pentecostal meeting.

4. By visions and revelations one of these Baptist preachers is compelled to go and introduce first the gospel among the Gentile heathen. — Acts 10:1-48.

Here we have another proof of the divine purpose in compelling his chosen ministers and people to take the lead in disseminating the gospel among the nations, insomuch we shall hereinafter see how God has compelled the Baptists to go forth, when they have hesitated to go under the broad commission, the first word of which is "Go." This fact is early illustrated in the divine dealing with the first Baptist church at Jerusalem. It is more than probable that that church would have been content to have reposed upon her grand achievements in her first great revival, and continued to have luxuriated upon the grand victory she had won in a single day, without making any further sacrifices for the further spread of the gospel, but God intended that they should be missionaries, that they should "GO," and therefore He sent down

upon them such a persecution that they were scattered abroad, and it is said with emphasis "they went everywhere preaching the word," but devout men had already carried Stephen to his burial, as the first fruits of the persecution that made all the church at Jerusalem missionaries. Acts 7:54-60; 8:2-4.

Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them, and it is said, as a result of his preaching there, that "there was great joy in that city," for the reason that "the people with one accord gave heed unto those things that Philip spake." — Acts 8:5-8. Truly it may be said, in the language of old Watts, "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform." His purposes cannot fail; His people must bear the news of salvation to "all nations." But we must take a few examples from God's dealings with the Baptists in more modern times.

5. When in the wisdom of God the time had fully come that He would more directly engage the English speaking race in the spread of the gospel, and his providence contemplated the inauguration of modern missions in foreign heathen lands, he began by first converting William Carey from the errors of pedobaptism to the faith of the Baptists, notwithstanding he had been reared and educated to regard Baptists with supreme and sovereign contempt.

Being endowed with superior intellectual powers, and a most wonderful capacity for mastering the languages, and with a soul aflame with the missionary spirit, God saw fit to pass by all the crowned heads, mitred brows, of all the thrones and kingdoms of earth, and enter the humble shoe cobbler's domicile and call William Carey to stand in the forefront and preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to a heathen world. For many long and weary months he sat upon his shoe bench with the map of the world before him, estimating the vast fields of heathenish night, and the immeasurable extent of superstitious darkness, while his bosom heaved with anxious solicitude, and his heart palpitated with fervent love, while his streaming eyes wet with their tears his hand and hammer as he plied his daily vocation. But he could not remain in that shop. God had another for him. He could not any longer endure the unutterable tortures of a perturbed soul and conscience, while myriads of heathen souls were annually going down to woe. He could contain himself no longer; he must doff his shoemaker's apron and throw down the hammer and last, and appeal to the English-speaking children of God to come to the rescue and save a sinking world.

It was at a meeting of the Nottingham Association on the 30th day of May, 1792, when preaching from the text, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitation; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes" — Isaiah 54:2, that he divided his subject into the two following heads, which have made his name immortal: 1. "Expect great things from God;" 2. "Attempt great things for God." With these as his motto and with victory for our King or death upon his banner, he stirred the British Empire from center to circumference, and ultimately lifted the standard of the cross amid the unbroken darkness of the East Indies, and illuminated the Burman Empire with the light of the Star of Bethlehem.

Who, with these facts before them, will dare say that the God of Missions was indifferent as to the faith of the instrument he would at first employ to break the long night of heathenish darkness? Why was it that Carey was not sent without first being made a Baptist?

6. Take another example: When God would awaken American Baptists and engage them actively in the great work of missions, He did it in the most unlooked-for manner by converting two Pedobaptist missionaries to Baptist principles as they were crossing the vast deep on their voyage to the land of heathendom. The reference is to Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice, who having received a most thorough

equipment in a finished education, were sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which was a Congregational Presbyterian organization, originated for the express purpose of sending out these young men, whose souls were fired with a holy zeal for the heathen.

Knowing that Wm. Carey and a number of co-laborers were already in the field whither they were going, and knowing that they were Baptists, and anticipating that they would be likely to encounter their peculiar views on baptism, Judson and Rice deemed it wise to post up on the subject, and hence they made the baptismal question the subject of special study on their protracted voyage. The result was their sound conversion to the faith of the Baptists; insomuch, that upon landing in the heathen field, they made haste to hunt Wm. Carey and his friends and ask baptism at their hands. Mr. Judson received baptism at the hands of Mr. Carey on the 6th of September, 1812, while Mr. Rice received baptism at the hands of Mr. Ward, who was a helper to Mr. Carey, on the 1st of November, 1812. Their change of denominations left them in a foreign land and on hostile shores without support. American Baptists at the time had no foreign missionary organization, but the action of these two heroic young men set on flame the great heart of American Baptists, and the "American Baptist Missionary Union" was called into existence, while Judson soon received assurances of support from his newly-made friends. That was a dark and sad hour when,, after Judson and Rice had received gospel baptism on a far distant shore, they sat down to consult as to what they should attempt to do. After much meditation and prayer, Judson said to Rice, "I will go down into the well if you will hold the rope," which meant that he would stay there and take all the risks if Rice would return to this country and endeavor to arouse the American Baptists on missions. He came, and, like a comet, with a lighted torch in his hand, he flew over the States of the nation like one having the everlasting gospel to preach, and truly the Baptist churches in the United States were set on fire with an all-consuming zeal for the cause of foreign missions. But we can pursue this thrilling story no further at present, but simply haste to draw some practical conclusions from this marvelous :record. Who can consider these facts and not see the hand of God in the change of their religious views by Judson and Rice? Is it asking too much of our readers that they shall believe that divine providence did interfere to prevent the errors of Pedobaptists from being propagated in the land' -whither these missionaries were going? What stronger proof have we need of to satisfy the most .skeptical of its being the King's pleasure that the Baptists shall take the lead in all the great movements having for their object the world's evangelization? Indeed, such a conclusion seems to be inevitable.

8. But the most wonderful exhibition that the world has ever seen of God's fixed purpose that the Baptists shall have the lead in all the moral and religious revolutions of the age is to be seen in the miraculous conversion, together with all that led to it, and in the subsequent career of Alberto J. Diaz, of Cuba. Where is there anything like it, either in the history of ancient or modern times? To hear the facts sounds like the recital of a fanciful romance. We can scarcely believe what seems so marvelous, notwithstanding we have the testimony of the most unimpeachable witnesses, who have been to Cuba and seen the things whereof they affirm. It is truly marvelous in our eyes how this young Cuban drifted into the army of the Insurgents;* was about to be captured, to avoid which he, with other comrades, sought to evade his pursuers by committing himself to the gulf current, floating on fragments of timber, but being drifted out seaward was thus "a day and a night in the deep," but being observed by a passing vessel he was taken aboard, and the vessel being bound to New York, he was lauded in that city; and having hitherto studied medicine, he concluded to make the study of the eye a specialty, but soon

fell sick in a private boarding-house in Brooklyn, and being kindly cared for by Miss Alice Tucker, who becoming interested in him when death seemed to be at the door, and being a pious young member of a Baptist church, she frequently read from a certain book, and prayed aloud for him, but by whose judicious nursing the crisis was passed, and convalescing he asked what book it was she read, when she talked to herself, as he called it; being told that it was the Bible, and that she had been praying for him, he very much desired to know more about that book, and the meaning of prayer. Finally a copy in the Spanish language was given him, and by it he was led to Christ, and feeling the love of God in his heart, after diligent investigation, was led to seek membership in the Baptist church presided over by Dr. McArthur, and was by him baptized; and now finding his soul stirred within him for the salvation of his kinsmen and brethren after the flesh, he returns to Cuba to tell them what a dear Saviour he has found — surprised at their blindness of mind and stupidity of soul, he is ready to despair, but urged on by his own convictions and experience, he would again face his difficulties, and so persisted through the most formidable discouragements, until under God he has unlocked the doors of Cuba to the gospel, his family has been converted, several Baptist churches organized, hundreds of converts baptized, and now more than eight thousand membership — the galling yoke of Catholic tyranny badly broken — while it is estimated that more than one-half of the inhabitants of the island are under Baptist influence. Now consider that Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists had before this signally failed to secure a footing in Cuba after large expenditures of money and many self-denying labors, does it not appear that the position taken in this discourse is true; which is, that our King intends that the Baptists shall lead this world to himself? The indications in Cuba at the present time are that in a very short period Cuba is destined to become a Baptist nation. "The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad."

V. The final thought suggested by the text is, that our work as Baptists requires haste. If the positions now assumed in this discourse are well taken, what industry, liberality, self-denial and urgency should characterize our efforts to possess this world for our Master. Surely our work is an urgent business.

1. Because our work is far reaching in its consequences, and so vastly important as it relates to the future religious interests and destinies of mankind. What we believe and do are the powers that must determine the final religious status of universal humanity. If this world is to be enlightened, elevated, liberated and saved, to say the least, Baptists must perform the most conspicuous part. Indeed, it is even questionable whether or not we are being facilitated in our work by what others are doing. How responsible our positions, how solemn our vast undertaking.

2. We should be in haste because the Master seems to be in a heavenly hurry. See how his great and strange providences are wheeling the nations into line. How mysterious are the wonder-working ways of the Almighty God whom we profess to love. What a grand and awful thing it is to live in the present age, "an age on ages telling."

3. We should make haste because the great opportunities and possibilities that now environ us will soon glide away forever. What our hands find to do let us do with our might. "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work." There are doors now opened before us by God's own hand, that may soon be closed to us

* This refers to the Cuban rebellion twenty years ago. forever.

Why stand here all the day idle? Why not thrust in the sickle and reap a sheaf for the Master's use in eternity?

4. We should make haste because the WICKED ONE, together with all his subalterns are making haste to mislead, deceive and destroy. The devil never sleeps, he is always alert, watchful and vigilant, seeking whom he may devour. While we sleep he works. While we stand idle he plies all his hellish ingenuity to embarrass and hinder our work. While we "forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of so many of our modern Baptists is," the devil holds high carnival in every city, town and cross-roads, aiding and abetting the grossest and most flagrant violations of the sanctity of the Holy Sabbath, by running ponderous trains over almost all the railroads of the country, and by encouraging base ball sports, which is the "abomination of desolation" to the morals of the community, while the laws of the land are impotent to protect good people in the pursuit of happiness, even on the day made holy by Divine command. How long shall the Christian people of this country repose in indolence, while such outrages are being perpetrated against the peace and good order of religious society, and the dignity and sanctity of our boasted civilization? When shall our "King reign in righteousness, and our Princes rule in judgment?" "Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean."

5. We should make haste because every form and shape of religious errorists are making haste to propagate and plant their pernicious principles and doctrines in every community in the length and breadth of the land. Their success is our failure; their triumphs our defeats. Though a man be soundly converted in spirit, yet if he fall a victim of the misrule of false religious teaching, his second conversion is only made the more difficult, for men are not rightly nor scripturally converted until they are ready and willing to render unqualified and implicit obedience to our King. How important that we enter and occupy every field. Now the doors to many neighborhoods and villages within the boundary of our own beloved Association are standing ajar for the entrance of our principles and faith, while the devotees, of religious error are putting forth every effort to pre-occupy these places. What an incentive for us "to do with our might what our hands find to do."

6. We should make haste because the time in which we can work is so exceedingly short. Already the day is far spent, and the night comes on. Many of our comrades and co-laborers are falling victims to the last enemy, which is death. Look back on the events of the year just ending and "see how the mighty have fallen." Where is Baker, and Taylor, and our own beloved Peay? Twelve months ago they stood shoulder to shoulder with us in the service of our King, but now they rest from their labors, and may God grant that their works may follow them. Many of us are standing upon the brink while the hoarse waves of the Jordan murmur at our feet. O, my brethren, what mean these numerous frosted heads before me to-day? Ah! these are the blossoms of eternity just lingering on the shores of time, waiting to be transplanted into the better land. O! my brethren, let us "awake out of sleep, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." Let us remember that "the King's business requires haste." May the God of all grace be with you all. Amen.

[This sermon has been published in tract form and has had a good circulation.]

Chapter XV - Life of John T. Christian, D.D., LL.D.

By Ben M. Bogard, 1900

John T. Christian was born, December 14, 1854, near Lexington, Ky. His family moved to Henry county, Ky., when he was six years old, and there he grew to manhood.

He professed faith in Christ and joined the Campbellsburg church at the age of sixteen, under the preaching of Elder J. H. Spencer, that remarkable man and great preacher, who was loved and honored by Kentucky Baptists for over thirty years.

The stalwart orthodoxy of John T. Christian may be partially accounted for by his coming under the influence, at the very beginning of his religious life, of such a man as J. H. Spencer. Spencer's numerous protracted meetings were BAPTIST meetings. He "shunned not to declare all of the counsel of God," and his converts nearly all joined the church and became useful Baptists.

Dr. Christian was educated at Bethel College, Russellville, Ky., and learned his theology, partially at least, under Dr. W. W. Gardner, than whom a safer, sounder Baptist has not lived in the South.

In June, 1876, he graduated from that college with the Bachelor's Degree, and in 1880 the same institution conferred on him the degree of Master of Arts, and in 1888 the title of Doctor of Divinity.

All of these titles he richly deserves. Keachie College, La., in 1898, pronounced Dr. Christian a LL.D.

Not only have the colleges recognized his ability, but the whole Baptist denomination has been influenced by his ready and powerful pen, and by his skill as a debater. Nobody thinks of Dr. Christian as an ordinary man.

He was licensed to preach by the church at Campbellsburg, Ky., in July, 1876. He became pastor in Tupelo, Miss., beginning in 1877, and served that church two years. He was afterward pastor of Sardis Church, in the same State, and went from there to the First Baptist Church, Chattanooga, Tenn., beginning there March, 1883. Here he preached for three years, and then became Secretary of Missions for Mississippi. In 1893, beginning June 1, he accepted the care of the historic East Church, Louisville, Ky., where he has since preached with great acceptance.

Dr. Christian is a man sought after by the churches, and those who sit under his preaching become stronger Baptists and more aggressive soldiers of the cross.

As an author he has but few equals. His book, entitled, "Immersion, The Act of Christian Baptism," has gone through twelve editions, and is without an equal in that class of books. As a companion volume is his "Close Communion," which has gone through six editions and still finds a ready sale. "Americanism or Romanism, Which?" is a vigorous attack on Romanism, which has had a wide circulation, and it clearly and forcibly shows the danger American institutions are in from that source. "Did They Dip?" is a discussion of the practice of English Baptists with regard to baptism prior to the year 1641. This is a valuable addition to Baptist history. "Four Theories of Church Government," a neat pamphlet and an able discussion of the theories mentioned. "Heathen and Infidel Testimonies to Jesus Christ," and "Blood of Jesus," are well prepared pamphlets of wide circulation. His latest book is entitled "Baptist History Vindicated." This is the most valuable history published in recent years.

Facts, hitherto unknown, or imperfectly known, are brought to light in this able work. It has an "Appendix," entitled, "Testimony of Living Scholars of the Church of England to Immersion." This is a valuable book and should be studied by all who care to know the facts discussed.

No doubt many other books will be written by Dr. Christian during the many years which he shall probably yet live. He is only forty-five, and, if the Lord spares him for thirty or forty years of active service in the future, what may he not accomplish?

The greatest service Dr. Christian has ever rendered to the denomination was his able defence of the Baptists against the attacks of Dr. William H. Whitsitt. The theories and vagaries of Dr. Whitsitt were met, and that without mercy. In that great discussion, Dr. Christian displayed greater familiarity with the facts of history than any other man who took up his pen to write. He seemed to have already investigated every part of the subject, and the ease and strength manifested were a surprise to all. To read what he had to say was to be convinced that he had been thoroughly over the ground before the question was raised.

His able defence of the Baptists at this most trying time won for him a place in this book and entitled him to the appellation of a "pillar of orthodoxy." His able article following this sketch, on "What Baptists have Done for the World," is worth the price of this volume.

=====

What Baptists Have Done for the World

By John T. Christian, D.D.

This subject is presented for the purpose, if possible, to stimulate our people to loftier devotion and to nobler deeds of usefulness. I honor every man who has been true to God and labors for the up-building of our race. I especially love the history and traditions of Baptist people. I shall not in this paper undertake to say anything of the origin and history of the Baptist churches. As interesting and instructive as this would be I prefer to discuss another question. Have the people called Baptists been of any service to the world? Have they been bearers of fruit? One hour of service is worth an age of being.

I would have our young people, and our older ones too, to know something of the thrilling deeds of our fathers. The world has always been interested in history, and men are better when they hear of good deeds. The Iliad of Homer is but a recounting of the deeds of Grecian heroes. The books of Joshua and Judges are records of the martial deeds of the Jews. Full many a time an old soldier sits down, draws around him his children and grandchildren, and fights over his battles again. The outlines of the story which is set before you, if studied in fullness and detail, would be of the sublimest interest to all. What have the Baptists done for the world? I answer:

1. Baptists have stood for the supreme authority of the Word of God. They do not acknowledge the binding authority of creeds, Their Confessions, from that of Schleithem to the New Hampshire, are valuable as literature and as a historical statement of truth. They do not recognize as authoritative the historic practices of the church nor appeal to the decrees of the councils. The sayings of the fathers are no more than historical statements. Their appeal is not to the "fathers," but to Jesus

Christ and the Apostles. Their sole recognized authority is the written word of the eternal God. All a Baptist desires to know upon any point of faith is, is it taught in the New Testament, and when God's mind is known on a point nothing more is needed. They think the Bible is a plain book, designed for common people, and may be understood by all. They do not think that it requires commentaries and an infallible Pope in order to understand Christian duties. They think the Bible is the impregnable Rock of Ages and stands four square against every wind that blows; and, to use the words of another, "We congratulate ourselves that our campaign document is the most widely-circulated book in the world."

The Baptists have translated the Bible into more languages than any other body of Christians. More than half the inhabitants of the globe are dependent upon Baptist translations for their knowledge of the Word of God. William Carey translated the New Testament into Bengali, and a similar blessing was conferred on China by Joshua Marshman, on Burma by Adoniram Judson, on the Karens by Francis Mason, on the Assamese by Nathan Brown, and on the Telegus by Lyman Jewett. I am persuaded that Doctors Cone, Conant, Armitage, Wyckoff, Everts, Hackett and others, through the Baptist Union, and the more recent agitations among Baptists, were largely influential in giving to the English-speaking people the Canterbury revision of the Scriptures. Thus the Baptists have made no small showing in Bible revision and translation.

Baptists have done equally well in the promotion of the circulation of the Scriptures. Joseph Hughes, a Baptist preacher, from Wales, originated the plan of giving the Bible to the world. He founded, originated, fostered and named the British Foreign Bible Society. Some one has quaintly said that "he was the hands and feet, as he had been the head of the institution." The missionary work of Carey had given a wonderful impetus to Bible circulation. He and his coadjutors, Ward and Marshman, made great progress in the translation of the Word of God, English Christians became much interested in these translations and large sums of money were contributed for their publication and circulation. This led to the foundation of a Bible Society for the world.

Dr. Christopher Anderson, of Edinburgh, while tracing the influences which led to the formation of the British Foreign Bible Society, says: "Such an enterprise (as that of Carey's), so warmly supported from home, could not possibly fail to have a powerful reflective influence on the mother country, and more especially on the healthiest minds throughout Britain, who grounded their chief hope of permanent good on the sacred volume alone." Dr. Thomas Scott, the son of the great Bible expositor, in his memoir of his father, says of Dr. Carey: "He is perhaps better entitled than any other individual to the praise of having the first impulse to the extraordinary exertions of the present age for the propagation of Christianity in the world." It is then to these four Baptist ministers, Dr. Carey, the Oriental Polyglot, and "Tindal of our times;" Dr. Marshman, the accurate and pioneer translator of the whole Bible into the Chinese; William Ward, the finished printer in twenty oriental languages, and Joseph Hughes, the founder of the Bible Society, that this mighty work of Bible distribution, in foreign lands, has been accomplished.

The Baptists were also the early promoters of the American Bible Society. In a few months after its organization they contributed no less than \$170,000 to that society. And they only withdrew from it because the society adopted what Baptists regarded as a narrow and sectarian policy, which was in direct violation of the plain principles of its organization.

2. Baptists have done a great thing for the world in preserving pure the

ordinances of the gospel.

This may not be the greatest achievement of the Baptists, but it is greatly worth the doing. They have constantly called a forgetting world back to the Word of God. The Baptists have retained in the western world, what the Greeks have done in the eastern, the act of Christian baptism. I shall permit a few scholars to testify on this point:

Dr. John F. Hurst, the leading Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, says: "With respect to the mode or baptism, on which there has been much discussion, there can be no doubt in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic, immersion in water was nearly, if not quite, the universal custom." (Short History of the Christian Church.)

In the Douay Bible, with Haydock's Notes, which received the official indorsement [sic] of Pope Pius IX., and is therefore the highest possible Roman Catholic authority, is the following comment on Matt. 3:6: "Baptized. The word baptism signifies a washing, particularly when it is done by immersion or by dipping or plunging a thing under water, which was formerly the ordinary way of administering the sacrament of baptism. But the Church, which cannot change the least article of Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremony. Not only the Catholic Church, but also the pretended reformed churches, have altered the primitive custom in giving the sacrament of baptism, and now allow of baptism by sprinkling or pouring water upon the person baptized; nay, many of their ministers do it nowadays by flipping a wet finger and thumb over the child's head, which it is hard enough to call a baptizing in any sense." All the Jewish rabbis and Hebrew scholars admit that baptism is an immersion. This is the declaration of Rabbi Wise, of Cincinnati; Felsenthal, of Chicago; and Moses, of Louisville. Rabbi Moses says: "There is no doubt that the Baptists are right on that point." Prof. Franz Delitzsch, the renowned professor of Leipzig, wrote me just before his death that baptizo "signifies to immerse." Prof. S. R. Driver, perhaps the foremost Hebrew scholar in England, says of the word: "It is rendered to plunge," and this is "the meaning recognized by all authorities. The word does not mean to pour or to sprinkle."

All of the late Greek critical scholarship is favorable to the Baptists. The professors in all colleges, in this country and Great Britain, of every denomination, recognize the seventh edition of Liddell and Scott as the best classical lexicon, and Thayer's New Testament lexicon as the best on the Scriptures. Dr. Gross Alexander, Vanderbilt University, commends Liddell and Scott and Thayer. Dr. Hodge, Princeton, says: "The best classical Greek lexicon is Liddell and Scott's. The best New Testament lexicon is Thayer's edition of Grimm." Prof. A. S. Wilkins, LL.D., Owens College, England, says: "You may fully trust the account you find in Thayer." Prof. G. E. Marmdin, Esq., M. A., Examiner of Greek in the London University, says: "I think you will find a perfectly correct account of the classical use of baptizo in Liddell and Scott's lexicon."

Now these two dictionaries, which are regarded as the standards by all scholars of all denominations, should satisfy all honest inquirers. Liddell and Scott define baptizo "to dip in or under water." Thayer's definition is: "Baptizo, to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterward by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the nature and contents of their religion, viz.: an immersion in water."

But does not some other good lexicon define baptizo "to sprinkle or to pour?" This is a natural and pertinent question, since many persons are known to practice

sprinkling and pouring; which is called baptism. Can it be that such practices are without the support of one authoritative lexicon? I have abundant material at hand to answer this question. The following question was asked of a number of Professors of Greek in this country and in England: "Is there an authoritative Greek-English lexicon which defines the word 'to sprinkle' or 'to pour?'"

American answers were as follows:

Prof. H. W. Humphreys, then of Vanderbilt, now of the University of Virginia, says: "There is no standard Greek-English lexicon that gives sprinkle or pour as one of the meanings of the Greek word baptizo."

Prof. W. S. Tyler, Amherst College, says: "I do not know of any good lexicon which gives sprinkling as a rendering of baptizo."

Prof. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, says: "There is no standard Greek-English lexicon that gives either sprinkle or pour as one of the meanings of the Greek verb baptizo."

Prof. Flagg, Cornell University, says: "I know of no lexicons which give the meanings which you speak of for baptizo, not even the lexicons of the Roman and Byzantine periods."

The English were as follows:

The Rev. H. Kynaston, D.D., Professor of Greek and Classical Literature, University of Durham, says: "The word baptizo means 'to dip, or sink' into water -- not sprinkle, which is raino. I know of no lexicon which gives 'sprinkle' for baptizo."

Prof. G. C. Warr, M.A., Professor of Greek in Kings College, says: "Certainly the classical meaning of baptizo is to dip, not to sprinkle or to pour."

Prof. John Stracham, M.A., Owens College; says: "I never to my knowledge met with the word in the literal sense of 'sprinkle,' and I doubt if it has any such meaning."

Prof. A. S. Wilkins, Litt. D., LL.D., Professor of Greek New Testament Criticism, Owens College, says: "I do not think that any lexicon of authority gives the literal meaning of 'to pour.'"

Prof. G. E. Marmdin, University of London, says: "I do not know of any Greek-English lexicon which gives the meaning 'to sprinkle' or 'to pour' - if any does so should say it makes a mistake."

Prof. R. C. Jebb, University of Cambridge, says: "I do not know whether there is any authoritative Greek-English lexicon which makes, the word mean 'sprinkle' or 'pour.' I can only say that such a meaning never belongs to the word in classical Greek."

It is then a most significant fact that the prevalent practices of sprinkling and pouring are not sustained by a single standard Greek-English lexicon. Baptists are laboring in a good cause when they urge upon all men to restore the primitive act of baptism.

3. Baptists have done a great work for the world in emphasizing the personal element in religion. They have always insisted upon individualism. They declare that a man should possess personal faith and decide all questions of faith for himself. They offer the protest of reason against authority, of prose against poetry, of the Word of God against custom.

A direct sequence of individualism in religion is a converted church membership. Baptists think that every man should give a personal account of himself to God. Hence they insist upon spirituality in the churches. This has ever been the faith of the Baptists. This was the contention of the Anabaptists. Jorg testifies that the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century desired "an entirely new church, a church of believers." Hast also observes: "The doctrine of spiritual regeneration, the soul of Christianity, has perhaps never been taught with deeper feeling and adhered to with greater zeal than by the despised Anabaptists. Their aim was the highest possible -- a church of saints. Nowhere in church history is found such a subjugation of all other motives to the religious, such an approach to the order and life of the church of the apostles."

A declaration of the faith of the Anabaptists has reached us, and no Baptist would dissent from the following declarations taken from it:

"1. The Scriptures are the only authority in matters of faith and practice.

"2. That personal faith in Jesus Christ alone secures salvation; therefore infant baptism is to be rejected.

"3. That a church is composed of believers who have been baptized on a personal confession of their faith in Jesus Christ.

"4. That each church has the entire control of its own affairs without interference on the part of any external power.

"5. That the outward life must be in accordance with such a confession of faith, and to this end it is essential that church discipline should be maintained."

Individualism has been one of the marked features of the Baptists of the United States. Joseph Cook, the great Boston lecturer, says: "I remember where I am speaking; I know what prejudices I am crossing; but I know that in this assembly, assuredly, nobody will have objection to my advocacy, even at a little expense of consistency with my own supposed principles, of the necessity of spiritual church membership. If I say that a certain denomination, represented by that man who was driven from Massachusetts to Rhode Island, has, in spite of all that we hear in criticism about one of its beliefs, been of the foremost service in bringing into the world, among all Protestant denominations, an adequate idea of the importance of a spiritual church membership. I know that no generous heart or searching intellect will object to this statement." The New York Tribune recently said: "THE BAPTISTS HAVE SOLVED THE GREAT PROBLEM. They combine the most resolute conviction, the most stubborn belief in their own special doctrines with the most admirable tolerance of the faith of other Christians." This exaltation of individualism in religion cuts away every support for infant baptism. Baptists think that the Bible requires that every man shall give an account to God for himself. They do not think that an infant is capable of choosing for itself, and so they defer baptism, and all other religious ordinances, to a maturer age.

Their interpretation of the Word of God, in this particular, is backed by the foremost scholars of the world. There is only space for a few Pedobaptist authorities, but their testimony is ample.

Dr. T. O. Summers, Methodist, Professor in Vanderbilt University, says: "It is not said, indeed, in so many words in the New Testament, that the Apostles baptized young children."

Dr. Wall, an Episcopalian, says: "Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles there is no express mention of infants."

Dr. George Edward Steitz, Lutheran, says: "Among scientific exegetes it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament."

Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, Southern Methodist, says: "With all of our searching we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism. We justify the rite, therefore, solely on the ground of logical inference, and not on any express word of Christ or his apostles."

Here is a point worthy of the loftiest consideration. Baptists have brought the whole world to recognize the importance of a converted church membership.

4. Baptists have done a great work in giving to the world soul liberty. This has been their peculiar honor. They have ever stood for the separation of church and State and for absolute liberty of conscience for all. In Germany the despised Anabaptists plead this cause. Hans Denck says: "In matters of faith everything must be left free, willing and unfettered." Belthazar Hubmeyer bore testimony: "Hence it follows that the inquisitors are the greatest heretics of all, since they, against the doctrine and example of Christ, condemn heretics to fire, and before the time of harvest root up the wheat with the tares. * * * And now it is clear to every one, even the blind, that a law to burn heretics is an invention of the devil. Truth is immortal."

We can trace the Baptists all through the liberties of England.

The Nonconformist and Independent, London, gives this summary of their work: "To the Baptists must be credited the proud distinction first of doctrinal relationship to the earliest Christians in Great Britain; and secondly, their priority in asserting the principle of liberty of conscience. Their essential doctrine was held firmly by the Christian communions which St. Augustine found in England when he arrived on his missionary enterprise, and no efforts of his could convert the Baptists to the ecclesiastical polity of the church of Rome. Coming to a more historical period, 'it is,' says Mr. Skeats, in his 'History of Free Churches,' 'the singular and distinguished honor of the Baptists to have repudiated from their earliest history all coercive power over the conscience, and the actions of men with reference to religion. * * * They were the proto-evangelists of the voluntary principle. * * * From the remote period referred to above, the principles of the Baptists have more or less permeated and leavened the religious life of England. The Lollards are said to have held their views. And Wycliffe is claimed as one of the early adherents of their theory of Christ's teaching. * * * They have had to endure imprisonment, pain and death for their rejection of the supremacy of the crown, and their assertion of a doctrine which cut at the very root of priestism.'"

The part Baptists took in establishing the liberties of England has never yet been fully acknowledged, but it will be done some time. Leonard Busher, in 1614, presented to the King and Parliament of England a treatise entitled: "Religious Peace, or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience," supposed to be the first regular discussion of the subject in the English language. When we take all of these things into consideration we are not astonished at the statement of the distinguished John Locke when he said that the Baptists were "the first and only expounders of. absolute liberty, -- just and true liberty, equal and impartial." We may also understand the attitude of William Penn, the founder of the Quakers, when we remember that he came of Baptist parentage.

In the United States the first to preach and practice soul liberty was a Baptist, Roger Williams. He was banished from Massachusetts on account of this view, and

set up in Rhode Island the first democracy in America. In this colony a man was allowed to maintain any religious dogma that he pleased, and all men were welcome.

Judge Story, the most distinguished of American jurists, says: "In the code of laws established by them in Rhode Island we read for the first time since Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars the declaration that the conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded he requires."

We cannot stop to show that religious liberty, in almost every State, was won by Baptists, but attention is called to a few general laws of the United States which the Baptists were influential in having passed. When the first Continental Congress met in 1774 the first petition presented was for religious liberty, and it was presented by a committee from Warren Baptist Association of Rhode Island. The Rev. Isaac Backus was chairman. As a result we have in our Constitution: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted there was doubt whether it secured liberty or conscience for all. A general committee of the Baptists of Virginia met at Williams' meeting house, Goochland county, March 7, 1778. The first question discussed was: "Whether the new Federal Constitution, which had now lately made its appearance in public, made sufficient provision for the secure enjoyment or religious liberty; on which it was argued unanimously, that, in the opinion of the general committee, it did not." Upon consultation with Mr. Madison they presented a memorial to George Washington and secured the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment or religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for the redress of grievances."

The answer of Mr. Washington was so favorable and complimentary that the reader will doubtless be glad to hear a few words from it. He says: "I have often expressed my sentiments that every man conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable alone to God for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping according to the dictates of his own conscience, while I recollect, with satisfaction, that the religious society of which you are members have been throughout America uniformly and almost unanimously the firm friends of civil liberty, and the preserving promoters of our glorious revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be faithful supporters of a free, yet efficient, general government. Under this pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely on my best wishes and endeavors to advance their prosperity."

It is scarcely needful to say that such deeds should be recorded.

5. It is claimed that Thomas Jefferson modeled the Constitution of the United States according to the Baptist plan of church government. He was in the habit of attending the meetings of a small Baptist church not far from his residence. It is said that the pastor, Rev. Andrew Tribble, asked Mr. Jefferson one day how he was pleased with their church government. Mr. Jefferson replied that "it had struck him with great force, and had interested him much; that he considered it the only form of democracy that then existed in the world, and had concluded that it would be the best form of government for the American colonies." This was several years before the Declaration of Independence. In the same line is a letter of Mr. Jefferson's which he wrote to the Baptist Church, Buck Mountain, Va., in 1809. He said: "We have acted together from the origin to the end of the memorable revolution, and we have contributed each in the line allotted us our endeavors to render its issues a

permanent blessing to our country."

I recently marked this statement from Prof. Austin Phelps, of Andover Theological Seminary: "Even Thomas Jefferson confessed that his first clear conception of a republic came from the polity of an obscure Baptist church in Virginia." My Portfolio, p. 125.

6. A Baptist deacon divides with Robert Raikes the honor of originating the Sunday-school work. Indeed, William Fox was scarcely less distinguished in this work than Raikes himself. The Sunday-school Society of England, which is still a useful organization, was founded by Fox. And when the Sunday-school as organized by Raikes on the plan of hired teachers was doomed to failure, it was a Baptist, Rev. William Birdie Gourney, who saved the work and organized Sunday-schools upon the present plan. Another Baptist, Mr. B. F. Jacobs, of Chicago, originated the present system of International Sunday-school Lessons.

7. Baptists are maintaining in the world sound evangelical doctrines of faith. They believe in the fundamental doctrines of grace and preach them. In a generation which is honeycombed with error it is a good thing to have one denomination which holds to the old faith. In a recent letter to Dr. Strong, of Rochester, that stalwart Presbyterian, Dr. William G. T. Shedd, says: "Among the denominations we all look to the Baptists for steady and firm adherence to sound doctrine. You have never had any internal conflicts, and from year to year you present an undivided front in the defense of the Calvinistic faith. Having no judicatures, and regarding the local church as a unit, it is remarkable that you maintain such a unity and solidarity of belief." The following extract was recently taken from the Nashville Christian Advocate, the leading Methodist paper in the South: "The Baptist church is very strong in the Southern States. In many communities it takes the lead. During the past twenty-five years it has made a wonderful advance in the education of its ministers and in other important particulars. We are not jealous of our 'submersionist' brethren, though we take exception to some of their exclusive ways. They preach a sound, honest gospel, and go after the masses of the people. The only thing about which we are careful is that they may not take our crown. Let the Methodists bestir themselves."

In a letter to myself Dr. Theodore Cuyler, the great New York Presbyterian, said: "Allow me to express my devout gratitude for all that the great Baptist Church is doing for the maintenance of sound evangelical doctrine and for the spread of the Kingdom of Christ."

8. Baptists are second to none in educational facilities. There are no people in this country who have more fully met the educational needs than have the Baptists. Our ministers in the point of education stand with the first in the land; our schools are second to none. They have always been the advocates of higher education. The oldest and largest university of the United States is Harvard. The first money it ever received as an endowment was from a Baptist, and the Hollis family -- Baptists -- were its most munificent benefactors.

It was named after a Baptist preacher. Its first two presidents -- Henry Dunster and Charles Chauncy -- were deeply impregnated with Baptist principles. President Quincy said of them: "For learning and talents they have been surpassed by no one of their successors."

Of Mr. Thomas Hollis, Mr. Quincy, the historian of Harvard, says: "Attached to his Baptist faith, with a firmness which admitted neither concealment nor compromise, he (Mr. Hollis) selected for the object of his extraordinary bounties an institution in which he knew those of his faith were regarded with dread by some,

and with detestation by others, and where he had reason to think, as he averred, that the very portrait of a Baptist, though of a benefactor, would be the subject of insult. Yet he suffered neither his affection nor his charity to fail, being actuated by the elevated motive, that it was more catholic and free in its religious sentiment than any other institution existing at that period. In establishing, conditions for enjoying the benefit of his bounty, he claimed no concession, he made no exclusion. He required only that the Baptist faith should not be deemed as a disqualification for partaking of his bounty, or for being a candidate for his professorship. In order to place an insurmountable barrier against the imposition of artificial creeds, woven in words of men's devising, he made the simple provision that the only article of faith, to which the Professor of the Divinity foundation, which he established, should be required to subscribe, was his belief that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only perfect rule of faith and practice." A professorship on the Hollis foundation is still retained in Harvard, and at the present is filled by Prof. D. G. Lyon. The Baptists assisted Franklin in laying the foundation of the University of Pennsylvania, and have been among the first in aiding all State institutions. As early as 1764, when numbering in all America only sixty churches and about 5,000 members, the Baptists founded their first college, Brown University, in Rhode Island. Now they have twenty-eight chartered colleges, over 200 academies and seminaries and nine theological seminaries. They have in the United States more money invested in colleges and endowments than any other denomination of Christians. They have given in the last ten years for education more money than all other denominations combined.

It may also be noticed that what has grown into the public school system was founded by Dr. John Clarke, a Baptist, of Rhode Island.

9. In the domain of letters the Baptists hold a very honorable position. A book that has attained a circulation next to the Bible was written by a Baptist -- John Bunyan -- and it has been translated into almost every language of earth. John Milton, the author of *Paradise Lost*, held many Baptist principles. Macaulay calls these the two original minds of the century. Gill has not been surpassed as a commentator; and the critical Baptist scholar, Tregelles, must not be forgotten. John Howard, the great philanthropist, was a Baptist. Among the great preachers of the world one can mention Fuller, Robert Hall, Haldane, Spurgeon, Broadus and others.

The Baptists have taught us to sing: "Blest be the tie that binds," "Did Christ o'er sinners weep," "Majestic sweetness sits enthroned upon the Saviour's brow," "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord," "All hail the power of Jesus' name," "Saviour, thy dying love," and "My country, 'tis of thee." These hymns which they have written with others of faith and hope and love, give them a right to exist.

I can therefore use the very graceful compliment of Dr. Chalmers, and it applies to the Baptists of America as well as to those of England. He says: "Let it never be forgotten of the Particular Baptists of England, that they form the denomination of Fuller and Carey and Ryland and Hall and Foster; that they have organized among the greatest of all missionary enterprises; that they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with authorship of the most exalted piety, as well as with the first talent, and the first eloquence; that they have waged a very noble and successful war with the hydra of Antinomianism; that perhaps there is not a more intellectual community of ministers in our islands, or who have put forth to their number a greater amount of mental power and mental activity in the defense and illustration of our common faith; and, what is better than all of the triumphs of genius or understanding, who by their zeal and fidelity and pastoral labor among congregations which they have reared, have done more to swell the list of genuine

discipleship in the walks of private society -- and thus to both uphold and extend the living Christianity of our nations." -- (Com. Romans, Lec. 14, p. 76.) The Baptists have more newspapers in the United States than any other denomination of Christians. The figures are, Baptists, 181; Methodists, 173; Roman Catholic, 134; Episcopalians, 76; Presbyterians, 73; Lutherans, 59; Congregationalists, 33.

10. The Baptists were the first to inaugurate the colportage work. This honor belongs to the American Baptist Publication Society. Dr. Schaff, shortly before his death, gave the Society full credit for this great work. When we come to consider the mighty power of the printed page, and how its use can be facilitated by colporters, we can see some of the far reaching results of this work.

11. Baptists have been the pioneers, in modern times, of foreign missions. In 1792, under Carey, the Baptists founded the first missionary society to the heathen. When Carey first made the proposition to send the gospel to India, Dr. Ryland was astounded at the audacity of Carey. But the Baptist cobbler became the forerunner of the mighty missionary work of to-day. It came to pass that the first churches founded in India, Burmah and China were Baptist churches.

We thank God for a history so full of thrilling deeds. But it is not for Baptists to turn their eyes to the past. They are to take inspiration from the things already accomplished, and onward press their way. Mr. Froude said: "The Baptists were the most thorough going of all the Protestant sects." The great Neander remarked that it was the "one denomination that had a future." Shall that future be filled with overflowing blessings? If we rely on the past, we shall and ought to die; if we seize the opportunities which God has thrown in our pathway, our history will grow brighter till the blessed day. May God fill the Baptists with zeal for his glory.

Chapter XVI - W. P. Harvey, D.D.

By Ben M. Bogard

William P. Harvey was born March 15, 1843, in the village of Kappa, County Galway, Ireland. In 1851 he came with his parents to America.

He was reared in the Roman Catholic faith. In his seventeenth year he became acquainted with the Rev. George Hunt, and by him was led to Christ and baptized into the fellowship of the Baptist Church at Maysville, Ky.

The subject of this sketch, besides attending the public schools in Mason county, Ky., spent two years at Maysville Seminary, three years at Georgetown College and two years at Kentucky University, where he graduated in 1865.

He was licensed to preach by the church at Maysville in 1861, and was ordained to the full work of the ministry by the church at Harrodsburg in 1872. For ten years he was pastor, and the Lord greatly blessed his labors. For over three years he was Secretary of the Sunday-school and Colportage Board of the General Association of Kentucky Baptists.

He was for one year Superintendent of Missions in the Eastern District of Kentucky. For one year also he was vice president of Georgetown College.

In every position held by him he was honored with a successful administration.

In 1887, Dr. Harvey, associated with Dr. T. T. Eaton and Mr. J. B. McFerran, bought the Western Recorder. Under their leadership the paper has become a great power in the denomination, and refers with satisfaction to its record of fidelity and loyalty to Baptist principles.

Afterward he was prominent in the organization of the Baptist Book Concern, raising a paid-up capital of \$100,000, of which he has been President and Treasurer since the organization.

Dr. Harvey is one of the best-known men, not only in Kentucky, but all over the South, and everywhere he enjoys the respect and confidence of the brotherhood. Mississippi College honored him with the title of D.D. We publish at the close of this sketch his able discussion of "Baptists in History."

Baptists in History

1892

By W. P. Harvey

A Preface and Special Introduction by J. B. Moody

Text: Psalm 48:12 and 13 verses -- "Walk about Zion, and go round her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye tell it to the generation following."

Introductory

Reminiscence excites gratitude, inspires hope and stimulates to noblest

achievements. With reverence and joy we recount the deeds of heroes: who neither courted the favor of the world nor feared its frown; who fought not for an earthly, but for a heavenly crown; whose brave protests rang out with no uncertain sound through the ages against the encroachments of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny. When the bloody deeds of warriors are forgotten and their mighty empires have perished, and the dust of oblivion shall cover all their glory, then will the defenders of the faith, once delivered to the saints, the apostles of civil and religious liberty, shine brighter than the stars of the firmament. That some champions of Baptist perpetuity have displayed more zeal than knowledge we admit, that others in their ambition to appear "broad and liberal" have made concessions at the expense of truth, cannot be denied. Because some have claimed too much is no reason why others should claim too little. Far be a spirit of vain boasting from us, and God forbid that we should be unmindful or underestimate the services of others in the great work of human redemption.

I. When Christ was on earth he promised to build his church.

We mean by church a congregation of baptized believers. Matthew 16:18: "On this rock, I will build my church." "On this rock" interpreted by Romanists generally to mean Peter, by Protestants usually Peter's confession, or Christ. Whatever it may or may not mean, beyond doubt: it does mean the foundation on which he said he, would build his church.

II. Theologians differ about the meaning of the word church.

Romanists claim it means a hierarchy, while Protestants and some Baptists say it means "An invisible and universal spiritual assembly." Baptists generally believe it means a local and visible congregation. As far-fetched as, the two former views may appear, they are no more, so than some other positions assumed by many good men, viz.: That the New Testament teaches infant baptism, and that immersion is not essential to Christian baptism, and that "something else will do as well." The Master did keep his promise and he did build his church; e. g., speaking of offenses involving discipline, in Matthew 18 :17 he said: "Tell it to the church." How could this be done if there was no local church? Whatever kind of a church he built, whether it was local and visible, or invisible, universal and spiritual, it was the one, and the only one, he built, and it is the one, and the only one, that, he calls his own -- "my church." If the church built by Christ was not local and visible, there is no divine authority for such churches. If the church built by Christ was not local and visible, the Apostles and their followers misunderstood him, because they continued to build local and visible churches after his model. We are told that the invisible and universal church is composed of the elect of all ages, and that outside of it there is no salvation. If this was the kind of church built by Christ, will some advocate of the invisible church theory tell us what became of the elect from Adam to Christ? Were all lost? If the church built by Christ was invisible, the world had no such church for the first four thousand years, "I will build my church." Church, in Matthew 16:18, means local and visible. Because it is not reasonable to believe that Jesus used the word in an enigmatical or ambiguous sense. The word church, in Matthew 16:18, has the same meaning that it has in Matthew 18 :17, and no one has ever questioned that the latter refers to a local and visible assembly. Dean Alford so declines. Stier says, referring to the word in both passages, "In the second, the expression obtains a more special significance, yet it evidently points back to the first, so that the fundamental idea can only be the same." Lange says, Matthew 16:18: "The word church alludes to the church as the organized and visible form." Expositor's Bible: Matthew 16:18: "It means an assembly called out," "Suggests the idea of separation so appropriate to the circumstances of the little band of outcasts." Pulpit

Commentary: "The word, translated church, 'ecclesia,' Matthew 16-18, is found the first time in the New Testament; it is derived from a verb meaning 'to Call out,' and in classic Greek denotes the regular legislative assembly of a people. Ecclesia has been that which designates the Christian society, and has been in "all ages and countries." Liddell and Scott, the standard Greek lexicon with all scholars and in all colleges and universities, defines ecclesia, "An assembly of people called together," "an assembly called out." The ecclesia was common among the Greeks. According to Trench ecclesia was a lawful assembly of a free Greek city of those who were worthy and well qualified as citizens for the transaction of public affairs.

Robinson's Greek lexicon: "The word ecclesia was familiar to the Jews as meaning a congregation, an assembly," Thayer, in his lexicon of New Testament Greek, "collates critically the usage of the word from Thucydides to the end of the New Testament period, and finds no support for the invisible theory. Take the entire range of Greek literature in all its dialects, secular and sacred, and there is not one passage in which ecclesia means an invisible and universal spiritual assembly."

Septuagint: "The word ecclesia is found in the Greek translation of the New Testament seventy-four times, and is always used in the translation of the Hebrew word 'kahal,' to call together. No other Hebrew word is so translated. Kahal is found in Hebrew Scriptures one hundred and twenty-four times, and translated seventy-four times ecclesia, forty-seven times synagogue, twice Plethos, and once Sanhedrin."

Vitringa says: "Synagogue always means an assembly gathered together, but not necessarily joined by any bond of union. Ecclesia, kahal, always denotes some multitude which constitutes a people bound among themselves by law and obligations."

In the Greek New Testament the word ecclesia occurs one hundred and fifteen times. In at least ninety-seven of these cases it is conceded that it means a local assembly; e.g., "Tell it to the church," "If he neglect to hear the church," "The church which is at Jerusalem," "Had gathered the church together," "Confirming the churches," "Unto the church of God at Corinth." By this it is evident that, according to New Testament usage, the word ecclesia means a local assembly. "The called out" Christians are represented as called out of the world. Romans 8:28: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the CALLED according to his purpose." Again, 30th verse: "And whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also glorified." In an article recently published, J. J. Taylor, D.D., of Norfolk, Va., gives an account of his correspondence with the Greek Professors of all the leading colleges and universities in regard to the meaning of ekklesia, and without an exception the distinguished specialists gave their testimony against the invisible church theory. Dr. Taylor also says:

"In the New Testament Jesus uses the word ekklesia twenty-two times; in twenty-one of these he clearly uses it in reference to the local, visible, corporeal assembly, and only a manifest violation of all linguistic usage could force a different meaning in the remaining case."

Rev. Dr. Henry M. Dexter, Congregationalist, says: "The weight of New Testament authority seems to decide that the ordinary and natural meaning of ecclesia is that of a local body of believers. "

"Now it is the plainest principle of sound interpretation that where the overwhelming usage in a book is plainly in favor of a certain meaning to a word, that meaning must be, given to it in every passage where it will make sense. We are at liberty to bring

in another meaning only when the ordinary meaning would destroy the sense. Many claim that there is no passage in the New Testament where making ekklesia mean local assembly would mar or destroy the same. If this be true, then the word cannot rightly be interpreted anywhere as meaning anything else than the local assembly.

"Common sense declares that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time. Affirmative and negative statements each having the same scope, subject and term, cannot be true. An invisible company of the elect on earth, who are physical beings, cannot be used as material to build an invisible house. An invisible house cannot be built of physical material."

III. What Baptists generally believe in regard to their origin.

History points to the origin of the various denominations, and in regard to their respective founders there is no controversy, but strange there is no recognized historic account of the origin of Baptists this side of the apostolic age.

The people now called Baptists have been known by different names in different ages and countries. We trace them not by any particular name, but by their fundamental principles. In more modern times they have been called "The baptized people," "The dippers," and "Anabaptists." The latter, Dr. Armitage says, "because they baptized those who came to them from other denominations." They did their own baptizing, and recognized no other. I quote from Dr. Armitage's History of the Baptists, page 329: "By custom their most friendly historians call them Anabaptists, yet many of their opponents speak of them as Baptists." It is no surprise to us that there are some modern historians among the destructive critics who question our apostolic origin. There are Protestant writers who exonerate the papacy from responsibility for the massacre of St. Bartholomew. There are so-called scientists who dispute the law of gravitation. The vain ambition to abandon "beaten tracks" and to pose as "original and advanced thinkers," does make some men reckless when dealing with what has been considered as "fixed." The more sacred, the more tempting to the self-complacent and destructive critic. According to Dr. Armitage and other writers, Anabaptists were called Baptists, and Baptists were called Anabaptists. That Anabaptists and Baptists are frequently spoken of as the same people is abundantly supported by the greatest authors who have written on the subject. Most of their articles of faith that have come down to us are essentially Baptist. When destructive critics prove that Napoleon Bonaparte was a myth, and that the Bible is not inspired; when Donnelly proves that Lord Bacon wrote Shakespeare, then some one may prove that there were no Baptists among the Anabaptists. My contention is that there were Anabaptists who held essentially to what are accepted generally as Baptist doctrines now. That those called Anabaptists differed among themselves, I do not question. The same is true of their descendants, the Baptists to-day; e. g., compare the Philadelphia and New Hampshire Confessions of Faith. Have we not missionary and anti-missionary Baptists? Calvinist and Arminian? Those who believe in final preservation, and those who do not? Those who receive alien baptism, and those who reject it? Those who believe in open communion, and those who do not? Those who believe that baptism is essential to salvation, and those who believe that salvation is essential to baptism? Those who believe in the plenary inspiration, and those who do not? Those who believe that immersion is essential to baptism and church privileges, and those who do not, as illustrated in open communion Baptist churches? Those who believe the church "built" by Christ is local and visible, and those who believe it is universal and invisible? Those who argue that because Anabaptists differed among themselves, and that because some may have apostatized, therefore there were no Baptists among them, can, by the same mode of reasoning, prove that there are no Baptists now. Happily, it is not for me to decide

how much or how little anyone had to believe in order to be stigmatized Anabaptist, or how much or little anyone must believe to be entitled to the honored name of Baptist. The English Baptists deny that John Smith or Edward Barber was their founder. The Welch Baptists claim that their ancestors were evangelized in the first century. While the Dutch Baptists claim apostolic origin, German Baptists maintain that they antedate the Reformation. Mosheim says: "Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay secreted in almost all the countries of Europe persons who adhered tenaciously to the principles of the modern Dutch Baptists." Vedder's Short History of the Baptists, page 49: "One cannot affirm that there was not a continuity in the outward and visible life of the churches founded by the apostles down to the time of the Reformation." Page 50: "A succession of the true faith may indeed be traced in faint lines at times, but never entirely disappearing." On the title page of Dr. Armitage's History of the Baptists we find the following paragraph: "A history of the Baptists, traced by their vital principles from the time of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to the year 1886." Rev. George B. Taylor says: "Baptist practices and Baptist principles have existed in all ages from the Reformation to apostolic times."

Pengilly says: "Our principles are as old as Christianity; we acknowledge no founder but Christ." Rev. Dr. Wm. Williams, once Professor of Church History Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, says: "In my opinion Baptist churches are of divine origin, and originated in the first century under the preaching and founding of the apostles of our Lord." Rev. Geo. P. Gould, of England, is now editing a series of Baptist manuals. In 1895 he published one of Hansford Knollys, by James Curloss, M.A., D.D., ex-President of Bristol College. After stating that Hansford Knollys became Secretary, probably in 1631, he declares: "Had Baptists thought anything depended on it, they might have traced their pedigree back to New Testament times. The channel of succession was certainly purer, if humbler, than through the apostate church of Rome. But they were content to rest on Scripture alone, and as they found only believers' baptism there, they adhered to that." Baptist History Vindicated, pages 27 and 28.

IV. Concessions of Great Church Historians and Scholars to Baptist Antiquity

Sir Isaac Newton, the celebrated philosopher, declared: "The Baptists are the only body of Christians that has not symbolized with the Church of Rome."

"The true origin of. that sect which acquired the denomination Anabaptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and extremely difficult to be ascertained." Church History, page 490.

Mosheim virtually admits that their origin cannot be found on this side of the New Testament age!

Hear Zwingle, the great Swiss reformer:

"The institution of Anabaptism is NO NOVELTY, but for 1300 YEARS has caused great disturbances in the church, and has acquired such a strength that the attempt in this age to contend with it appears futile for a time."

Ree, in his "reply to Wall, page 20, says:

"The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect, of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem to have been. Nor is this heresy a modern thing, for it existed in the time of Austin."

The Roman Catholic Cardinal Hosius, President of the Council of Trent, in 1650, was forced as an impartial historian to declare:

"If the truths of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness

which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then in the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists (Baptists), since there have been none for the PAST TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS that have been more generally punished, or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to the most cruel sorts or punishment, than these people."

In 1819 the King of Holland appointed Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen, and Rev. I. J. Dermout, Chaplain to the King, both learned men and members of the Dutch Reformed church, to prepare a history of their church. In the authentic volume which they prepared and published at Breda, 1823, they devote one chapter to the Baptists, in which they make the following statement:

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin.

"On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the apostles, and as a Christian society has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages."

"Let it be remembered," says Dr. Wheaton Smith, "that these learned men were not Baptists, that they proclaimed the result of their diligent research in the ear of a King, who listened unwillingly to their conclusions.

"Let it be remembered that, as a result of their investigation, the Government of Holland offered to the Baptist churches in the kingdom the support of the State, and, true to their principles, they declined it."

The testimony of Drs. Ypeij and Dermout in favor of Baptist perpetuity has been relied on as authentic by Baptists all over the world for over seventy-five years. But when worldly-wise men claimed to discover that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, and that Roger Williams was a mythological chief of the Narragansett Indian tribe, then came an assault on this superb evidence of Baptist antiquity. The following correspondence explains itself. Rev. George Manly, D.D., is an A.B. graduate of Georgetown College, a graduate of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and also a graduate of the University of Berlin. He is now President of a college of languages in Berlin. There is no man more competent to investigate the subject under consideration.

LOUISVILLE, KY., Dec. 6, 1895.

Prof. George Manly, Berlin, Germany, Potsdamer Strasse 4:

My Dear Brother -- I write to get your opinion of the authenticity of a quotation often found in Baptist history. "In 1819 the King of Holland appointed Dr. A. Ypeij, Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen, and Rev. I. J. Dermout, Chaplain to the King, both learned men and members of the Dutch Reformed church. In the authentic volume which they prepared and published at Breda, 1819, they devote one chapter to the Baptists, in which they make the following statement: 'We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the apostles, and as a Christian society has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages.' This has been quoted by the great Dr. J. Newton Brown; and Prof. Toby, formerly of Bethel College, wrote an article quoting it in the old Baptist Review.

Recently articles have appeared in some of our denominational papers denying that it had any reference to Baptists. I am now revising my tract, Baptists in History, and will publish your reply in connection with my letter to you.

Please favor me with your information at your earliest convenience. I wish you the largest success in your great work, and hope to see you again in the nicest city of the [world].

BERLIN, den 14, Jan. 1896.

Rev. W. P. Harvey, D.D., Louisville, Ky.:

My Dear Sir -- In reply to your favor of December 6, 1895, in which you inquire as to the authenticity of a passage quoted in Baptist histories, and now called in question by a prominent writer, I take pleasure in stating that the passage is genuine and the translation gives the thought correctly. It is found on page 148, vol. 1, of the work entitled: "Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk: door A. Ypeij, Doctor en Hoogleraar der godgeleersheid te Groningen, en I. J. Dermout, Deereberis van de Algemeene Synode der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk en Rredikant te's Gravenpage. Te Breda, MDCCCXIX."

("History of the Dutch Reformed Church, by A. Ypeij, Doctor and Professor of Theology

at Groningen, and I. J. Dermout, Secretary of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, and Preacher at The Hague, at Breda, 1819.")

The passage is the following:

"Gezien hebben wij nee, dat de doopsgezinden, dis, in voeegere tijden, Wederdoopers, en in labere tijden Monnonieten genoemd werden, oorsponkelijk Waldenzen waren, die, in der geschiedenis der kerk, sedert lang altijd zulk eene welverdiende hulde hebben ontvangen Derhalve mogen de doopsgezinden beschouwd worden als van ouds her de eenige godsdienstgemeenschap, de bestaan heeft van de tijden der Apostelen af, als eene christelijke maatschappij, welke de evanvelische godsdienstleer rein bewaard heeft, door alle eenwen heen."

("We have now shown that the baptizers [the baptizing people], who were called Anabaptists in the earlier times and Mennonites in later times, were originally Waldenses, who, in the history of the church, for a long time have always received such a well-deserved honor. On this account the baptizers may be considered as from olden times the only religious community, which has stood from the times of the Apostles as a Christian society, which has preserved the evangelical religious doctrine pure which you have found elsewhere. I give "religious community" instead of "Christian community," but of course the author had in mind only Christian communities, and the thought remains unaffected. "Evangelical religious doctrine" can only be "doctrine of the gospel." The original work is in the Royal Library at Berlin.

Yours fraternally,

G. W. MANLY.

The above letter I showed to Mr. Theodore Harris, President of the Louisville National Banking Company, and one of our leading and most intelligent Baptist laymen. He forwarded a copy to Miss Zuda Harris, his daughter, who has spent many years in Berlin. She is a celebrated pianist, and also highly educated, and has a certificate to teach German literature in any part of the empire. She took up the subject and made a thorough investigation, translating the Dutch into German and the German into English, and fully endorsed the testimony of Dr. Manly.

I now quote from Mr. Alexander Campbell, in his debate with McCall, page 378 :

"From the apostolic age to the present time the sentiments of Baptists and their practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every center can be produced."

V. Baptist Churches Are Identical With New Testament Churches.

1. New Testament churches were local and visible assemblies of baptized believers. In this respect are not Baptist churches like them? 2. Apostolic churches were not called the church of the particular country in which they were located; e. g., the Church of England, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist Church of Kentucky or of America. We do not read in the New Testament the Church of Judea, but "the churches of Judea." We do not read the Church of Macedonia, but "the churches of Macedonia." We do not read the Church of Galatia, but "the churches of Galatia." We do not read of the Church of Asia, but "the seven churches of Asia." In this respect are not Baptist churches like them?

I am reminded that Acts 9:31 teaches differently. "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, Galatia and Samaria, and "were edified." While the plural, churches, is the reading in some good manuscripts, we admit that the oldest and most valuable has the singular, "church," so has the revised version. According to Dr. John A. Broadus, who is quoted by Dr. George Clark in his commentary on this verse, "the word church in the text is limited in this passage to the original church at Jerusalem. The members had been scattered throughout Judea, Samaria and Galilee, and held meetings where they were, but still belonged to the original organization at Jerusalem." 3. Conditions of membership in New Testament churches: a. "Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." b. A public and credible profession. c. Scriptural baptism. This is according to the practice of Baptist churches. 4. The design of baptism. a. Not in order to the remission of sins, but because of the remission of sins. Baptism is not essential to salvation, but salvation is essential to baptism. Are not Baptist churches like them? 5. Scriptural baptism was prerequisite to membership in New Testament churches. Where there is no scriptural baptism, can there be a scriptural church? Baptist churches are like them. 6. The validity of baptism as practiced by apostolic churches was not questioned. This is true of baptism practiced by Baptist churches. Baptism administered by Baptists stands not only unchallenged, but endorsed, directly or indirectly, by all denominations. 1. There were two, and only two, ordinances in apostolic churches, viz.: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The officers consisted of pastors, bishops, or elders, and deacons. The same is true of Baptist churches. 8. New Testament church government, democratic or congregational. Each congregation as separate and independent of every other as if it were the only one on earth. This is all true of Baptist churches. Baptist churches are as much like apostolic churches as they were like each other, and as much as Baptist churches are like each other now. We affirm that between apostolic and Baptist churches there is no essential difference. If Baptist churches are not a continuity of apostolic churches, will some one tell us where and when the last of the apostolic churches died, and when and where Baptist churches began? Where is the harm in the continued existence of Baptists through all ages since the apostles? Why should any Baptist oppose such a belief? We do not understand how a man who does not want the Baptists to have existed continuously can really desire them to exist at all.

VI. We predicate the continuity of apostolic churches and churches like them on the promise of Christ: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

In Matthew 18:17, Jesus, in speaking of offenses between brethren, says: "Tell it to the church." If there has been a day since he uttered these words when there was no church to tell anything to, for that day this passage was of no effect, and his word failed. We do not regard it necessary to prove an unbroken visible and historical continuity of New Testament churches from Christ and his apostles until now. We hold that any church that bears the genuine apostolic stamp, if constituted yesterday by those duly authorized, is in direct historical descent from New Testament churches. The question is not, Can we trace the history of his church and those fashioned after its divine model? but the question is, Has Christ kept his promise?

VII. We predicate perpetuity of New Testament churches, and the identity of Baptist churches with them, upon Christ's prophecy that has been fulfilled in our history.

"If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you." The forerunner, John the Baptist, was beheaded. The Master was crucified. The apostles suffered martyrdom. Saul of Tarsus made havoc of the church at Jerusalem. Over three hundred years of Jewish and Pagan persecutions followed. In the early part of the fourth century, Constantine, contending for no less a prize than the throne of the Caesars, chose the Christians for allies, and by their valor he triumphed. To the conquerors the spoils were awarded. Christians suddenly emancipated from legal disabilities and social ostracism, and elevated to positions of honor and trust, were tempted beyond their power to resist, and the many for the sake of peace suffered themselves to be betrayed into a compromise with Judaism and Paganism, which in the course of time crystallized into Romanism. This event marked the first great halt in the evangelization of the world. The consummation of the unhallowed union of church and State was followed by an intellectual and spiritual eclipse that lasted one thousand years, known as "the dark ages." No doubt the apostasy was quite general, but it would be presumptuous to infer that it was universal. Elijah thought the apostasy of Israel under the reign of Jezebel was universal. In despair and bitterest anguish he exclaimed, "I only am left." He was mistaken, because God said there were in Israel seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. According to Bryce's Holy Roman Empire, the Papacy claimed that, as God ruled the heavens, therefore His vicegerent, the Pope, ought to rule the earth. To enforce conformity of worship, for twelve hundred years the sword, the stake and all forms of torture were employed to exterminate those who bravely withstood Popish innovations. Who were the victims? Surely Romanists did not persecute each other. They were those who heard the voice of God above the voice of Caesar. Those who obeyed God rather than men. "The sect everywhere spoken against."

In the sixteenth century, when Luther heralded to the world, "The just shall live by faith," he headed a revolution that threatened the existence of Romanism. To welcome the glorious Reformation Baptists emerged from their hiding places, hoping that the day of their deliverance had come, but they were doomed to disappointment. While Romanists and Protestants hated and persecuted each other, they united to exterminate the Baptists, because they regarded them, on account of their opposition to church and State, as worse than traitors, and looked upon them as arch heretics, because they opposed baptismal regeneration and infant church membership. Mosheim, p. 505: "There were certain sects and doctors against whom the zeal, vigilance and severity of Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists were united, and in opposing whose settlement and progress, these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous councils and endeavors. The object of this common aversion were the Anabaptists." The Elector of Hesse, Germany, commended in the following language the zeal of King Henry VIII., who had banished

Baptists, giving them twelve days to leave his kingdom on pain of death if they disobeyed: "There are no rulers in Germany, whether they be Papists or Protestants, that do suffer these men. If they come into their hands all men punish them quickly." To justify the slaughter of the Anabaptists in the Netherlands, they are accused of the abominations of Munster and held responsible for indiscriminate bloodshed. The greatest authorities have exonerated the Anabaptists. Kurtz's Church History, page 243, says: "The leader was Thomas Munger, formerly a Roman Catholic priest, but now a Lutheran pastor of the church at Zurich." Kellar, in his late work on the Reformation, page 370, says: "That Cornelius has shown that in the chief points Munger was opposed to the Baptists." Dr. Schaff says: "It is the greatest injustice to make the Anabaptists responsible for the extravagances that led to the Munster tragedy." In reply to the old Munster slander, Dr. J. Newton Brown said:

"It is now too late in the day to confound these primitive people with the Munster sect, because both were called by their enemies, Anabaptists. As well confound the Baptist of the United States with the Mormons of Salt Lake. I thought it proper to note this, although no man of intelligence and candor believes that Baptists so originated. The Baptists had been in existence full fifteen hundred years when Bockhold, Mathis and their frantic followers commenced their career of folly and crime. Munster was a German forest where the Saxon chased the fierce wild boar, when the Master and his disciples laid the foundation of our history. The blood of Caesar who drove Ariovistus to the Danube was not yet extinct in the veins of Nero, when Baptists were clustering in the vales of Thessaly and Tempe, and among the hills of Rome. The fading light of letters and of art still played in lingering beauty on the marble steps of the Acropolis, when hundreds of Athenians and Corinthian believers were buried with Christ in baptism."

Mosheim, p, 493: "In almost all countries of Europe an unspeakable number of these unhappy wretches preferred death in its worst forms to a retraction of their errors. Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword could shake their invincible, but ill-placed, constancy, or make them abandon tenets that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments."

Speaking of Baptists burned at the stake in England, Froude, the historian says:

"The details are gone -- their names are gone. Poor Hollanders they were, and that is all. Scarcely the fact seemed worth mention, so shortly is it told in a passing paragraph. For them no Europe was agitated, no courts were ordered into mourning, no royal hearts trembled with indignation. At their death the world looked on complacent, indifferent, or exulting. Yet here, too, out of twenty-five poor men and women were found fourteen who by no terror of stake or torture, could be tempted to say they believed what they did not believe. History for them has no word of praise; yet they, too, were not giving their blood in vain. Their lives might have been as useless as the lives of most of us. In their death they assisted to pay the purchase-money for England's freedom."

In England, acts of general pardon were published in 1538, '40 and '50. Thieves and vagabonds shared the royal favor, but Baptists were excepted. Under Bloody Mary a large portion of the blood that flowed was from Baptist veins. Queen Elizabeth followed the example of her wicked father, and like him banished Baptists, giving them twenty days to leave her realm. For two hundred years, according to the records of the courts, Baptists were persecuted in England. It has been asserted that "immersion was founded, discovered and invented" in 1641 in England. W. H. King, D.D., of London, England, as the correspondent of the Western Recorder, spent

several months in the London Museum, and after a thorough research said in the Recorder of June 4, 1896: "I can affirm with the most unhesitating confidence that in these volumes there is not a sentence or hint from which it can be inferred that the Baptists generally, or any section of them, or even any individual Baptist, held any other opinion than that immersion is the only true and scriptural method of baptism, either before the year 1639 or after it."

"In 1526, death by drowning and at the stake was the common fate of Baptists in Switzerland. Those who were not arrested escaped to Moravia, where for a season they were tolerated. Finally King Ferdinand was persuaded to banish them, and only a few days were given them to leave his dominions.

"It was summer; harvest was near, and the vintage would follow soon; and humanity would have dedicated that even if justice demanded the banishment of these men, they should have opportunity of gathering the produce of their labors, and so be provided with the means of sustenance for their families during the approaching winter. But they were ordered to leave in three weeks and three days on pain of death." -- Cramp, page 267.

"Without leaving one murmur on record, in solemn, silent submission to the Power that governs the universe, and causes all things to work for good, they packed up and departed.

"In several hundred wagons they conveyed their sick, their innocent new-born infants at the breast of their weeping mothers, and their decrepit [sic] parents, whose work was done, and whose silvery locks told everyone that they wanted only the solace of the grave. At the frontier they filed off, some to Walachia, and others to Transylvania, Hungary and Poland. Greater far greater, for their virtues than Ferdinand for all his titles and all his glory."

The Word of God declares: "For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known." When Sir Isaac Newton announced "that all bodies that reflect light are combustible," scientific men challenged his statement, and triumphantly demanded that he demonstrate by burning the diamond. Frankly, he replied, "the diamond is an exception, but I base my observation on the uniformity of nature's laws, and I believe the time will come when the diamond will be burned." Long ago the chemist with his blow pipe verified the philosopher's prediction. This is an age of tireless research. To the interrogation of an imperative curiosity the rocks have rendered an account of themselves. The leaves that fell before the flood have told their story. Not a time-worn mark or hieroglyphic found that is not deciphered. Not a crumbling monument or a buried city but has been reproduced on the canvas of living history. Nothing will escape the sleepless and persevering antiquarian; with his pick and spade. Investigations now being made by Kellar, the great church historian, and others, are lifting the clouds and dispelling the shadows that have so long obscured our history.

BAPTIST PERSECUTIONS IN AMERICA

Roger Williams, who was raised in the Church of England, and a graduate of one of the colleges of the chief University, arrived in Plymouth Colony 1631, and became a minister of the Established Church. Soon he commenced preaching Baptist doctrines, for which in 1636 he was excommunicated and compelled in midwinter, in order to avoid imprisonment, to flee through the snows of the wilderness. After forty days of perilous journey, not knowing what bed or bread did mean, he found refuge among the Narragansett Indians, where as a token of his gratitude to God he founded the city of Providence, R. I. Williams was a pious man, and by reading his Bible he

became dissatisfied with his baptism. He became impatient waiting for a Baptist minister, and finally he was baptized by Ezekiel Holliman. In regard to the act I have no doubt it was immersion. 1. Protestants and Romanists have never disputed that the act was immersion. "One year before, in 1638," Dr. Newman, in the Examiner of May 13, 1896, tells us: "Rev. Chas. Chauncey (afterward President of Harvard College) arrived at Plymouth from England. He became assistant pastor at Plymouth." Referring to him, Gov. Bradford says: "But there fell out some difference about baptism, he holding it ought to be by dipping ye whole body under water; and that sprinkling was unlawful." 2. The testimony is overwhelming. Rev. John Stanford's History First Church, Providence, R. I. (vol. 4, p. 495: An. Register), says, speaking of Roger Williams and his companions: "They were convinced of the nature and design of baptism by immersion." Dr. W. H. Whitsitt, "Question in Baptist History," page 163, argues that Roger Williams was not immersed, and says: "Benedict, who claims to have followed the records closely, employs the word baptize and says nothing of immersion." Rev. H. M. King, D.D., of Providence, R., I., in reply, said, in Watchman of November 18, 1896: "The truth is, that Benedict quotes Stanford's language verbatim, immersion and all, when he gives an account of the First Church at Providence. Vol. 1, p. 475." Dr. King continues: "To say that Mr. Stanford does not mention immersion is simply a confession that he never has seen Stanford's history," and adds: "If he had not referred to the edition, volume and page, we should be compelled to conclude that he had never seen Benedict either. As it is, we do not know what to conclude." Dr. A. H. Newman, in the Examiner of May 13, 1896, says: "Roger Williams was immersed," and adds: "Dr. Dexter, to whom I wrote in 1882, was of the opinion that Roger Williams practiced immersion." Prof. H. C. Vedder, in the Examiner of May 21, 1896, says: "Roger Williams was immersed," and adds: "In fine, anybody who asserts that anything but immersion has been practiced from the beginning among American Baptists assumes the burden of proof, and ingenious guesses about Mark Lucar, and things of that sort, are not proofs. They may satisfy the guesser, but he cannot fairly ask that anybody else should be satisfied with them." 3. For anyone who claims to be a Baptist to "infer," or presume, that when Baptists use the word "baptize," they of course must mean sprinkling, and not immersion, is manifestly unfair to his own people. 4. No man of Roger Williams' intelligence would have become dissatisfied with immersion and sought relief in sprinkling or pouring.

July 20, 1651, Elders Holmes, Clark and Grandall, Baptist preachers of Concord, R.I., while assisting Eld. Witter in a meeting near Lynn, Mass., were arrested and imprisoned in the Boston jail. Holmes was fined \$150, Clark \$100 and Grandall \$25. The fines of the two latter were paid. Holmes was publicly and cruelly flogged. Rev. Henry Dunston, first President of Harvard College, because he preached a sermon against infant baptism was removed from his position. Two students of the college were expelled because during vacation they attended a Baptist meeting. In 1655, Thomas Gould, of Charleston, Mass., refused to have his body sprinkled, for which he was censured by his church and prosecuted in the courts for over seven years. In connection with others, he organized a Baptist church in Boston. Magistrates, hearing of it, issued warrants requiring them to attend the Established Church. The General Court disfranchised them and imprisoned them, and for three years they pursued them with fines and imprisonment. In May, 1668, the General Court sentenced Thomas Gould, William Turner and John Forman to be banished, and because they did not flee they were put in jail for about one year. In 1676, the first Baptist meeting-house was built in Boston. A law was at once passed confiscating it, if they did not cease to meet in it. In 1680, the doors were nailed up by order of the court. In 1718, fourteen were imprisoned in Boston because they refused to pay the

salary assessment for the parish minister. Such instances were general throughout what is now known as New England. In the colony of Virginia there was a law that required dissenters to report, and if they refused, the first time the penalty was, to be whipped. For the second offense, to be whipped twice and publicly acknowledge their fault on the Sabbath day in the congregation. Third offense, to be whipped every day until obedience was secured. Baptist preachers were arrested as vagrants and cast into jails for no cause but their religious opinions. Rev. Wm. Wickenden preached the first Baptist sermon in New York in 1669. He was arrested, convicted and put in jail for three months. In North Carolina there was a law prohibiting Baptists from building meeting-houses in cities. The Georgia Legislature once refused to charter a Baptist institution of learning. In 1774, Rev. Isaac Backus, a Baptist preacher, chairman of a committee appointed by Warren Baptist Association of Rhode Island, was the first committee to appear before the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, asking for religious liberty. The elder Adams sarcastically told Mr. Backus, "You might as well try to change the evolutions of the heavenly bodies as to dissolve the union of church and State." He was mistaken. That Baptist committee was instrumental in engrafting the following clause in the Federal Constitution: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." In 1775, the Baptists of Virginia organized a crusade against the Established Church. After their triumph was complete, Hawks, the historian, says: "The Baptists seem to have known no relenting; their hostility never ceased for twenty-seven years." Again he says: "The Establishment was finally put down. The Baptists were the principal promoters of this work, and in truth did more than any other denomination in its accomplishment." Virginia and Rhode Island were slow in adopting the Constitution of the United States, and to conciliate them the following amendment was made to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Brethren, were the millions of martyred heroes misguided, and did they suffer in vain? Yes, if one religion is as good as another. Yes, if it matters not what a man believes, so he is sincere. Yes, if believers are not the only proper scriptural subjects of baptism, and if immersion is not essential to Christian baptism. Yes, if Christ did not build a church. Yes, if he did "build" his church and the gates of hell prevailed against it. We have followed the Baptists through the pages of history, written not by themselves, but by opponents. We have learned of their struggles and afflictions in their helplessness. We have seen them without secular allies and worldly advantages, contending valiantly "against principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in high places." The sculptor with his chisel hews the marble block, and makes the beautiful statue. The furnace separates the gold from the dross. Veterans who win great battles are made by constant drilling, long marches and rigid discipline. As the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through suffering, so God in his providence has brought Baptists through many trials and tribulations.

Baptist doctrines, once so unpopular that it cost the life of a believer to avow them, have taken deep root in the institutions of the land. We no longer stand alone for civil and religious liberty, for separation of church and State, and self-government in each. Our principles laid the ax at the root of the Upas tree, the one-man power, and sounded the death-knell of all forms of absolutism and priest-craft. In great religious movements God has highly honored us by giving us leadership. It was Wm. Bordie Gourney, a Baptist preacher, who inaugurated, in 1805, the voluntary Sunday-school plan, when the Robert Raikes movement of hired teachers and endowed schools was doomed to die. Wm. Hughes, a consecrated Baptist layman, founded the first Bible society. In 1793, God chose Wm. Carey, ironically called the consecrated cobbler by Dean Swift, to be the Apostle of Modern Missions. Roger Williams, influenced by his

Baptist principles, was the forerunner in the establishment of civil and religious liberty. The Declaration of Independence was denounced by the tyrants of Europe as "an Anabaptist document." Baptists were among the first and bravest to enlist in the Revolutionary war. So distinguished were their services that General Washington made most honorable mention of their sacrifices and valor in the glorious struggle for independence. To-day civil and religious liberty is no dearer to us than to many other denominations. Cordially we acknowledge that in our struggles we have had the prayers and fraternal aid of many who were not Baptists. We only claim what history accords, that we were the pioneers who blazed the way, and that to our lot has fallen the hardest of the fighting. We have furnished more martyrs than any other people. When the Lord Chancellor of England proposed to award John Locke the honor of being the author of religious liberty, he proclaimed to the world the following: "The Baptists were the first propounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty." Chief Justice Story, speaking of the Baptist settlement of Rhode Island, says: "In the code of laws established by them in Rhode Island we read for the first time since Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars, the declaration that conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded he requires."

Schaff says of the English Baptists: "For this change of public sentiment, the chief merit is due to the English nonconformists, who in the school of persecution became advocates of toleration, especially to the Baptists and Quakers, who made religious liberty (within the limit of the golden rule) an article of their creed, so that they could not consistently persecute, even if they should ever have the chance to do so." *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 1, page 803.

Herbert S. Skeats, "A History of the Free Churches of England, London," page 24, says: "It is the singular and distinguishing honor of the Baptists to have repudiated, from their earliest history, all coercive power over the consciences and actions of men with reference to religion. No sentence is to be found in all their writings inconsistent with these principles of Christian liberty and willingness which are equally dear to all the free congregational churches of England. They were the proto-evangelists of the voluntary principle."

In a foot note the author says: "The author is not connected with the Baptist denomination, and has therefore, perhaps, greater pleasure in bearing this testimony to undoubted historic fact."

Bancroft, our great American historian, says, vol. 2, page 66: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first the trophy of the Baptists."

In 1790 there were 65,000 Baptists in the United States. In 1800 there were 80,000. Now there are not less than 4,250,000, and about 15,000,000 under our influence. One hundred years ago we had one communicant to every sixty of the population, now we have one to every eighteen. We have become in the South about one-ninth of the population. In 1800 the population of the United States was 7,000,000. It is now about 75,000,000. The Baptists are sixty-two times as many as they were in 1800, while the population is only ten times what it was then. In other words, the Baptists have multiplied these ninety-nine years fifty times more in proportion than the population. Phenomenally has our numerical strength increased, and more so has been our gain in wealth, learning, and social power. The greatest preacher of the century was a Baptist, Charles H. Spurgeon. The richest man in the world is a Baptist, and to his honor, and the honor of his Baptist faith, he is the most liberal rich man of the age. God is abundantly blessing our labors in home and foreign

fields. The Father has given us much, and much fruit will He require. Whether I reflect about our marvelous past and present obligations, I tremble. The children of Israel have left a history not richer in great lessons than our own. After hundreds of years of Egyptian bondage God delivered them. Before them He divided the waters. He gave them a cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night. Water from the rock and manna from heaven, but they forgot God's mercies and murmured, and wandered forty years in the wilderness, a journey that could have been made in twenty-four hours. At Kadesh Barnes they heard the report of the spies, and, lacking faith, they turned back and perished in the wilderness.

Epictetus had these ringing words for his motto, "Know an opportunity." This is the molding and golden age of the world. Men read, think, and for themselves interpret God's word. Shackles forged by arrogant tyrants in church and church and State, and fostered by superstition, have been broke. God, the giver of all light, commands us to let our light shine. The organic laws of our republic, supported by enlightened public opinion, are our allies. This country is our earthly Canaan. This is the jubilee epoch in our history. We are not only free to worship God as our conscience dictates, but free to propagate our principles. The Father has given His Son "the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession." In the language of Caleb, "Let us go up at once and possess it, for we are able to overcome it." The Baptist denomination is neither an apology nor reminiscence. It glories in its past, rejoices in the present, and, in the words of the great Neander,

"The Baptists have a future."

"For truth with tireless zeal they sought,
In joyless paths they trod,
Heedless of pain or blame they wrought,
And left the rest with God.

"But though their names no poet wove
In deathless song or story,
Their record is inscribed above,
Their wreaths are crowns of glory."

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, immovable, and always abounding in the work of the Lord."

Chapter XVII - J. N. [John Newton] Hall

By Ben M. Bogard, 1900

J. N. Hall, the greatest debater in the Baptist denomination, was born at Pleasureville, Ky., Feb. 5, 1849. At the age of seven years he went with his parents to Ballard county, Ky., where he grew to manhood.

Bro. Hall was reared in the country, and never received a college education, yet he is better educated than nine out of ten of those who have received diplomas from college or university. Like Spurgeon or D. L. Moody, he has risen above almost any of the college men, and, with his oratory and keen logic and personal magnetism, he is a great power before an audience.

At the age of fourteen he was converted, under the ministry of Elder C. L. Cate, and was baptized by the authority of Cane Run Church, Ballard county, Ky. Later he joined the Hopewell church, same county, where he was licensed to preach on the second Saturday in January, 1871, and was ordained the second Sunday in January the next year.

Bro. Hall has confined his work to the country and small towns. He has only held a few meetings in the larger centers. He has never had any ambition to rise in the ministry, and his greatness has been recognized and talked of by others. He never sought a pastorate, he never applied for a place to preach. He has taken such work as has come in his way, and has not been able to accept one-half the invitations to hold meetings and to engage in the defense of Baptist doctrines that have been offered to him.

He has averaged, perhaps, one sermon a day for the last twenty years, making not less than ten thousand sermons during his ministry of thirty years. As he grows older his work accumulates, and a recent letter from him to the writer states that he seldom stops work before twelve o'clock at night after having worked all day.

As a result of his preaching, hundreds have professed conversion. Sometimes there are as many as forty or fifty professions of faith in a protracted meeting, and he scarcely ever holds a meeting entirely barren of results. His prominence as a debater has caused some slanderers to publish the idea that his ministry has been barren of conversions. It is a fact that few men have been more successful in soul-winning, and the souls won by him always join the Baptists. The writer has had the most favorable opportunity of knowing the facts, and he never heard of one who joined another denomination after being converted in J. N. Hall's meeting. This fact is suggestive. When other men can show such a record, it will be time then, but not before, to find fault with J. N. Hall's manner of preaching.

For twenty-eight years he had the help of a most excellent wife. He married Miss Mollie Earle on the sixth day of July, 1871, and, after standing by his side in his great work for twenty-eight years, she died Dec. 12, 1899. Mrs. Hall was an intelligent woman and an untiring worker. Bro. Hall could never have accomplished what he has if it had not been for her. The writer knew her personally, having been pastor in Fulton, Ky., where Bro. Hall and wife held their membership. It seemed to be a pleasure to her to have "fellowship in the gospel" by assisting her husband. She helped him in his correspondence, in his editorial work, and book business. She was an helpmeet indeed. She now rests from her labors and her works do follow her.

Bro. Hall has proved himself to be a very successful newspaper man. His first venture was in 1879, when he engaged with Elder F. L. Dupont in publishing the Baptist Gleaner, at Fulton, Ky. Bro. DuPont, owing to failing health, withdrew from the paper, and for some time Bro. Hall edited and published the paper alone. In 1881 the Gleaner was consolidated with the Baptist Banner, of Cairo, Ill., and for nearly a year he labored with Elder W. P. Throgmorton in publishing that paper.

In 1884 Bro. Hall, in partnership with Elder J. B. Moody, revived the Baptist Gleaner, at Fulton, Ky., and this arrangement was continued, for about five years, when he sold out to Bro. Moody.

Later he became connected with the Baptist Reaper, and changed its name to Baptist Gleaner, and continued its publication for five years, when overwork compelled him to sell out to the Western Recorder, and for about two years he was editor of the Gleaner Department of that great paper.

In 1898 the American Baptist Flag of St. Louis, Mo., was sold at auction, and J. N. Hall bought it; and he has been editor of that paper ever since. The Flag has a large circulation; the last published statement gave it at fourteen thousand. It is growing in circulation and influence, and it is necessary to take the Flag into account if one would succeed in any great denominational enterprise. It is an independent, fearless defender of the faith.

As a debater Bro. Hall has no equal. His self-possession, keen logic, personal magnetism, oratorical power, ready repartee, broad reading, rapid speaking, clear enunciation, correct pronunciation, distinct articulation and thorough knowledge of all theological questions make him invincible in debate.

His first debate was with Prof. E. C. L. Denton, in 1884. Denton was a practiced Campbellite debater, but he proved to be no match for the young David who had just come on the field. Mr. Denton has since then, at various times, refused to meet Bro. Hall in debate. He has also debated with the famous polemic, J. A. Harding, Campbellite, of Nashville, Tenn. The defeat of Harding was so crushing that his brethren have not called on him since to defend their doctrines. He has met such Methodist champions as Dr. Jacob Ditzler and Dr. E. W. Alderson. His debates have always been eminently satisfactory to Baptists, and but few men have ever been willing to meet him a second time in debate.

One of the greatest triumphs he ever had was in his debate with the famous infidel Putman, of New York. The debate was held at a place known as "Between the Rivers," in Trigg county, Ky., about eight miles from Canton, Ky. There was an infidel club in that community, and the members of it had been constantly challenging the Christian people in the community for a debate. They said openly that no preacher would dare to meet Ingersoll or Putman. At last, when patience has ceased to be a virtue, the Baptist pastor in the community accepted their challenge, and asked that the infidels bring Ingersoll, and he promised to get Hall. The terms were agreed upon and the infidel club made up \$500 to secure Ingersoll, who refused to come, but recommended Putman, who was President of the Free Thought Association of America.

The time for the debate came on and Mr. Putman was present, but Hall, being a very busy man, failed to reach the place at the hour the debate was to begin. The infidels were delighted, and the Christian people, of course, were in despair. The time to begin was at 7 o'clock p. m. A large congregation had gathered and Hall [was] not there. You can imagine, the situation better than it can be told.

Mr. Putman arose to speak and stated that it was just as he expected, that he had

no idea Mr. Hall would meet him, but that it made no difference, as he was paid to come and discuss the questions at issue for four days, and that he intended to stay the four days, "Hall or no Hall." He spoke two hours, and, being both eloquent and able, the effect on the congregation was overwhelming. Infidelity was flourishing. But its prosperity was to be short-lived.

A boy came into the large building that was fitted up for the debate just before Putman finished speaking, and slipped up to the Baptist pastor and spoke some words. When Putman had finished speaking, the pastor arose and stated that the boy had come from Canton and had brought the news that Bro. Hall was there, and, being too tired to get further without doing himself an injury, would stay there and rest that night and would be on the ground the next day in time for the debate.

The next morning Bro. Hall was there. He took Putman to one side and asked him for the arguments he had made the night before, which were given him. Without any hesitation he walked to the stand, when the time for the exercises came, and made his speech in reply to the speech he had not heard. He spoke for two hours, and it was so overwhelming that the people forgot themselves and all the rest of the world for the time being and thought only of the great truths that were being expounded by Bro. Hall.

Mr. Putman never rallied again. He made some miserable efforts to meet Hall's arguments, and at every turn he was met by Hall's keen logic and lucid answers. At the end of the second day he announced that he had "pressing business in New York" and left, notwithstanding his boast that he had come to stay four days, "Hall or no Hall."

Bro. Hall, being left alone, finished out the time preaching the gospel, and his closing sermon was from the text: "What Think Ye of Christ ." At the conclusion of this great sermon he invited all who had been infidels or skeptics, and who now thought well of Christ and would like to become followers of Christ, to come forward and give him their hands. Forty-seven came forward! It was glorious! The backbone of infidelity was broken in that community, and it has never rallied since. Such have been the good results of these debates. He has held over ninety public debates, besides written discussions.

Bro. Hall is just in the prime of life, fifty years old. The probability is that twenty-five years at least will be yet given to him for active service in the Master's work. When his time comes to be gathered to the fathers it can be said of him that he spent his life "contending earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3), and that he has "not shunned to declare all of the counsel of God."

Bro. Hall is now living in Fulton, Ky., where he edits and publishes the American Baptist Flag.

The State of the Dead

By J. N. (John Nelson) Hall, 1898

[The following speech of J. N. Hall was made in reply to a speech by Thomas Williams, a Christadelphian, in a debate at Zion, Ky., which debate continued six days, beginning August 1, 1898. Bro. Hall's lucid, clear and forcible style is clearly seen in this speech, besides it meets the doctrine of the death of the soul, as held by Christadelphians, Seventh Day Adventists and others. There is comfort in the speech, as it proves that our loved ones who have passed away are not gone forever, but are

alive with God. - BMB]

J. N. Hall's First Speech of One Hour

Brethren, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are entering upon the discussion of a subject that is fraught with profound interest to everybody present. I suppose probably no subject could claim your attention or arouse your interest so much as does the condition of the dead. The thought that comes nearest our hearts and provokes our falling tears is the recollection of our departed friends, and the anxious inquiry springs to our lips: What is the present condition of the dead? What shall be our condition when it will be said of us that we are dead?

We appreciate the very patient attention that has been given to our brother while he proceeded to outline before you his position on the subject; I bespeak for the entire discussion of the question that same degree of interest, and as fearful as is the thought that we may stand by the open sepulchre and look in on the pale face of the ones we love, with the expectation that they have fallen into utter unconsciousness, and must sleep without consciousness until the resurrection from the dead, terrible, I say, as such a truth may be, yet if it be the truth of God's word we ought to accept it, and I now assert my readiness to accept the position that has been taken by this brother, if the passages he has quoted, when placed in their right connection with what they themselves say, teach any such doctrine. I will be willing to believe it if God teaches it. But I am not going to accept it because of some sort of an interpretation my brother may make. I shall follow my brother, as he did not follow me, and will not set up an opposing line of argument until I have noticed his.

I shall first call attention to the fact that he does not like the proposition, and yet he volunteered to put his name to it; he accepted it, and that makes it all right so far as he is concerned. The proposition states just what he tried to prove. I do not know why he objects to it. He has been trying to impress us with the thought that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from the time of death until the resurrection. If he didn't try to prove that, what did he try to prove? He wanted the proposition to read that man is unconscious from death to the resurrection.

Well, my brother, "all that constitutes man" should be understood in that term "man." If there is an advantage that is sought to be taken in the use of the word "man," then you see why the brother wanted the wording changed. But the doctrine of the Christadelphians is that all that constitutes man, and everything belonging to man, from the time of death to the resurrection, is unconscious. That is their doctrine. The proposition states it, and I like it, and the brother will be obliged to stand by it. I admit that he will have trouble to defend it. It says a good deal, but it will be hardly possible to prove it. It means, when you come to consider the question, that you have got to find out what man is. The brother's proposition required him to do this. He forgot it; he overlooked it; for some reason he did not do it. Do you know what constitutes man from anything he said? He undertook to prove that man is made of dust, that at least a part of the earth is in his constitution. That part is accepted; he proved it, we admit it. He quoted a number of Scriptures, I Corinthians xv. 45, "The first man is of the earth, earthy." We believe that he had earth in him. Genesis ii. 7, "The Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground." That proposition is admitted. He was formed of the dust. But there is another word, "formed," in that connection the brother did not happen to notice. We will see it directly. Genesis iii. 19, "Out of the dust wast thou taken." Correct. Job xxxiii. 6, "Formed out of clay." That is right. Genesis iii. 23. All right. Genesis xviii. 27, "Abraham but dust and ashes." That is right. Abraham was dust and ashes; so

are we, but is that "all that constitutes man?" The proposition says that all that constitutes man is unconscious. Dust constitutes man in part; the brother proves it, and we admit it, but is that all? Suppose we take a little time to inquire into that. Let us see what it does take to constitute a man. We admit dust is a part of it. Turn to II Corinthians iv. 1, "For though our outward man perish, yet our inward man is renewed day by day." There is man, an "outward man," and that man perishes; the brother proved it. What man is that? The man taken out of the ground, made out of clay, of the earth, earthy, who goes back to dust and ashes; that is the outward man and that man perishes. Is that all that constitutes man? Let Paul answer, "But our inward man is renewed day by day." There is another man, brother, that pertains to the constitution of man, and belongs to the proposition. Here are two men, if you please; one man of the dust who perishes, and the other man rises out of his death that does not perish, and Paul declares that both are of the same man.

Ephesians iii. 16, "To be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man." "The inner man." What man is that? Is that the one that came out of the dust? Is that the one that dies day by day when the body is perishing day by day? Here are two men, and they constitute but one man, and the brother says that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from death to the resurrection. That is true of the dust man, but there is another man. Is it true of him? Did he prove that the dust man dies? Does anybody deny it? No, sir. He says that all he wants to prove to this audience is that when a man is dead he is dead. We all believe that, brother. The question is, which man is it that is dead? We ask this because the Word says there are two of them, one on the outside and the other on the inside. You prove that the outside man is dead and we accept it, but there happens to be a passage you have lost sight of that speaks of another man, the inner man.

Romans vii. 22, "For I delight in the law of God after the inner man. * * * So then with the mind (the inner man) I myself serve the law of God, but with flesh (the outer man) the law of sin." There are two parts to man, one an outer man, the other an inner man.

I. Pet. iii. 1-4, listen, "Likewise, ye wives * * whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and wearing of gold and putting on of apparel." That is done on the outer man, the body. Do not give your special attention to that. Peter says, "But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit." Let it be what? The adorning of the inner man. What is that? A meek and quiet spirit. Have you got a spirit? These wives had. Is that their inner man? Yes, Peter says that is the inner man, and they are adorning that which is not corruptible. What is it that is not corruptible? This meek and quiet spirit is not corruptible. That word "not corruptible" is the word which, in Romans ii. 7, is translated "immortal," "incorruptible" — the very word in original Greek that is translated "immortal" is there translated incorruptible and is applied to the spirit of the godly women. Didn't you say something about finding a place which said something about an "immortal soul" or an "immortal spirit?" Here it is. Look after it a little, if you please.

All that constitutes man is totally unconscious before the resurrection. What constitutes man? An outer man and an inner man; a dust body and a spirit; one a dying, perishing body, and the other being renewed day by day at the same time. These are declarations of God's word. It says this is what constitutes a man.

Let us turn and examine the Scriptures given by the brother. He went over a long list of Scriptures in a hurry. I took them down as fast as he read, I Corinthians xv. 45, "The first man is of the earth, earthy." Correct. Did God form man from the dust of

the earth? He did. What part of the man? His body. What of the spirit? Did he form the spirit out of dust? If he did not, where did the spirit come from?

Job iv. 17, "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" There it is, "mortal." The body is mortal. Is the spirit mortal? I challenge the brother to say so. The brother challenged me to find a solitary passage where it said "immortal soul." You find a passage containing the words "mortal soul," and I will find right next to it the passage containing "immortal soul."

Psalms ciii. 14, "He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust." What is it that is dust? Our mortal body. It goes back to dust. But is our spirit dust?

Job xxx. 25, "For I know that thou wilt bring me to death and to the house appointed to all the living." Correct. This is spoken of the body, not of the spirit.

Ecclesiastes. ix. 5 makes the statement that "the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten." The brother takes the position that this involves the entire man. "The living know that they must die; but the dead know not any thing." That is going to be admitted, but the question arises, What is it that is dead? What is it that is involved in the matter of death? Suppose we read just a little further from that same author. Listen: "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they a portion any more in anything that is done under the sun." You see now he is speaking of death, and the relationship of the dead to things which are under the sun. This serves as a key. What element is it that is being considered as dead? Let us look a little further into that. Does the death include the spirit? The body is dead; that is admitted; and the death mentioned there includes the spirit or it does not. Is there something that survives? Let us ask this same man that used this language in this same book whether the spirit goes down into death or not. Listen: Ecclesiastes xii. 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was." Does the spirit return to dust? "But the spirit goes to God who gave it." What is it then that is dead? The part that pertains to the knowledge that is under the sun. Let us see a little further what is meant by the expression, "The dead know not any thing." The declaration is, "For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." That is the statement of Jesus Christ. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. But didn't all of them die? Yes. Is not all that constitutes a man wholly dead? The brother so affirms. If so, God is no longer their God. But He is their God! He is, therefore, the God of the dead because they all live unto him. Then they are not dead. There is an element in them that is not dead. The expression must be taken either in a limited or an unlimited sense — please look at another part of the sentence — "neither have they any more a reward." If the application is of unlimited application to all, then this will deny my brother his reward. He is now alive; he is going to die; the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward. His own passage has cut him off from the resurrection and from the reward. Listen to Job vii. 9, 10: "He that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more. He shall return no more to his house; neither shall his place know him any more." This declaration is to be taken in an unlimited or in a limited sense. The statement is that those that go to the grave shall come up no more. It is a declaration of the total annihilation of the dead and a denial of the resurrection from the dead, if taken in an unlimited sense. We must determine the sense of our Scriptures. So the passage is to be taken in a limited sense, and the reference is to those under the sun who shall have no more knowledge of anything that takes place. But the spirit, which is a part of the essential being as God gave it, still lives. The inner man returns to God, who gave it. It follows, then, that the proposition is untrue so far as that passage is concerned.

But he also called attention to another passage; let me turn and read, Job xiv. 10: "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? "Giveth up what? The ghost, "and where is he?" "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. * * * If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait." What is it that dies? The body. What is it of which Job is speaking? The body, that which goes down to the grave. The spirit does not go to the grave. Solomon says the spirit returns at death to God who gave it; the body returns to dust. If the phrase body does not include the spirit, the proof is not to be found in this passage for the support of his proposition. That it does not include it in this passage is found in the fact that Solomon says the spirit returns to God who gave it.

It is said that God formed man from the dust of the ground? Did God form man's spirit from the dust of the ground? "God formeth the spirit of man within him" — Zechariah xii. 1. Here is the same word "formed " that is used in Genesis ii. 7. That body that the brother says was made out of the dust of the ground was unconscious until the time that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. That body was nothing but a magnificent corpse until God gave unto it the breath of life. But did God make the breath of life of the dust? Was it just breath, or breath having life in it? Zechariah declares that God "formeth the spirit of man within him." That is made a direct part of the matter of his creation.

The brother referred also to Ecclesiastes iii. 18: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go to one place; all are of the dust and all turn to dust again." The brother presumes to say as a conclusion of this statement that there is no distinction between man and beast. They both go to one place; they all are of dust and all turn to dust again. Now the very next sentence, which the brother neglected to quote, gives us the key to the situation and makes a statement of the true nature of the case: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" It is true that the body of the beast and the body of the man are alike, but is it true of their spirits, of their inner man? The very next sentence declares that when you come to their spirits you strike the difference. The spirit of the man goeth upward at death, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward at death. God made the beasts and gave them their breath, but he did not breathe into their nostrils of the breath of life. The beast hath breath and flesh, and it comes from the dust. In these respects man's body is like them, but when man comes to die the spirit returns to God who gave it and goeth upward. But this is not so of the beast.

Psalms cxlvi. 3: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." What is the psalmist David talking of in this connection? It is well enough to look at the connection, and by doing it we are able to escape false conclusions we otherwise would fall into. The psalmist is talking about men who put their trust in the princes of this world. He says, "Put not your trust in princes that cannot carry out their purposes." They have no perpetuity of life in this world; when they die their purposes perish. That word is also translated "purposes," "intentions," "designs." They fail; they are unable to carry out their plans; they die. It has no reference whatever to their condition after death. These princes may still live — do

live, because God is the God of the living.

Then we have the statement that Hezekiah prayed that God would spare his life yet for fifteen years. The brother says, "Did God spare his life?" Yes. Would he have lived if God had not spared his life? No. Would he have died? Yes. In what sense? Total, unconsciousness? That is the very point the brother undertakes to prove. He would have been dead as to his body; would he have been dead as to his inner man? All men have an inner man. When God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul, did he give the first man what he expected every other man to have? Did he give what those wives had, a spirit? Did he give what the Corinthians had, a spirit? If he did, did that die? If it did the brother has not yet proved it. The brother says, suppose he had died and gone to heaven, would it have been just to Hezekiah to let him stay out of heaven fifteen years? Yes. Why? Because God has so constituted life in its natural relations as to make us love life. So long as we look at life from this side of the grave, life is desirable; our relationships here have by nature and association become sweet; so if, like Paul, we could have a glimpse of paradise, we still would have a desire for the things of this world, unless we, like Paul, had been crucified to the world and the world unto us. There is not any inconsistency in this.

But the brother asks what is the need of the resurrection if the dead are now alive. He thinks it would be cruel to bring them back to their earthly bodies. Why bring back the dead from heaven? For instance: Abel has been in heaven ever since the time he passed away. Why call the spirits back and put them in mortal bodies? We do not come back and enter into mortal bodies. In the resurrection from the dead they get immortal bodies; their bodies become immortal, like their spirits in that glorious operation.

Then the brother came to the New Testament. He said: "Lazarus is dead." Jesus Christ said it. Was he dead? He was; but in what sense was he dead? Was he dead in the sense of being totally unconscious? Was everything that constituted Lazarus dead? Was his inner man dead? His spirit dead? The declaration is, "The spirit returns to God who gave it." If that was true of anybody in Solomon's time, wasn't it just as true in Lazarus' time? If Solomon's spirit went to God at death, and everybody in his time went to God in spirit at death, so did Lazarus. Then the spirit of Lazarus was not dead. The body died. There is no doubt about that. Where did he come from? If he was dead in spirit he would have come down from heaven; whereas the dead Lazarus came forth from the grave. Was he in the grave? He was. He had died and been buried. Whenever resurrection comes, the spirit comes to the body and the body is obliged to come out of the grave. The dead body is revived and the man lives.

Then the brother came to I Corinthians xv. I will turn and read that statement: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The argument the brother makes is drawn from the expression, "They which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished," if the dead rise not. The point in the argument is this: "If there be a conscious condition of the spirit between death and the resurrection, then there could not be any perishing even if their bodies did not rise, since there is an element of their being which is already saved. Paul's entire argument is hypothetical; he bases the argument on a supposition. He says, "Ye are yet in your sins if Christ be not raised from the dead,"

yet the Corinthians had already received the forgiveness of sins. He bases the assurance that there was remission of sins on the resurrection from the dead, and yet whether there was a resurrection from the dead or not, they had had remission of sins. He says, "Your faith is vain, yet they had faith." In the very same hypothesis Paul argues that if there is no resurrection of the dead, then you have got no spirit and they that have departed have no existence at all. Resurrection from the dead is based on the idea that man is potentially immortal and resurrection from the dead is a necessity for the development of immortality. If there is no resurrection from the dead, then there is no immortality; on the same ground you have no faith, and no remission of sins; yet you did have faith, and remission of sins, resurrection or no resurrection. To show that his argument is purely hypothetical he proceeds to say in the twentieth verse: "Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." Therefore they that sleep in Christ are not perished; therefore your faith is not vain, our preaching is not vain, your sins are pardoned. Therefore the hypothetical argument Paul makes, instead of supporting my brother's position, is directly opposed to it. His next point was the resurrection of Jesus Christ. He asks whether Christ was dead. There is a sense in which Christ's death involves a separation from God. That is the meaning of the word death, separation. In that dying hour Christ looked up and said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Does God forsake him? Does he die? Yes. Therefore the Son of God separated from the Father goes down in the grave and he speaks of it as "death." And I wish to call attention to a thought just here. My brother intimates that Christ became as totally unconscious in his death as we are in ours. According to his conception, Jesus Christ was wholly without knowledge from the day of his death to the time of his resurrection. His divinity as well as his humanity both alike slept. Listen to what Jesus said in his departing hour. He looks up into the face of the Father and says, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit." "Where did his spirit go? Into the hands of God. Unless his solemn declaration in the dying hour was false, his spirit did not go down into the sleep of death. Did he have a spirit? He says he did, and he commended it to God. Spirits do not go into the grave; spirits do not return to dust for they are not taken from the dust.

I believe I have noticed every point taken by the brother except the last one. He says the primary meaning of the word soul is "breathing creature;" it is used very frequently of soul and of spirit in the Bible; it is applied to beasts and various other things; it is also applicable to man and God. We have got to determine by the context what the meaning of the word is. That is granted. Nearly any word you may think of in connection with the Scriptures has various applications, and you have to determine its meaning by the context. Therefore there is very little to be drawn from the statement of the original word rendered soul and spirit and sometimes applied to beasts and to man and sometimes to God. If it always meant a mortal being, then God is mortal; if it sometimes means an immortal being, then it may be so applied to man. I have called your attention to the line of argument drawn by the brother. There is one point further. "The grave cannot praise thee; neither any that go down into silence." Who goes to the grave, to this pit of corruption? The outer or the inner man? The key to the whole situation is found in this simple definition of what constitutes man. If the fleshly body is all there is of him, then the fleshly body in death is unconscious. If there is an element in man separate from the dust body which at death goes to God, then it does not go to the grave. All these passages the brother stated of going to the grave, of having no knowledge under the sun, our purposes perishing — all that pertains to the grave. It involves the body and does not involve the spirit. The brother has to prove that the spirit man also goes down to the grave, as does the dust man, and when he has established that proposition he

will make some start to prove his doctrine.

If I have overlooked a passage that you quoted and you will now call my attention to it, I will look at it before I proceed. Name it and I will now turn and look after it, or name it later on. Then let us proceed to inquire a little into the nature of this subject.

Genesis i. 26, Man was made in the image of God. "And God said, let us make man in our image and after our likeness." What is God's image or likeness as it is expressed in man? Man was to have dominion over all earthly creation. It may be well to find something further about the construction of man who was made in God's image, and given this dominion over nature. Man's body could not have that ascendancy necessary for this dominion. There are ten thousand things in nature that have decided advantages over our bodies, but there is nothing in nature that has an ascendancy over our spirits. When it comes to his conceptions, his thoughts, his imaginations, his discoveries, his inventions, man rises in the scale of his being until he ascends above everything else that has earthly being. Whatever it is in man that is in God's image it was to have dominion. Flesh cannot do it; therefore flesh is not the part of man made in the image of God. Man's body could not be made in the image of God. Turn to Isaiah xl. ii., "To whom will you liken God? To what image will ye compare him? "You can make an image of man; you can make it out of clay, out of brass, out of gold, out of silver, and it is the declaration of Isaiah that nobody can make a likeness of God. That man and God are not in the same image; if they were you could make an image of God as easily as you can make an image of man.

In Acts xvii. 29, "Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold or silver or stone, graven by art of man's device." Any sculptor can make an image of man, but no one can make an image of God, and this shows us that our bodies are not in God's image.

It is dishonoring to God to attempt to make a likeness of him. In Romans i. 23, "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." That was a disgrace to God to make an attempt at it, but it would not be a disgrace if man's corruptible body was in God's image.

Philippians ii. 6-8, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man." Here is a change on the part of Christ from the likeness of God to the likeness of man. He took on himself our flesh and was made like we are in body. That shows that our bodies are not like God's image. Who took on the likeness of the flesh? Christ. But have you found that the outer man, or dust man, that constitutes man as to his flesh, and his inner man, are both distinct things, and that this outer man is not in the image of God? It is merely of the earth, and goes back at death to dust. If there is, therefore, any likeness of God in man, it must be his inner man. He has a dual nature; his dust or material body is not in God's image.

But read again John iv. 24, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." There is God's character, God's nature. It is spirit. Let us see if we do not find an endowment of that element in man which is called spirit, and that the real man made in the image of God will turn out to be the spirit which does not die.

Romans viii. 16, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." God is spirit, and the relationship between us and God is of a spiritual character.

Can this dust body of man be like a spirit? Luke xxiv. 36-40, "When Jesus stood in

their midst they were terrified and affrighted, supposing they had seen a spirit, but Jesus said, 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.'" Dust bodies do have flesh and bones, and spirits do not. Spirits cannot, therefore, be in the form of dust bodies. Now, then, whence came this spirit that does not have flesh and bones and that was not made of dust? Zechariah xii. 1, "He formeth the spirit of man within him." Notice, he is speaking of the creation. Where did the spirit come from? God. How? God formed it in man. When God stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth that is the creation period, what else did he do? He formed the spirit of man within him. When? At the beginning. How? When God made man out of the dust of the ground, he was a corpse; it takes another act, a creative act, for that man to have life. God formed the spirit within him, that is what Zechariah says. Moses says that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Whence, then, came the spirit? From God. At death what becomes of the spirit? The body goes back to dust, but the spirit that came from God was formed in man at the time of the creation, that spirit thus formed at death goes back to God who gave it, and you have the same lifeless corpse you had at the beginning. What is the distinction between man now at death and Adam at the creation? He is a corpse; he was then, he is now. There was a period in which he lived. Now he is dead. Where is his spirit gone? To God who gave it. As to his spirit, he is not dead; as to the outer man, he is dead.

Acts vii. 59, "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Who said it? Stephen. When? At death, when he was dying, he looked up to God and said, I am now going, I am taking my departure; I know where my body is going, down under these stones in death. Is that all that constitutes a man? Listen to his statement: "Lord, receive my spirit." When Jesus was on the cross he cried with a loud voice, saying, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." Does all that constitutes a man become unconscious at death?

But the question may arise, Can spirits have conscious being without material bodies? The declaration is made that God is a spirit; God's body is not made of dust; it does not have material organization; he is nothing but spirit. Jesus Christ was spirit before he became incarnate. Then he had a body, and continued in the body until death, and from the time of death until the resurrection he was without a material body; at the resurrection the spirit and body came together. Angels are said to be the spirits sent forth to administer to them that shall be heirs of salvation, and yet they have no material bodies; they are not made of dust. It is, therefore, possible for the spirit of man to exist separate from his material body and still have conscious being' in the presence of God after death.

Now a few words about immortal soul; the brother did not find it, and nobody else finds the expression, "immortal soul," yet I showed you that there is an incorruptible spirit; the same word translated immortal in other places, a spirit undying, that abides and will continue. The word "mortal" is always applied to the flesh and never applied to the spirit, and there is not any statement that at death the spirit dies. James says that the body without the spirit is dead, but the spirit is not dead. It is that inner man that we claim is still conscious after the death of the body.

I have called attention to the fact that the flesh body is not in the image of God; let us see if the spiritual man is in the image of God. Romans viii. 29: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." In the transaction in the garden of Eden there was a twofold nature in man. Who was it stretched forth his hand and took the fruit? Adam. What part of Adam? His hand. What was it ate of the fruit? His mouth; his material body. What was it transgressed the law? His material body, the only man present. Was there no other man present

except that? Where was the spirit that Zechariah said God formed within him? Did not that have a part in it?

Had man's will, his conscience, his mind, no part in the act of disobedience? The man spirit was involved as well as his body, and he lost the image of God in that transaction. The declaration was. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." In some sense or other man died that day; he did not die as to his body; he died in the sense of a moral death, in the sense of a separation from God. In Colossians iii. 10, we read, "And have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." It becomes like a new creation. The man dead in trespasses and sins has been brought to life. What man is that? The inner man. Where does he go at death? To God. Stephen's spirit returned to God; Jesus' spirit returned to God. The thief's spirit went with Christ. What died? The body? No, the spirit, the inner man, that God said should die in the day that he ate of the fruit, not in the sense of being totally extinct, but in the sense of separation from God. The body is the outer man, the mortal; that dies in the sense of becoming unconscious and going back to dust. The word mortal means subject to death; the word immortal means exemption from death. Death as to the body means that state of being in which there is a total and permanent cessation of the vital functions and sensations of life, an extinction of bodily life. That is Webster. What of the soul, Mr. Webster? Spiritual death, a perversion of the soul by sin, loss of the favor of God.

Can man be dead and at the same time be alive? Can the spirit be dead and the body alive? Let us see if it is possible. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she yet liveth." There is life and death both in the same person. Look a little further; Colossians ii. 13, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him." These people who he here says had been dead were alive all the time and at the very time that he says they were dead. That shows that there is one element in man that can be dead, while at the same time there is another element in man that can be alive. Here are two men, an inner and an outer man, and while the inner man is dead in trespasses and sins, the outer man is very much alive. When the outer man is dead and goes into the grave, the other man lives in the spiritual realm just the same.

Away back in the Old Testament he is finding all his proof in the use of hypothetical expressions. I am going back to the Old Testament. In Isaiah xiv. 4-9 you will read what the prophet said of Babylon: "How hath the oppressor ceased! * * * hell from beneath is moved to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee." That word hell is translated from the Hebrew word sheol, which represents both the grave and the state of the dead in the grave. He told us yesterday that everybody in sheol had quit thinking, quit acting, quit speaking. Listen: "It stirreth up the dead for thee." What! I thought if they were clean dead it could not stir them up. God's word says they are there in sheol, even all the chief ones of the earth, and all stirred up. Let us look a little further. Ezekiel xxxi. 15, 17: "In the day when he went down to the grave I caused a mourning. * * * I made the nation to shake at the sound of his fall when I cast him down to hell with them that descend into the pit. * * * This is Pharaoh and all his multitude." They are dead, and in the grave, and in hell. Now compare these words on the same subject: "The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of sheol" — dead, buried, in hell, in sheol and yet talking! That is from the Old Testament, the very place where he goes to prove that everything dead is silent, right out of those same Scriptures we read that in hell they speak.

I want to quote another passage, a declaration of the Old Testament. The Scriptures talk about being gathered to the fathers. Listen: "Genesis xxv. 8, "And Abraham

gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man and feeble of years, and was gathered to his people." You cannot have a gathering to people without considering the idea of a multitude. Abraham's body was never buried with his people; it was buried by the side of his wife in the cave of Machpelah; yet God's word declares before he was buried that he died and was gathered to his people. The idea of being gathered to people carried the idea of a multitude. You have got to have a multitude in existence to which Abraham went after his death. From the New Testament, before this debate closes, we are going to find this man Abraham alive with his people.

I want to notice another thought; I want to tell you that the ordinance of baptism is a contradiction of this man's doctrine. Romans vi. 3, "As many as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In this we have a picture of the burial of a dead body. Speak to the administrator and say: What are you doing? Burying the old man. What are you doing? Raising up the new man. Here is a representation of the death and burial of the body and the resurrection of the body. What is the condition of the man between the burial and the resurrection? Is he dead? You do not bury a man until he is dead. Were you clean good dead when you were put under the water? Is there a conscious or an unconscious condition represented by the figure between the burial and the resurrection? I come to tell you this morning that the doctrine the brother undertakes to impress upon us degrades man to the level of the brute; it is a gospel of dirt.

I propose to show you that all that constitutes man does not die at death. Turn, if you please, to Luke xx. 37, 38, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he said, I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." Remember, all three of these men were dead at the time this language was uttered. Now, if my brother is in the right, these dead men were entirely dead, clean, good dead, and they have no life of any sort. Then God is not their God.. But if there is still an element of their being that is alive, that has survived death, then God is their God, for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. How can he be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob when they are dead, according to my brother's argument? The answer is here: "For all live unto him." Every one of them had their spirits return back to God and are still alive and in his presence, in his sight. He knows of them; he is their God. That includes Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all of the dead until time shall be no more. Jesus positively says they are all alive, and I am not, therefore, going to believe that they are all dead in the sense my brother believes they are dead.

Turn to Matthew x. 28, "Fear not them that can kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do, but rather fear him that is able to destroy both, soul and body in hell." Will you notice, man can kill our bodies, but they cannot kill our souls? That shows that the body and soul must be distinct. If my body and soul were the same thing, and if a man was to kill my body he would kill both together. If body and breath are all there is of man, man can kill him. Can any man kill him? Jesus Christ says he cannot do it. Why can't he? Can he kill the body? Yes. Can he kill the soul? No. Then the body and soul are two distinct things. This shows that the spirit or soul in the man is distinct from the body and is not killed with the body.

Look further: Luke ix. 29, "And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening. And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias." Both these talking with him, talking with Christ during his personal ministry, Moses and Elias! Talking? Jesus said they did.

"Who appeared in glory, and spoke of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." They talked to him about his death. Who was Moses? He died away back yonder. Who was Elijah? He was translated hundreds of years before and went back to God. Both gone. When have they had resurrection? How did they get back? My brother says that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from death to the resurrection. Was everything that constituted these men unconscious? If so, how could they get back and talk? God's word says they did and I believe it. Therefore his proposition is untrue. The presence of spirits who have come back and have been seen and heard and made themselves known is positive proof of the fact of the untruthfulness of the proposition. He could not make the proposition stand to save his life if there were only this passage. But we have only given you a start to show the absurdity of this doctrine of dirt which reduces man to the level of the brute and ignores the fact that they, having come from God, return to him again.

We come to the thief on the cross. Let us take a little time to look into the question about the thief. You will find a reference to it in Luke xxiii. 42. The Saviour was on the cross dying as a malefactor; one thief reviled him and the other prayed to him, and his prayer was this: "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." The brother intimates that prayer contemplated that the thief had an idea of the future coming kingdom, and when the Saviour came in that kingdom he wanted to be remembered. It may be this was the idea of the thief since he probably was himself a Jew, or at least had associated with the Jews, for he was put to death in Jerusalem, and, no doubt, therefore thought that there was coming a time when the Messiah's kingdom was to come in Jerusalem, and he wanted to be remembered in that kingdom. But Christ at once understood his difficulty, and he knew how to deal with it. Not away beyond the future will I hear your prayer; I keep no poor penitent man waiting hundreds of years for the answer to his prayer; you may fix your time, but now is God's accepted time. To-day I will answer you; right now shalt thou be with me in paradise. Not away beyond in the future when you think I am coming in my kingdom in this materialistic reign, but to-day. How is Jesus going to answer it? What is he going to give him? Into what will he take him? Jesus solves the problem and looks into his face and says: "TO-DAY shalt thou be with me in paradise."

Let us see if we can find where paradise is; if we can, we can find where the thief is and where Christ is. Turn to Revelation ii. 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." There is paradise. Jesus said to the thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Where is paradise? The tree of life is in the midst of paradise. Wherever you find paradise you will find the tree of life in the middle of it; wherever you find the tree of life you will find paradise. If I could make a circle on this board and draw a tree in the middle of it, wherever you find the circle you find the tree. Let us take this tree as a pointer. Turn to Rev. xxii: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life." Who said that? John. What did he see? He saw the tree of life. Where did he see it? In the middle of the street, and on either side of the river. There is God on his throne, and the river proceeding out of the throne. Where is the tree of life? In the middle of paradise. Where else is the tree of life? In the midst of the city. Then the city and paradise is the same place. The 14th verse: "Blessed are they that keep his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city." Where is the tree of life? In the city. Who has a right to it? They that do his commandments. When do they enter? Whenever they pass out of this life and go into the holy city. Where is paradise? God's throne is in it; the tree of life stands in it, and they enter it that keep his commandments. That is where the thief went that

day. That is the heaven we speak of.

Turn to II Corinthians xii. 1: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago; whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell." Did you ever know a man to talk like that who was a Christadelphian? I know Paul never knew a Christadelphian. If my brother had been there he would have said: "You are the most poorly instructed Christadelphian I ever saw! Don't you know a man could not be out of his body? When a man is out of his body he is dead. Have you lost your mind? Has anybody hit you on the head with a club? What is the trouble that you cannot tell whether a man can be in the body or out? Don't you know if he gets out he goes out like a candle? I tell you, Paul wasn't a Christadelphian. "How that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." It is a vision, a revelation. God makes it and Paul calls it such. There was paradise to which the thief went. The declaration is that the tree of life is in paradise, and the tree of life is in the city of God. If it is, you might reasonably expect to see marvelous things. What did he say? Listen: "And heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Heard what? Heard words that a man could not be allowed to utter." Who did the speaking? Those in paradise. He looked in and saw paradise. He looked in and saw paradise and heard somebody talking.

He had a vision, a revelation from God. There was no mere dream about it. He heard unspeakable words. Heard what? Words. What are words? Signs of ideas. What are ideas? Conceptions of conscious minds. Can a man who is unconscious express himself in words? Did Paul hear words? He says he did. Where? In paradise. Where is paradise? Up where the tree of life is in the city of God. What have they there? Words. What kind of words? Unspeakable words which it was not lawful that man should utter, which he could not repeat. I say, therefore, in heaven, in paradise, they have language there, people talking, and when a man is enwrapped in vision, in a revelation from God, he can hear the words of paradise that would not be lawful to repeat here. I tell you, those of you who have lost friends in this life, who have stood by the side of the open, cheerless grave, lift up the eye of faith, the heart of hope, and realize that those who have departed have entered into the paradise of God, and that they, with faithful Abraham and all the good, are now singing the songs and talking in a language that you could not utter. Let me read you some statements:

Conscious beings only can utter words; Paul heard words uttered in paradise. Therefore paradise is a place of conscious beings.

God's throne is in paradise. God's throne is where God is; therefore God is in paradise.

God is in paradise; at death the spirit goes to God; therefore departed spirits are in paradise.

Departed spirits are in paradise; they enter paradise at death and leave it at the resurrection. Therefore in paradise we have conscious spirits from death until the resurrection.

Therefore my brother's proposition from one end of it to the other is untrue.

I turn to Philippians i. 21-25. "For me to live is Christ and to die is gain, * * * yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; which is far better. * * * This is what Paul says. I am in a condition of trouble. I am in a strait; I have to choose whether to die or to remain and work for Christ. I am here in prison and possibly will be condemned to death if I do not take proper means to defend myself, and I am in a strait what I shall do about it. If I live it will be for your good; if I die it will be for my gain. If I go I will go

to Christ; my body will be crucified and it will go to the ground and I will be with Christ. Where is Christ? Stephen saw him seated at the right hand of God. He is over in the next world. He has no communication with us now; physically we are cut off from him. If I depart I will be with him. There is a man looking in the face of death and contemplating the possibility of dying and being with Christ on the other side.

II Peter i. 13, "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle" — referring to his body — "to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle even as the Lord Jesus has showed me." * * *

"For we have not followed cunningly-devised fables " — now notice, the apostle Peter is going to draw some conclusion in view of death from the revelation he saw when Moses and Elias came and talked with Christ. He is going to get consolation out of it. "But we were eye-witnesses of his majesty; for he received from the Father honor and glory, when there came to him such a voice from the excellent glory, saying, This is my son in whom I am well pleased." We have also a more sure word of prophecy. Note: We have had an assurance in prophecy of life for the dead; we have all of God's promises; now we have had a conclusive demonstration of it; a light has shone in a dark place; we never understood it, never clearly recognized it; we believed about it, and our faith was strong in God's word; now we have seen a demonstration of it. Peter and the other disciples saw men in the death state who came back, who were alive and in actual existence.

II. Corinthians v. 1-8, "For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked." Paul's idea is: I do not merely want to die to get out of the body, and be done with the troubles of this life; I am not going to commit suicide; I want this mortal condition that brings me this torture of mind and body laid aside, and I want to be, not naked,, but clothed with the other life, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. * * * "Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." Absence and presence are conditions of the consciousness. You cannot tell if you are absent from any place to-day unless you are conscious. Paul says that we want to die and lay down this tabernacle and be swallowed up of life, absent from the body and present with the Lord. That shows that Paul knew that when this body died then his presence with the Lord would be a fact.

Revelation vi. 9-11, "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 they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood in them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them." Here is a vision. Look at it! There are people dead; he said they had been slain, but their souls were not slain, because Jesus said, Fear not him that can kill the body, but is not able to kill the soul. Their souls had not been killed. Now where were they? Under the altar. What altar? "I saw the Lord stand on the altar, and he said, smite * * * That is the millennial dawning; that is the time the Lord is coming to take vengeance, and these saints were under that altar, and God answered their prayer for vengeance when the time for vengeance came. Now, the souls of these people who had been slain were right before God's throne where God himself is standing. They were under the altar; their bodies were dead and their spirits, souls, were talking. We want to know how long before you avenge our blood. God replied to them, You have got to be patient for a little while; put the white robes on you and rest till your brethren are killed like you. The resurrection has not come,

and their bodies are slain, sleeping in the dust of the ground, and here are their souls, there on the other side of death, between death and the time of the resurrection. This then covers the very period of the time of my brother's proposition. Listen to what the proposition says: "All that constitutes man will be totally unconscious from the time of death until the resurrection." And here John saw these souls after they were dead and before they were raised from the dead; here is a passage that comes right in between my brother's proposition and knocks it into smithereens.

Let us notice further. The declaration of God's word is, we have eternal life. That is promised to believers. I want to call attention to some passages briefly on that line. John iii. 14, 16, "That whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have eternal life." There eternal life is promised the believer. It begins in this life the moment he believes. He puts himself in the position to get that promise the hour he becomes a believer. Eternal life has no cessation in it. It is put in his hand at once, and has the assurance of God, like the souls under the altar, who rest and are robed in white.

Further than that; John vi. 54, "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," hath, "and I will raise him up." Notice, will you; he hath eternal life. Is there going to be a death about it? Yes; the body has got to die and resurrection is coming to the body, but notwithstanding the dying body, he has eternal life; it belongs to that spirit made in the likeness of God. Let me submit, if there is a period of time from the death of man till the resurrection, when he is totally unconscious, then perishing is the result for that length of time. The man has gone out like the light of the candle, and would not have any existence anywhere. If all that constitutes man dies at death, then man perishes. The body perishes, the breath perishes, the soul perishes, and that statement of Jesus Christ never could be true.

John xvii. 2, 3, "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." What is eternal life? To know God. Do they know him now? Christ has revealed him to you, and you know him. This is life eternal and it never perishes.

I John v. 10, 13, "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." If he believes in Jesus Christ he has the witness in himself; he knows it. He that believeth not God hath made him a liar. And this is the record that God hath given us eternal life and that life is in his Son. Our life is in Christ and Christ is in us. We have him as a present possession, because he is formed in you the hope of glory; because you have the witness in yourself, you have got the life that shall never die; when he comes by and by the body shall perish, but when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. We shall stand by his side, we shall hear his voice in the resurrection, and spirit and body shall glorify God together.

=====

[Ben M. Bogard, editor, Pillars of Orthodoxy, or Defenders of the Faith, 1900.]

ABOUT THIS VOLUME

Pillars of Orthodoxy is at once a history, an album, and a collection of notable Baptist sermons and essays. Edited by Ben M. Bogard in 1900, it preserves the lives and convictions of men who labored to defend biblical faith and Baptist truth.

Each chapter stands as a complete portrait, joining a life sketch with a representative sermon or essay. Among those remembered are A. C. Dayton, Richard Fuller, William Vaughan, A. P. Williams, James P. Boyce, and other influential defenders of the faith.

This historic volume offers students of Baptist history an important record of conviction, courage, preaching, and service.

BEN M. BOGARD

Editor of the original 1900 edition