

Life and Lessons
of
J. W. McGarvey

Edited By
John Wadley

GOSPEL LIGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY
DELIGHT, ARKANSAS 71940

Copyright 1988
By
Gospel Light Publishing Company

Cover Design by Jay Morris

Dedication

***To that noble host of gospel preachers
who love, honor and proclaim the Word of God
as did***

John William McGarvey.

May their tribe increase.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION, <i>John Wadley</i>	7
THE LIFE OF J. W. McGARVEY, <i>Benjamin DeWeese</i>	9
THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS	29
RESURRECTION OF JESUS: DIRECT EVIDENCE	34
RESURRECTION OF JESUS: TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESSES	49
RECONCILIATION	65
GRACE, GRACES, STATE OF GRACE	70
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH	76
REPENTANCE	97
WHAT IS REPENTANCE?	110
IS BAPTISM A POSITIVE INSTITUTION?	116
THE THIEF ON THE CROSS	119
IMMERSION IN THE HOLY SPIRIT	123
THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT — I	141
THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT — II	151
RELIGIOUS DUTIES OF CHILDREN	158
THE CHURCH AND THE NEW TESTAMENT	163
UNWRITTEN CREEDS	166
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES	168
THE ELDERSHIP: TITLES AND DUTIES OF THE OFFICE	173
THE ELDERSHIP: QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE OFFICE	188

PREACHING - WHAT IS IT?.....199

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION 201

HOW TO BE RESPECTED **216**

KEEP THYSELF PURE..... **220**

PASTORS..... **223**

LEGALIZED ADULTERY..... **232**

LEGALIZED ADULTERY AGAIN **236**

"LORD, TEACH US TO PRAY" **239**

WILL GOD ANSWER PRAYER?..... **243**

PAUL'S PRAYER FOR TWO CHURCHES 248

PAUL'S PRAYER FOR HIS FRIENDS..... 253

PRAYER AND MEDITATION **257**

HOW TO KEEP A GOOD CONSCIENCE.....261

LYING..... **266**

COMPROMISING WITH SIN 270

GEHAZI'S AVARICE..... **274**

WITH THE LORD..... 277

IS THE STORY OF JONAH INCREDIBLE? **280**

JEWISH WARS AS PRECEDENTS FOR MODERN WARS297

DESTINY OF THE WICKED 311

Introduction

Of the millions who have lived upon the earth only a few have so impressed their fellow citizens that they still command a hearing seventy-five years after their death. John William McGarvey is one of that mighty minority whose teaching and influence have survived his passing. Today most of his many books are yet in circulation and eagerly sought for. His original commentary on Acts has proven the most enduring volume produced by members of the Restoration Movement. His book on the Eldership has had a lasting effect on the brotherhood's concept of church government. His writings defending the Christian faith against the assaults of skeptical modernists have inoculated most of our preachers against this destructive error for upwards of 100 years. His work in this field is preserved in four excellent volumes: *Biblical Criticism*, *Evidences of Christianity*, *The Authorship of Deuteronomy* and *Jesus and Jonah*. His book of Sermons occupies a prominent place in the library of most of our gospel preachers.

Through his work of training preachers in the College of the Bible at Lexington, Kentucky, Brother McGarvey established a pattern for ministerial training and a standard of excellence that still is felt in all our Christian colleges and schools of preaching.

Great as he was, J. W. McGarvey was not perfect in every decision and action in his long career. When the brotherhood was wracked and torn over the innovations of instrumental music in worship and missionary societies to do the Lord's work, he stood between the two opposing sides. He strongly opposed instrumental music in worship but worked with enthusiasm for the various Missionary Societies of his day. This position, held by several of his co-laborers at the College of the Bible and in Central Kentucky, placed them in an awkward

position. They were too conservative for the dominant liberal element in the church led by Isaac Errett, editor of the *Christian Standard*, and J. H. Garrison, editor of the *Christian Evangelist*, and too liberal for the conservative brethren associated with David Lipscomb and the *Gospel Advocate*.

For some 30 years McGarvey was associated with the Broadway Church in Lexington, Kentucky. Eleven years were served as her minister, the rest as one of her elders. Yet when the other elders and Mark Collis, the minister, announced their intent to poll the congregation regarding the introduction of an organ, he immediately resigned. He and Sister McGarvey placed their membership with the Chestnut Street congregation where they could worship in good conscience.

After many years of outspoken opposition on the music question, his pen grew silent on the matter. When asked why, he confessed that he had decided it to be a losing battle and had elected to pursue other matters. His last years of literary work were spent with the *Christian Standard* with the very men he had earlier opposed.

We can only cast a mantle of charity over this one blot on his record, knowing that each of us will doubtless make similar mistakes across the years. In spite of this flaw, we can profit greatly from the masterful work he did in other areas. The church today needs men of his scholarship, dignity, and conviction.

We leave the details of his noble life to the Memorial Address of Benjamin Deweese, long-time associate of our subject on the faculty of the College of the Bible. Needless to say, we do not approve of Brother McGarvey's involvement in the various missionary societies that are mentioned. The lessons we have gathered are from a wide range of McGarvey's literary work; some from his books, but most from gospel papers and collections of sermons and lectures by various authors.

All that this great preacher attempted, he did well. Today's disciples will be benefitted by reading his thoughts. Preachers especially will be strengthened by so doing. The knowledge that the cause of Christ will so benefit is adequate reward for the editor's work.

The Life of J. W. McGarvey

A Memorial Address delivered March 1, 1912

by

Benjamin C. DeWeese

The life of this exceptionally useful man is rich in lessons which are fitted to inspire us to most worthy endeavor. It merits careful study. Hundreds of leaders in the Church of Christ received their training in large measure at his feet. To them a sketch of his life cannot fail to be of interest, if in any fairly adequate way it does justice to his merits. Moreover, there are multiplied thousands who held him in the highest esteem for threescore years. He stood before their mind as one of the ablest of teachers and staunchest defenders of the Holy Scriptures.

Thousands of years ago these true words, "The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance," went to record. There can be no reasonable ground for doubting that these words of the Bible express our faith with respect to the permanent place the name of President McGarvey will hold in the memory of the church. What do we know then of his family line, of the surroundings of his long life, and what of his own individual traits? Of some men family stock molds the life. From some families we expect little. From others it is a matter of disgrace to son or daughter to bring reproach upon the good name the family has borne for generations. The almost fatal handicap of an evil environment is proverbially expressed in Nathaniel's reply to Philip's invitation to come see Jesus: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" The home of our Lord's first thirty years became the name by which his foes sought to destroy the church. To call it "the sect of the

Nazarenes" was sufficient to prejudice multitudes so that they did not ally themselves with his followers nor investigate his claims. Circumstances are usually potent to enoble or degrade a man. Happily for the world, some men have such splendid personality that in spite of bad stock and in spite of harmful environment, they reach the greatest eminence. They triumph over all obstacles. President McGarvey exhibits the union of good blood, excellent environment, and striking personality. This awakens interest in a study of his life, to which we turn with eager expectation for ample reward for the time and patience required.

Family and Early School Days

John McGarvey, his father, emigrated from Ireland in early life. His wife was a Miss Thomson, of a good Bluegrass family, of Virginia stock. The McGarveys located in Christian County, Kentucky, where the husband followed mercantile pursuits until an early death left his wife a widow and his children fatherless. John William McGarvey, the subject of this memorial, was the second of the four children by this marriage. His mother's sister married Dr. G. F. Saltenstall and bore him nine children. Later he married Mrs. McGarvey, and of this union six children were born. This was a unique situation under one roof, of brothers and sisters, step-brothers and step-sisters, with half-brothers and half-sisters, and all first cousins—nineteen in all. Here, indeed, was a puzzle for children who wished to learn their own kinship to other members of the household. Doubtless, husband and wife often used the words "your children," "my children," and "our children." It is a pleasure to record that unselfishness, mutual affection and mutual consideration reigned in this large circle in which President McGarvey grew to manhood. Dr. Saltenstall and his wife decided that they would be unable to sustain their united families in good social station in Kentucky for lack of funds. The stigma was placed by society on manual labor by white men, because of existence of slavery. The parents decided to go to Tazewell County, Illinois, in 1839, near Peoria, where every child could have good farmland, and where all could labor without loss of social prestige. Here exceptional instruction was secured for the children. Professor Kellogg, an English-

man and a graduate of a British university, conducted a private school of good standing. President McGarvey writes in his story of his early life a most appreciative estimate of the superiority of Professor Kellogg's work, and emphasizes the fact that by it he was thoroughly grounded in the elements of a good education. Farm labor developed a strong body and boyish sports supplied recreation. On his own showing the future president was active, agile, had temper and to spare, was mischievous and was a favorite of the home group.

College Days

It will be fitting to say something of Dr. Saltenstall, the lad's step-father, who, as became the good man, wisely planned for the young man's future and ably carried out his program. In the spring of 1847, he took the young step-son at eighteen and one of his own sons to a steamboat on the Illinois River, and set out by way of that river and the Mississippi and Ohio for Bethany College in Virginia (now West Virginia). Stopping at Cincinnati he fitted out his charge with books for his entire college course, clothes for daily use, and a full dress suit and silk hat for special social and academic occasions. Professor John Henry Neville, the companion of his boyhood and a life-long friend, and for years a colleague in Kentucky University, had preceded him to Bethany. On the morning of his friend's graduation he came to young McGarvey's room and was in elegant dress. Mr. McGarvey brought out his own silk hat and presented it to his friend. Just before his own death he wrote that he thought Professor Neville at that time was the most splendid specimen of physical manhood, properly dressed, he ever saw. He highly rated his friend's natural gifts and solid learning.

As a student, Mr. McGarvey was painstaking, diligent, striving for knowledge, and, July 4, 1850, graduated with first honors and delivered the Greek speech. He took great interest in the chapel lectures on the Bible delivered by Alexander Campbell. After an excellent examination by Mr. Campbell, he received a New Testament with his name inscribed, and with the words, "For proficiency in the sacred scriptures," and signed A. Campbell. This would doubtless be today the prized treasure of his preacher son, had not the disastrous fire of

years ago destroyed the library of his father which contained this book. Who knows but that this token of appreciation shown by Mr. Campbell's act, may have given direction to the young man's career and was a sign of promise of his future eminence in the study and defense of the one Book?

His estimate of the great value of regular work in the college literary society was shown by active participation in a college society, and his frequent appeals to his own students in later years to make the most of its privileges.

While at college he entered the social circle on principle. He records that comradeship with refined young women, if not carried to such extremes that it becomes a detriment to first-rate work as a student, is highly beneficial. Throughout his entire life he enjoyed the society of worthy Christian women. He respected them, gave them honor, and derived both pleasure and profit from this source.

In 1848, he confessed his faith in Christ and was baptized by Professor Pendleton. He was thenceforth committed to a life of service in the Kingdom of God. This also he rendered with all good fidelity for more than sixty-three years. There is neither record nor oral tradition that his zeal ever grew cold till the chill of death claimed him—a life pre-eminently worthy of imitation by his every student.

It may be worthy of note here that Robert Graham was his first teacher in Greek, and they became life-long friends for the ennobling of thousands of faithful young people.

Further Preparation in Missouri

Let us enter upon a most interesting study of the life of a young man well equipped for a man's work in the world. During the twelve years immediately following his graduation he made his home in Missouri. Dr. Saltenstall, the worthy step-father, had removed from Illinois to Fayette, Missouri, during the college days of Mr. McGarvey. In 1852, that good man, while on his way to the commencement exercises of Bethany College, died of cholera at Marietta, Ohio. He was fully interested in the work done by Bethany College under the able leadership of Alexander Campbell. He gave \$2,500 to its fund

while he lived, and bequeathed to it a child's portion of his estate. He was always esteemed as a father by his distinguished step-son, who cherished his memory.

Mr. McGarvey, immediately after graduating, established a private school for boys at Fayette, which he continued for one year. This year in Fayette was the beginning of a thorough course of preparation for what became his chief life task, and was continued twelve years in Fayette and in Dover, Missouri. In Fayette he met Miss Otway Anna Hicks, whom he married in 1853, and who followed him to the home eternal within a few weeks after his death. Early in this period he conscientiously decided that he would find his greatest happiness and usefulness in devoting himself for life to the service of the church. His ordination to the ministry followed in 1851. He served the Fayette church as minister until 1853. He organized at Dover a school which was continued with marked success for years. Here he devoted large portions of his time to teaching. These were years of great activity. He purchased the best commentaries on the Scriptures then within reach, and used them with great zeal and profit. For years this was his chief task. Little did he or his friends see that this was divinely guided preparation for the magnificent service he rendered to Biblical learning. Evangelistic services, public discussions, of which he held five, gave him full command of himself and raised very high expectations. We see clearly that when he had fairly entered his thirties his life justified the reputation accorded him by his brethren.

Lexington Career: Ministerial Labors

In 1862, the old Main Street Christian Church, of this city, called him to its pulpit. From that date till October 6, 1911, he resided in Lexington. For this Lexington career of more than forty-nine years he came well fitted by natural gifts, good college training, and years of special study. Here he met his opportunity. He found his orbit. As true as is the needle to the pole he loyally and royally pursued his long and great life work. To this I must now direct your special attention.

He entered service in Lexington as a minister of Christ. Fittingly then does Mr. McGarvey's ministerial life receive its tribute. His services as minister in Lexington fell into two

periods. He continued with the Main Street Church from 1862 to 1869, when the Broadway Christian Church was organized. Of this congregation he was chosen minister and remained in its service until 1881. The congregation had become so large by that date that his double duty as minister and full professor in The College of the Bible justified him in resigning the pulpit. For seventeen years longer he continued regular preaching, but labored for large country churches, where shepherding the flock was not so exacting as it had become in the larger city church.

His sermons were always carefully prepared. As a minister he was a favorite in Lexington. His congregations were attentive. He understood how to make good sermons. They were always biblical, practical, and so varied that his people learned the vital truth in Christ. His outlines of their thought were remarkably clear, logical, forcibly spoken, and closed with well considered appeals to his hearers for full submission to Jesus the Lord, and for fidelity in his service. Many hearers were convinced by his presentation of the claims of Christ and "were baptized both men and women." Seldom were his Sunday services closed without visible proof of their efficiency.

As a leader in church life he ranked high. He filled the pulpit of leading churches. His congregations were always large and liberal and loyal. Both of his Lexington charges soon outgrew the capacity of their church homes. His care of his church flock was notably successful. The sick were visited, the indifferent warned and exhorted, and the erring faithfully rebuked with all long-suffering and teaching. His warm heart and genial nature closely attached his people to him. His friends were numerous, and any man could well be thankful for friends of such high character.

When he became a hearer regularly, under the ministry of others, even after increasing deafness made it next to impossible for him to follow the speaker, he would give his cordial approval by the closest attention. He was never listless, and his preacher was always conscious that he had President McGarvey's confidence and support. What a help this was to his minister!

Executive Abilities

As an executive officer in great enterprises he was quite successful. For more than forty years he was a member of the Kentucky Christian Missionary Board. For many years he was its chairman. The great success of this interest and the eminence it has attained among our state organizations are largely due to his special interest, wise counsel, and constant and liberal financial support. For most of his college life he was an officer of the Kentucky Christian Education Society, which by its financial help has made possible the education of hundreds of men for the Christian ministry. He became convinced that far too large a sum of the society's income was expended for the salaries of officers. His efforts abolished this abuse, and for many years he personally conducted the financial management of its affairs gratuitously.

His protracted membership on the Board of Hocker College, now Hamilton College, proved beneficial because of his customary zeal, sound judgment, punctual attention, and influence of his name as a managing official, with Disciples who had daughters to be trained. That Brother McGarvey was on its board was sufficient reason to settle the choice of Hamilton as the school home of their daughters for people far and near. Next to the good presidents, who directed the literary destinies of the college, President McGarvey received marked tokens of welcome about the college. His presence was a benediction.

About a year before his death he ceased his active services as professor. He said to us in Milligan Chapel in The College of the Bible, where his coming was ever a delight to us all, "You must expect to see me about the college as long as I live." Most of our college community and other citizens living on North Broadway have seen his pathetic figure leaning against a telephone pole to secure the needed rest that he might reach his beloved college. In coming days, when people ask for reminiscences of the old soldier of Christ, this proof of his undying interest in the pride of his life will not be forgotten.

His assistance in the financial direction of the congregations which he served, by his liberal contributions, his sermons aimed to lay upon the hearts of the members of his flock their Christian duty in the support of the Gospel, enforced by

earnest exhortation and entreaty, did much to give to those churches their enviable reputation for liberality.

The success of our organized National Missionary interests was very near his heart. He was well informed respecting these large and varied enterprises. His interest and approval greatly cheered the presidents and secretaries of these societies. In later years his occasional appearances on programs at our National Church conventions were highly appreciated. He was a conspicuous figure at our Centennial Convention at Pittsburgh in 1909. It was also one of his happiest experiences. In the love and esteem of his brethren he came to his own on this occasion. At fourscore then, the ripened sheaf was the best symbol of his life.

His presidency of the Claude Garth Educational Society was the last in the order of time of his executive services. He was the personal friend and trusted advisor of that man who so splendidly endowed that society, which will do so much for a higher education of the ministry. To act as president of this society was to him a labor of love.

By far his greatest success in executive skill was his part with able associates in the management of The College of the Bible. Robert Milligan, the first president of Kentucky University after its organization at Harrodsburg, came to Lexington in 1865. Transylvania was merged with Kentucky University because of the signs of promise for a great future given by this new institution, which has just been organized on the older foundation, Bacon College. Mr. McGarvey had been three years as minister at the Main Street Church. His excellent reputation before coming to Lexington, and his notable success for three years in his pulpit here, led President Milligan to associate himself with the young minister, and with Professor Joseph Desha Pickett in a faculty for The College of the Bible, which was organized after the university was re-established in its new home. After several years of successful work, difference about the management of the affairs of the university led to strife and strong feeling. This might have been adjusted peacefully, but an indiscreet partisan of the other group made in print the serious charge that Professor McGarvey was the leader of a conspiracy to rid the university of its Regent. This precipitated open strife and the Executive

Committee of the university dismissed President McGarvey. On his appeal to the Curators, they sustained the action of the Executive Committee. Professor I. B. Grubbs was then minister of the Chestnut and Floyd Street Church in Louisville. He addressed an open letter to our churches in Kentucky, which was published in the *Courier-Journal*. He called upon them to send to the Curators of the University a strong protest against Professor McGarvey's dismissal, a demand for his immediate reinstatement, and the abolishing of the regency of the University. Scores of leading churches in the State took prompt action. The unwisdom of his dismissal became so apparent that the Curators resolved to ask the Kentucky Christian Education Society to nominate a man for his vacant chair. The officials of the society met and acted at once. They nominated him for his old place. The University ratified the nomination, and, within less than a year, Professor McGarvey was back in the place where he had so fully established himself as an able, safe, and conscientious teacher of God's Word. Students who left when he was dismissed returned, and The College of the Bible began a new career of prosperity. Within a rather brief period the University suspended the College on the plea that the income was no longer adequate to meet the burden of its support. So ended the story of the first College of the Bible.

With Robert Graham, who had succeeded the lamented Robert Milligan, and Professor I. B. Grubbs, now the sole survivor of that group, he planned at once the organization of a new College of the Bible, independent of the University. In the autumn of the same year its classes were taught in the basement of the old Main Street Church. The professors served for a pittance, but made heroic efforts to secure money for buildings and endowment. This was a time of testing men. Time, money, and personal sacrifice went into the new enterprise. Professor McGarvey gave his best energies to this task. How great was his influence present conditions fully show. After the first year, in a church basement, the Curators in fine Christian spirit gratuitously offered class rooms and other buildings to the new college. In grateful recognition of this courtesy, the two institutions did their work on this campus. Harmony, co-operation, and zeal in training the young charac-

terized their joint labor. In this way was closed forever a period of alienation which is now a memory, but it is an exhortation to study the things which make for peace.

In 1895, Professor McGarvey succeeded Robert Graham as President, and filled that office until October 6, 1911. His executive labors were discharged with remarkable promptness, wisdom, zeal, and tact. In the nomination of members for the faculty, he consulted his colleagues, made special efforts to see that the man had good character, was intellectually trained, was intelligently loyal to the teachings of the Scriptures, and open-minded to the discovery of new truth. He would have none of that craze for novelty which is the bane of so many minds in this age of mental fermentation. When the new man was installed, he treated him with most inspiring confidence. Not once in the sixteen years of his presidency did alienation of feeling, criticism that hurt, or any other thing arise to mar the peace of our fellowship. He decided that his faculty was worthy and urged every member to work out the problems of his department as his best judgment dictated. Life-long observation of college men justifies me, I think, in saying that I have never known a president whose faculty enjoyed a larger independence. This is academic freedom. I venture to add for my colleagues, that I have never known another faculty where personal independence was more marked. They buy the truth and are free indeed. Pleasant, affable, approachable, courteous and sympathetic, we always found our President to be. He took us at our best and helped us to reach higher things. The memory of his fellowship is to us delightful, and will always be cherished as a most enjoyable and inspiring experience.

His Writings

Let us consider his literary output. He was editor with able associates, Robert Graham, M. E. Lard, L. B. Wilkes, and Dr. W. Hopson, of the *Apostolic Times*, published for years in this city. His colleagues rated his editorial work as very valuable, and he was a leading spirit in furthering the interests of the paper by what he wrote and by remarkably good advice in its business management.

He wrote constantly for our periodical literature. He wrote seven valuable discussions of important themes within two

years for the quarterly edited by the distinguished Moses E. Lard. Helps for Sunday Schools he prepared regularly with great care and delight. For eighteen years he conducted for our most widely read religious journal a department every week on "Biblical Criticism," which he and many others thought rendered invaluable service in the defense of the Bible against a pretentious, but unwarranted, method of attack. To this long continued task he devoted careful and exacting labor. Selections from this department constitute his last published volume, "Biblical Criticism."

His books, of which there were many, were, without exception, devoted to the explanation and defense of the Scriptures. When he became professor in The College of the Bible, he prepared four volumes of "Class Notes" embracing all the historical materials contained in the Bible. As soon as written he began the careful revision of these text-books. Volume one was revised within one year, and then followed a revision of volumes two, three, and four, giving a year to each. Then he took up volume one again. This process he continued for twenty-eight years, till every volume had passed seven times under his closest critical scrutiny. These manuscript volumes were then printed. He is a lesson which ought to cure indolent habits in any student. His success as a Master teacher was won by his wise use of his "Class Notes." Further, he always went before his classes after careful preparation, because he thought it unworthy in him to ask pupils to drink from a stagnant pool.

In 1864, his Commentary on Acts appeared, after years devoted to the study of the history of the Apostolic Church. Twenty-nine years later he rewrote the book. Its sale has been continuous for forty-eight years—a very long life for a commentary in our day. James Hastings, editor of great religious encyclopedias, in a personal review said that he should keep it on his study table for constant reference. A "Commentary on Matthew and Mark," the first volume of a series projected by the Disciples of Christ, but never finished, was written for the popular exposition of the books assigned to him. It has not attained the great favor accorded to his work on Acts of the Apostles, but has been esteemed by many. A volume of sermons preached in Louisville, Kentucky, and stenographi-

cally reported, contains a variety of subjects of vital interest on which he had long reflected. Their value is high.

His most popular work was "Lands of the Bible," which John A. Broadus, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, and a specially competent judge, pronounced "the best single volume in print on Palestine." Its first edition was of ten thousand copies, the second of five thousand, and the third of three thousand. Information about later editions is not at hand.

In the field of Biblical criticism President McGarvey held that his greatest work was done. For more than forty years he toiled constantly to fully study this subject as set out in the writings of the ablest expounders of the later views. In reply recently to a direct question about what he considered his greatest intellectual labor, he replied: "The master of the critical attacks on the truthfulness of the Old Testament." He then confessed his conviction that he had fully refuted the efforts to discredit the historical fidelity of the Bible record of God's dealings with Israel. On a few points of minor importance he said he could wish for more data to put these issues also beyond debate.

Under the title "Jesus and Jonah," he published a small volume in which he reviewed a symposium by a few representative champions of new fashions in advanced Biblical criticism. Advanced critics have the time of their critical lives to make good their claims to reverence the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament, and yet reconcile his views with their critical speculations. The great plain people think Jesus knew the facts about Jonah, and they do not willingly accept the critical contention that the book of Jonah is not true to fact. They think it contains "a true and faithful narrative of what actually happened." President McGarvey thought the common people were right, and this little volume shows his mastery of the art of refutation.

All students in the literature of Old Testament historical criticism know that the hardest battle must be fought on the trustworthiness of the report respecting the finding of the book of the law in the temple by Hilkiah. If these chapters tell the truth, radical critics freely admit that the foundations are

removed from beneath most of their contentions that the Old Testament history must be rewritten. President McGarvey girded his loins for this conflict. Forty years of careful study of the pages of the Bible, a full mastery of the critical attacks, an unwavering conviction that the critical position was wrong, a marvelously clear statement of his argument and an acknowledged high degree of fairness (always quoting the strongest statement he could find of the positions of his foes), he wrote his "Authorship of Deuteronomy." Hastings, who secured the advanced scholars to present the critical views which seek to revolutionize the belief of eighteen centuries respecting the Bible, wrote that these views could not lay claim to a good title to acceptance until the refutation of Professor McGarvey's arguments had been achieved. This confession makes us proud of President McGarvey.

As a Controversialist

Permit here a few words about President McGarvey as a controversialist. His critics and some of his friends thought that his method was often most exasperating. I once asked him what he thought of omitting the names of those whose errors he was exposing. His reply reveals the reason for his course. He said: "It is the personal feature which lends piquancy and interest to a discussion." "Besides this, when a man brings error into the arena in propagating his views, those who oppose him have the inalienable right and the paramount duty to expose and refute these errors." He thought it is morally right to make a man in error responsible for propagating error, and that defenders of truth fail of their duty if they remain silent when truth is in peril. A peculiarity of style in writing sometimes so belies President McGarvey's real feelings that he was unjustly accused of personal bitterness. Antagonists who heard him speak, or met him socially and in his home, and who were large enough to accept gracefully an exposure of their ignorance and bad logic, came to esteem him highly. Sometimes, it should be frankly admitted, he was misled by unfair reports of the positions of men whom he reviewed. His open-hearted sincerity and freedom from duplicity made him the victim of unworthy men who used him to punish their foes. Sometimes his indignation was profound-

ly stirred and most forcibly expressed when his confidence had been unworthily obtained and wickedly used. He always carefully studied controverted questions, and had an Irishman's love of contest—so much so, that he never consciously misstated an opponent's position so as to make his reply plausible and easy. No one who knew him could accuse him of that folly. His mastery of the Scriptures was such, and his thorough acquaintance with the attacks on them, that he earned the reputation among fully qualified judges outside his own religious circle that he was, in the field of Biblical learning, one of the ablest of controversialists.

The Teacher

One paragraph must be devoted to a brief statement of his career as a teacher. Here he came to the sphere of his greatest influence and usefulness. His exceptional clearness of statement of subjects saved so much time that long drawn-out discussions were not needed to put his students in possession of the coveted knowledge. In lectures he had the credit for giving twice the amount of information given by the average lecturer. They were full of accurately verified facts, clearly arranged and expressed in the plainest words. He often, in the familiarity of the classroom, used the vocabulary of colloquial speech. There was no excuse for not getting his meaning. His students always had the conviction that their teacher accepted any statement of the Bible as the final word on any subject of which it treats. He had no compromise to make with speculative guesses. He resolutely rejected them. He never stopped an investigation until he thought he had gone to the bottom of the subject. The greatest debt the brotherhood owes to him in his great influence through his instruction in his four classes in Sacred History. For forty-five years he enthusiastically labored at this task. He was a master spirit with probably no superior.

His Religious Life

His religious life was beautiful, childlike in its faith, enriched by constant devotional study of the Bible and of Christian hymns. In his study of these his good taste, sane judgment, and full appreciation were very manifest, as his

selections, continued for many years for chapel services and recorded on many pages in his chapel note books, attest. He never bubbled over in an effervescing enthusiasm for popular hymns, which lacked poetic merit, scriptural sentiment or adaptability for edification. He knew by heart a splendid list of our classic English hymns and they fed his soul. His prayers were the talks of a child to the Father whom he loved and who would gladly grant his requests. Many a man came to a full belief in President McGarvey's conscious fellowship with God by noting his prayers. Prayer made the darkened clouds withdraw when great burdens rested on his heart. For these aids to spiritual culture his attendance on prayer services was continuous. No great success ever attends minister or church if prayer does not have the first claim on the heart. In fact, the secret of this man's life revealed in the strength of his faith and the childlike simplicity with which he met all the obligations that a very long career laid upon him.

Future of The College of the Bible

With respect to the future of The College of the Bible he talked much, thought profoundly, and prayed constantly. His ideal for the College is so admirably stated by him in a recent annual report to its Trustees that I quote liberal extracts.

He said:

"I have on several occasions within the last year publicly announced as my hope and expectation that The College of the Bible shall eventually become the greatest seat of Biblical learning in the world. This may appear to some like an idle dream, but some institution is destined to occupy that high position, and why not ours? The institution which shall occupy this rank shall do so, not as a result of accident, but as the result of strenuous effort wisely directed. It will be the result of ample financial resources supporting a succession of teachers endowed with brains, heart, and industry in no ordinary degree.

"I have had a conference with my junior colleagues on this subject, and have charged them each to select a branch of Biblical learning in which to make himself a specialist and a master, so that in this no man anywhere shall be his superior. They are all young enough, if a

goodly length of life shall be granted them; they all have sufficient preparation in a general knowledge of the Bible; and they all have brains enough to accomplish this grand purpose. They have pledged themselves to it, and have selected their lines of study. In order that progress toward the final goal may continue after their decease, they are to keep watch for young men in their classes, from year to year, who shall be capable of pushing this aim still higher, to incite them to it, and to see that all needed aid and encouragement shall be given to them.

"The part which the Board of Trustees will take in pursuit of this great purpose will be to avoid overloading the professors with work in the classroom; to free their minds from distraction in reference to their financial affairs; to assist, when need be, the young men whom they may select for advanced studies; to elect these to suitable chairs in the college, some of which are yet to be created; and to keep guard incessantly lest any incompetent or unsafe man shall be selected as professor.

"In pursuing this high purpose, no attention is to be paid by either the professors or the governing board to the clamor, often heard, that the age demands this and forbids that. For, within the limits of its work, the college task shall be to teach the age what it ought to demand—to teach the leading minds among the faithful what is the true and right way of the Lord. Certain seats of learning have assumed this task heretofore, and have often misled the world. In the coming time, let ours assume it, so that what it demands the age shall demand. Shall not Apostolic Christianity finally triumph in the world? Then, why may not the institution of learning which shall most truly represent and uphold it maintain preeminence among its advocates?

"In other words, the purpose is that, in the good days of our future, whatever is known or can be known by mortals about the Bible, its contents, and its history, shall be known and taught by the faculty of The College of the Bible; that skepticism, in its present forms and all the protean forms which it will yet assume, shall be here encountered and overthrown; and that students of the Bible from every quarter who wish to add to the Biblical knowledge imparted elsewhere, shall flock to this College for the most thorough information.

"It seems to me that this aim is sufficiently great and lofty to inspire us with enthusiasm, and to keep the flame burning in our successors until the goal shall be reached. I would not venture to place it before you if I did not believe it is also attainable. We have for more than forty years been building on a solid foundation, which has proved itself to be so by results in the lives of many hundreds of ministers trained in the College. The foundation is not to be removed or changed. It is the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. We have only to go forward in the ascending way which we have thus far followed, in order to reach the eminence to which I am pointing. My own part in the feeble beginning of this effort will soon terminate, but I trust that, like the patriarchs of old, though I shall not receive the promises, my dying eyes, like theirs, shall see them and greet them from afar."

How this appeals to his colleagues as an inspiration to so labor that this ideal may be proximated as the years come.

Personal Tributes

A few personal tributes to his memory from leaders in the church and personal admirers close this sketch.

Professor S. M. Jefferson writes the following of President McGarvey's Christian character:

"Great as he was a champion of the truth, he was greater still as its embodiment and the living exemplification of its blessedness and beauty in his own character and conduct. He realized that not warfare, but work, is the ultimate condition of all true progress and prosperity, and that having earned the right and room to live, the real worth of the victory is measured by the life achieved in peace. And so he grew to his superior greatness by daily nourishing his soul with the word of life, by fellowship with Jesus Christ, and by communion with God and with the Holy Spirit. Those who knew him intimately recognized and rejoiced in this spiritual greatness most of all. His family, his college faculty, and his personal friends found in him in abundance 'the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control.' Not as a polemic or controversialist, but as an eminent and inspiring example

of Christian manhood in its strength and beauty will his most intimate friends revere his memory and mourn his loss."

Mr. C. S. Medbury, minister of the great University Place Church, Des Moines, Iowa, wrote as follows:

"How one is moved to think of the influences of the life of this strong man of God! In every part of the earth today there are men and women preaching the gospel, teaching in Bible schools, and in the every day run of life's activities, whose lives reveal the influences of this fallen saint within our Israel. And how rugged the type of those who have come under the spell of his life and teaching! They have stood for things! They have counted! They have been back of work that will abide! And great hosts of us, who never knew his class-room privileges, have yet been blessed by the ministry of his years. Personally, I have read and re-read every book from his hand and almost numberless articles from his pen. How much I owe him cannot be told. Surely it is wonderful so to live that when at the end of a long journey the work is laid aside, both God and men can unite in saying, 'Well done'."

Professor B. J. Radford, of Eureka, Illinois, voices the sentiment of many respecting President McGarvey's fidelity to every trust in these lines:

" 'The things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.' No man among us, perhaps no man of his generation, fulfilled this injunction in such large measure as John William McGarvey. If all the faithful men whom he has taught the things which he learned from Christ and his apostles, and 'the others also' whom they have taught, could be gathered from the ends of the earth, they would make a mighty host—mighty in numbers and mighty for righteousness. If all those through whom these teachings will be handed down from generation to generation shall ever gather round Brother McGarvey on the plains of glory—and why may they not, betimes?—it will be a great multitude whom no man can number.' The throngs which gathered about him in loving admiration at Pittsburg would be small in comparison."

*All earth's grandest masterpieces,
 Since the course of art began,
 Spring where Christian love increases,
 Man's regard for fellow-man,
 And the noblest art is living
 Christ's own life of service-giving.*

E. B. Barnes, a prominent former student, gives this estimate of the inner side of his former teacher's life:

"Whatever estimate the future may put upon the influence of his teaching, we are sure that all schools of thought will accord to President McGarvey the praise due every man who loyally stands by his convictions. He was ever ready to enter the lists against all comers in defense of what he believed to be right. The heroic beat high in him.

"To those who knew Brother McGarvey only at a distance, he was a controversialist; to his intimate acquaintances he was the devoted friend. Face to face with those whose views he opposed, he impressed them with the tenderness of his nature as well as with the depth of his convictions, but the milder quality seldom appeared when he addressed those from whom he differed through the press. The pathetic sketches which came from his pen, all too rarely, overflowed with brotherliness and human sympathy. There are not many productions in the literature of the present generation of any communion more tender than his memorial of the visit to the "Old Aunty," Maria Young, in her declining years and his noble tribute to her sainthood. The simple faith of that humble cot he raised to the dignity of a sacrament. And the tribute is all the more worthy of praise when we remember his Southern environment. After reading that and his beautiful note of submission to the divine will on the occasion of his son's death, it is difficult to think of him as the unyielding theologian. Those who lived nearest to him have borne frequent testimony to the love of the heart that found its truest nourishment, not in the tumult and the shouting, but because he dwelt in the secret place of the Most high."

In his relations to students, whom he called affectionately his boys, there were traits which endeared him to generations of them. One of them, now matriculated in the University, Mr.

Byron Hester, '13, aptly represents their appreciation of his paternal interest in their welfare in these lines:

*Our father is gone, boys; McGarvey is gone;
 No more will he lead us so smilingly on,
 Nor bid us, with laughter in the light of his eye,
 To rest in green pastures, the still waters by,
 While he tells us a story from the Wonderful Book,
 As he leans on his staff, boys, as he rests on its crook.
 Our shepherd is gone, boys, our shepherd is gone;
 No more will he lead us so tenderly on
 Through the lands o' the Bible away over there,
 Lead ever so gently, with such loving care.
 But we'll see him again, boys, we'll see him again,
 And many more stories he'll have for us then;
 For he's in the Lands o' the Bible—he's over there now
 With his cane and ear trumpet and quaint little bow.
 Neither cane nor ear trumpet does he need over there;
 But he keeps them for us, boys, and keeps them with care;
 For he is our shepherd and the cane is his crook,
 And he remembers the flock that he left by the brook;
 And the trumpet, why that he will use just for fun,
 A happy surprise for what the Saviour has done.
 He knows now the story of Jonah was true,
 And rejoices to know that he told it to you.
 Together they walk through the beautiful Land,
 And he learns what the Saviour once wrote in the sand.
 He remembers us all, boys, he remembers us all,
 And oft 'cross that River he'll send one a call
 To come o'er the River and join in the class
 Of those who once lay with us here on the grass.
 We'll **see** him again, boys, how inspiring the thought
 That all of the boys in the Bible he taught
 Through the Lands o' the Bible, the New Jerusalem,
 Once more will be smilingly guided by him."*

What a legacy John William McGarvey left to his family, his friends, his brethren, the Christian world!

The Messiahship of Jesus

The Jews of the time of Jesus, and after, believed that in the writings of Moses and the prophets there were predictions concerning a great ruler and deliverer yet to come, called the Messiah in their language, the Christ in Greek. They expected him, as we have stated in a former chapter, to be a son of David, to restore the kingdom of David, to settle all difficult questions of doctrine and worship, and to abide forever. This expectation was embodied in the remark of Philip concerning Jesus: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45); and it is alluded to in the remark concerning Simeon, that he was looking for the consolation of Israel; and in the statement that the aged Anna "spoke of him to all that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke 2:38). The same expectation and hope are more fully and beautifully expressed in the song of Zacharias:

Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel;
For he hath visited and wrought redemption for his people,
and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us
In the house of his servant David
(As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have
been since the world began),
Salvation from our enemies, and from all that hate us;
To show mercy toward our fathers,
And to remember his holy covenant,
The oath which he swore unto Abraham our father,
To grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hands
of our enemies,
Should serve him without fear
In holiness and righteousness before him all our days.
(Luke 1:68-75).

From *Evidences of Christianity*, Vol. 2. Louisville, Ky.: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1891, pp. 163-167.

When John the Baptist appeared on the banks of the Jordan, and with preaching of unprecedented power stirred the hearts and consciences of the whole people, we are told that they "were in expectation, and reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ" (Luke 3:15); and the leaders in Jerusalem went so far as to send to him priests and Levites to ask him pointedly this very question (John 1:19, 20). So when John had passed away, and Jesus engrossed the popular attention, during the whole of his ministry the great and absorbing question was, Is he the Christ? True, the question whether he was the Son of God became prominent also, and especially toward the close of his career; but the former was ever the foremost question of the two. In the course of our discussion we have reversed this order; for to us the question of his sonship stands foremost both in importance and in the order in which we most naturally consider it. Having settled this, we have prepared the way for the other question, and have made its settlement a very easy task.

The question of the Messiahship turns on the fulfillment in Jesus of the predictions concerning the Messiah. He claimed while he was living that there were such predictions, and that they were fulfilled in him, saying on one occasion: "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they that testify of me. . . . Think not that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses on whom ye set your hope. For if ye believed Moses ye would believe me; for he wrote of me" (John 5:39, 45). After his resurrection, in conversations with his disciples he taught the same thing with greater fullness. When addressing the two on the way to Emmaus, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself;" and to the Twelve he said: "These are my words which I spake to you while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me " (Luke 24:27, 44). This was also the leading theme with all the apostles when addressing Jewish audiences. Peter, in his second recorded discourse, after speaking of the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus, says:

"But the things which God foreshadowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled. . . . Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those who follow after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days" (Acts 3:18, 24). Thus the Apostles spoke in Jerusalem at the beginning; and in Rome, at the close of the record of apostolic preaching, we learn of Paul that when he had gathered the unbelieving Jews of the city together in great numbers, "he expounded the matter, testifying the kingdom of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses and from the prophets, from morning till evening" (Acts 28:23). These citations show that it was the settled doctrine of both Jesus and the Apostles that many predictions in the Old Testament written concerning the promised Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus, thus proving him to be the Christ.

There is no attempt by any of the New Testament writers to cite all the predictions thus fulfilled. While the general terms which they employ imply that there is a large number of them, the number which they quote is comparatively small. Matthew deals more in this kind of argument than any other, but even he leaves the specifications chiefly to the intelligence of the reader. While Matthew cites many along the line of incidents in the life of Jesus, beginning with genealogy and the scenes of the infancy, the author of Hebrews cites chiefly those respecting his exalted dignity in heaven as the Lord of angels and the high priest for men. But Jesus, Peter and Paul, in their preaching, concentrate their attention on those respecting his death, resurrection and exaltation; and as these have been proved to be realities by our previous course of evidence, it is sufficient for our purpose now to show that these were characteristics of the Christ, in order to identify Jesus as that personage.

In his first sermon, Peter rested the whole of his argument for the Messiahship of Jesus on the fulfillment of two predictions by David. The first is quoted from the sixteenth Psalm, in the words, following the Septuagint: "Moreover, my flesh also shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou madest known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of gladness with thy countenance." This is certainly a pre-

diction of a resurrection from the dead; for if one's soul is not left in hades, and his flesh does not see corruption, it is because the soul and body are brought together again by a resurrection. But the Psalmist could not have been speaking of himself, as Peter correctly argues; for his flesh saw corruption, and his soul has remained in hades. The soul of Jesus, however, did not remain in hades, but returned into his body before the latter saw corruption; and this is true of no other eminent person; consequently, he is the person of whom the prophet spoke. He is the Christ of prophecy.

The second prediction is taken from the 110th Psalm, in the words: "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool." This Peter had just proved by the testimony of the Holy Spirit had taken place with Jesus, and certainly no other human being ever sat on the right hand of God; consequently this is another proof that Jesus is the person of whom the prophets did write. Paul, in his sermon at Antioch of Pisidia, uses the former of these two predictions in the same way. He says: "As concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he hath spoken on this wise, I will give you the holy and sure mercies of David. Because he saith also in another psalm, Thou wilt not give thy Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but he whom God raised up saw no corruption" (Acts 13:34-36). On these two predictions, then, together with many others which readily occurred to their hearers, these two apostles rested the argument for the Messiahship of Jesus, in connection with other and still stronger proofs that he was the Son of God; and these are sufficient to make out the case. Indeed, if the Jews, or any other people who believe in the prophecies of the Old Testament, are convinced that Jesus rose from the dead and ascended to the right hand of God to reign as a king, they need no other or better proof that he is also the Messiah of the prophets. It is for this reason, doubtless, that the apostles, after proving the former proposition, paid comparatively little attention to the proof of the latter.

Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and that therefore the system of religion which he established in the earth is of divine origin and authority. . . .

Resurrection of Jesus

The Direct Evidence for the New Testament Miracles

The miracles of the New Testament are distributable into five classes: first, those wrought by Jesus; second, those wrought upon Jesus, such as his birth and his resurrection; third, those wrought by the Apostles; fourth, the inspiration of the Apostles; and fifth, the predictions which Jesus and the Apostles uttered. In considering the evidence of their reality, our task is simplified by the relation which all of them sustain to a single one. If Jesus arose from the dead, the other miracles will be admitted, as well as all else that is claimed for Jesus in the New Testament. This is freely granted by Strauss, who pronounces the resurrection "the crowning miracle—the touchstone, not only of Lives of Jesus, but of Christianity itself;" and who, when he reaches the former consideration of it in his *New Life of Jesus*, says: "Here we stand on that decisive point where, in the presence of the accounts of the miraculous resurrection of Jesus, we either acknowledge the inadmissibility of the natural and historical view of the life of Jesus, and consequently retract all that precedes, and so give up our whole undertaking, or pledge ourselves to make out the possibility of the result of these accounts, i. e., the origin of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus, without any corresponding miraculous fact" (i. 41: 397). On the other hand, if the resurrection of Jesus was not a reality, all the other miracles would be valueless even if real, and all effort to establish their reality would be abandoned. This is admitted by the Apostle Paul, who says: "If

From *Evidences of Christianity*, Vol. 2. Louisville, Ky.: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1891. pp. 116-131.

Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we witnessed of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised" (I Cor. 15:14, 15). The reason given is conclusive; for if the Apostles are found false witnesses concerning the main fact of which they testify, we can not credit them as to anything else; and as all we know of Jesus comes to us through them, it must all be laid aside as untrustworthy.

From these concessions, and their obvious propriety, it appears that in discussing the question of New Testament miracles it is necessary to discuss the reality of only one of them. This simplifies the inquiry, and it should lead to a concentration of the whole discussion on this single point. The conflict between belief and unbelief is thus reduced to an issue like that presented by the challenge of Goliath: "Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me and kill me, then we will be your servants; but if I prevail against him, and kill him, then shall ye be our servants." Let us settle all by settling the question, Did Jesus rise from the dead? This inquiry is simplified by the admissions of unbelievers. By the leading skeptics it is now admitted, first, that Jesus actually died and was buried; second, it is admitted that on or before the third morning his body disappeared from the tomb; third, that the disciples came to believe firmly that he rose from the dead.' The exact issue has reference to the last two facts, and may be stated by the two questions, Did the body disappear by a resurrection, or in some other way? and, Did the belief of the disciples originate from the fact of the resurrection, or from some other cause? In seeking to answer these questions, infidels have adopted as their line of argument, first, an attack on the credibility of the witnesses; and second, the propounding of adverse theories as to the disappearance of the body, and of the origin of the belief in the resurrection. We shall state and consider the chief points in this line of argument before we present the body of the direct evidence.

Before considering the attack on the witnesses, it is necessary that we distinctly understand who the witnesses are and where their testimony is to be found. To us the witnesses are a

group of women, not less than five in number; the twelve older Apostles; and the Apostle Paul. The testimony of the women and of the twelve is recorded in the four Gospels, in Acts, in the Epistles of Peter and John, and in Revelation. That of Paul is found in Acts and his Epistles. Of these documents none are admitted by infidels in general to be genuine, except Revelation and four of Paul's Epistles, viz., Romans, Galatians, and I and II Corinthians. But while the genuineness of the other books is disputed, it is admitted that in these books the testimony originally given by the witnesses to the resurrection is preserved. We stand on common ground, then, with the unbeliever when we treat the testimony of the several witnesses which we find in these books as that by which the question must be settled.

The first charge against the witnesses which we shall consider is that, apart from the main fact of the resurrection, they assert some things which are incredible, and some which are impossible, and that they contradict one another, thus throwing discredit on their testimony to the main fact.

The most prominent specification of things incredible, and one which is urged by all recent infidels, is the account given by Matthew of the guard of Roman soldiers sent to prevent the opening of the tomb. It is held to be incredible that the priests, as represented in this account, remembered the prediction by Jesus of his own resurrection on the third day, when the disciples did not; incredible that Pilate, at the request of the priests, would grant a guard; incredible that the soldiers reported to the priests rather than to Pilate, their commander; and incredible that, at the risk of their lives, they admitted for the sake of money that they had been asleep on guard.' In reply to all this it is sufficient to observe, first, that the soldiers took no risk at all in saying they had gone to sleep; when their statement came to the ears of Pilate, the priests had only to tell him privately that the soldiers had not been asleep at all, but had said this at their instigation, to prevent him from proceeding against them. Second, Pilate, according to the story told, had put the soldiers at this disposal of the priests, and to these it was their duty to report when the special service for which they had been detailed was accomplished. Third, Pilate was as much interested in preventing the circulation of a

report that Jesus had risen as were the priests; and therefore he would naturally be as ready to grant a guard as they to ask for it. Finally, there is a good sufficient reason why the chief priests should remember the prediction of the resurrection, and speak of it after the death of Jesus; and why the disciples should not think of it at all. The reason is found in the totally different views of that prediction taken by the two parties when it was uttered. The disciples would not, and could not, believe that Jesus meant what he said when he spoke either of his death or of his resurrection. They construed his repeated remarks on the subject as a dark parable, the meaning of which they could not even conjecture.' When, therefore, he was put to death, they could not at first regard this as the fulfillment of the second part. On the contrary, when the priests and elders heard that he had uttered this prediction they as naturally understood it literally, inasmuch as they not only expected him to die, but intended to kill him. They as naturally understood him to speak literally of his resurrection, and they expected to triumph over his disciples by his failure to rise. Thinking now that this triumph was certainly within their reach, if only the body of Jesus could be kept secure till the three days should pass, they had every reason which shrewd and cunning men could have under such circumstances to proceed as they are said to have done.

It should also be observed, in reference to this matter of the guard, that in all the subsequent controversy between the Apostles and the chief priests the story of the guard was never denied, as it certainly would have been if it had been false; that, on the contrary, it was tacitly admitted in the very report which the priests caused to be spread abroad, that the disciples stole the body away while the soldiers were sleep. And if it should be assumed that neither this report nor the story of the guard had an existence until the publication of Matthew's Gospel, still the fact remains that it was published in the Gospel written especially for Jewish readers, and that after its publication the Jews made no such denial. Since it was not denied at the time when men knew the facts, it is too late to deny it now.'

As a second specification, it is held to be incredible that Mary did not at once recognize Jesus, if she saw him, instead

of supposing him to be the gardener.⁶ But it is answered, first, that her own statement, that she did not recognize him at first, is proof that her story was not made up; for surely she would not have made it up this way, but would have said, "As soon as I laid my eyes on him I knew him." Second, her failure to at once recognize him is naturally accounted for by the considerations that she thought he was still dead, that she was anxiously inquiring where his dead body could be found, and that her eyes were full of tears when she first turned toward the person who spoke to her.

Under the head of things impossible, it is said that Jesus could not have vanished as he is said to have done frequently, nor have entered a room through the boards of closed doors, if he had been in a real body. But these two things can be declared impossible only on the assumption that Jesus possessed no supernatural power; for if he had such power, neither was impossible. Both of the infidel writers cited in the footnote below unconsciously provide in their own words this answer to their objection. One of them says, if the incidents in question occurred, "there could be no question that the natural corporeality of the body and life of this human being was of a very peculiar, perfectly supernatural order;" while the other says of the entrance into the room, "It can scarcely be doubted that the intention of the writer is to represent a miraculous entry." This charge is in reality based on the assumption that Jesus had not really risen from the dead; for if he had, he could certainly do all that is said of him; and the objection therefore contains a fallacious assumption of the very thing to be proved. In other words, it is an attempt to discredit the proof of the resurrection by assuming that the resurrection did not occur, and that therefore the witnesses must be mistaken. No fallacy could be more inexcusable. In reality, the sudden appearance of Jesus in a closed room, and his equally sudden disappearance without passing through the door, are no more wonderful than the omnipresence of God, or the fact that he sees in the darkness as well as in the light.

The second general charge against the witnesses is that they were incompetent. This charge is not made formally, but is involved, as will be seen, in certain specifications.

First, it is insisted that not one of these witnesses actually saw Jesus come out of the tomb. By the author of *Supernatural Religion* the objection is stated in these words: "The remarkable fact is, therefore, absolutely undeniable, that there was not, and it is not pretended that there was, a single eye-witness of the actual resurrection. " ⁸ There can be no reason for thus insisting on this fact, unless it be to show that the witnesses were incompetent for want of opportunity. But in this direction it has no bearing whatever; for if they saw him after his death, this is proof that he came to life. The fact that no one claims to have witnessed the actual resurrection is indeed a remarkable fact, remarkable as proof that the story of the resurrection was not made up by pretense; for if it had been, the witnesses, or at least some of them, would almost certainly have claimed to have seen him come out of the tomb, especially as some of them claim to have reached the tomb very nearly at the time of his departure from it.

A second specification is that the witnesses were demented, and therefore mentally incompetent. This objection is one of the oldest ever employed by unbelievers, and it has been more elaborately set forth in modern times than almost any other. It was urged by Celsus, the first known writer against the evidences of Christianity. He sneeringly remarks concerning the evidence of the resurrection, that the witnesses were "a half frantic woman," and some one else who "had either dreamed so, owing to a peculiar state of mind, or, under the influence of a wandering imagination, had formed to himself an appearance according to his wishes. " ⁹ Echoing the sneer of the ancient Epicurean, modern infidels, notably Renan, say that Mary of Magdala, because seven demons had been cast out of her, was a woman of unsound mind, and that her vision of Jesus was a hallucination. ¹⁰ As to the other women, having heard Mary's story, they were seized with the hallucination that they had seen a young man in white who told them that Jesus had risen." The two men at Emmaus fell into revery as a stranger who had journeyed with them was breaking bread at the supper table; the stranger walked away; they recovered from their revery, and concluded that the stranger was Jesus. ¹² The twelve, shut up in a room, feel a light breath pass over them, or they hear a window creak, or a

chance murmur, and they fancy that the feeble sound is the voice of Jesus. At once they conclude that Jesus is in their midst, and afterwards it was pretended that they had seen his wounds.¹³ If we accept these statements, we must certainly conclude that the women and the Twelve were demented almost to idiocy.

One would suppose that Paul, with his sturdy common sense, would be excepted from this charge of hallucination; but it is boldly affirmed that at the time of his supposed conversation with Jesus a sunstroke or an attack of ophthalmia had thrown him into a delirious fever; a flash of lightning or a peal of thunder had blinded him, and for the time being he was demented.¹⁴ It has also been affirmed that he was subject to epilepsy, with a view to making it appear possible that he had a fit at the time he thought he saw

While this charge is as old as Celsus, those who prefer it have to this day made no attempt at proof that is worthy of the name. There are only two ways to prove that a man's testimony as to an object of sight is untrustworthy because of unsoundness of mind. If, in the first place, he gave evidence of insanity either before or after the event to which he testifies, his testimony may be ascribed to the workings of a disordered brain, provided there is in it anything highly improbable. But in the case of these witnesses nothing of this kind is claimed except Mary's possession, which had long ago passed away, and the above mentioned charge against Paul, which is a mere fiction of the imagination. All that was done or said by *any* of the witnesses up to the moment of seeing Jesus, and all from that moment onward, is perfectly rational—it is that which any sane person under the same circumstances would do and say; and the only ground for charging them with insanity is the fact that they claim to have seen Jesus. But, in the second place, one may be pronounced a subject of hallucination without previous evidence of insanity if he sees something which is known by others present not to be a reality, or which is known for any reason to be impossible. For example, when a man sees snakes crawling on his bed, and feels them twining around his arms and his neck, while others standing at his bedside can see nothing of the kind, it is known that he is suffering from hallucination; or when he sees hob-goblins grinning at

him through the ceiling and thrusting at him red-hot irons, he is known to be hallucinated because of the impossibility of what he sees. But in the cases of the witnesses to the resurrection neither of these conditions existed. When one of the women saw Jesus, all saw him who were present; and so with the Twelve. When Paul saw him, his companions saw the miraculous light in which he appeared, and they heard the voice speaking to Paul, though they heard not the words that were spoken. There is a total absence in every case of such circumstances as given evidence of hallucination, unless it be the assumed impossibility of what they saw; and this is not impossible if there is a God; for it is certainly not impossible that God should raise the dead, and especially such a dead man as Jesus. It appears, then, that the only ground for the charge of hallucination is the mere fact that these witnesses claim to have seen Jesus. If such a mode of reasoning were employed in the investigation of any other event, those who employ it, and not the witnesses to the event, would be pronounced of unsound mind.

The third and last charge against the witnesses which we shall consider is the charge that they contradict one another. If this were true, and the contradictions had a bearing on the main fact of the resurrection, some of the witnesses making statements inconsistent with this main fact, there would be force in the objection; and we would be left, as in other cases of conflicting testimony, to the necessity of deciding between the witnesses by the preponderance of evidence. But it is not claimed, nor is it true, that the alleged contradictions take this form. It is only subordinate and unessential details that are affected by them. Such contradictions could exist in large numbers, as they often do in the testimony of credible witnesses in courts of justice, without invalidating the evidence as to the main fact. Infidels themselves admit this in regard to the evidence of the crucifixion of Jesus; for while they claim that John contradicts the other Evangelists in respect to the hour of the crucifixion, yet not one of them on this account doubts the reality of the crucifixion itself. So it should be in respect to the resurrection; they should not allow similar contradictions about details to make them doubt the united and harmonious testimony as to the resurrection itself.

But is it true that the witnesses contradict one another? This can be determined only by examining closely the specifications under this charge, bearing in mind while we do so that a contradiction, as we have said before (*Evidences of Christianity*, Part IV, J. W. McGarvey), can not be justly charged except when two statements are made which can not both be true; that if, on any rational hypothesis, they both can be supposed true, they both may be true, and no contradiction is made out. This rule is made necessary by the fact that writers and speakers often omit details, the absence of which give their statements the appearance of inconsistency, whereas their presence in the narrative would have prevented this appearance. It is unjust to refuse any writers the benefit of this rule; for in doing so we are liable to charge with falsehood the most truthful writers, and with incorrect information those best informed.

The first specification to be noticed under this head has reference to the time at which the women went to the sepulcher. Matthew says they came "as it began to dawn;" and John, "while it was yet dark," as it always is when it begins to dawn. In apparent conflict with this, Mark says they came "when the sun was risen." Now if the word "came" (*epxomai*) used by all of these writers is employed here in the sense of arriving, which is in its usual meaning, there is a contradiction of Matthew and John by Mark. But this word is sometimes used in reference to starting instead of arriving, and examples of this use are found elsewhere in the writings of both Matthew and John. A notable instance is the statement (Matt. 19:2) that the disciples of John "came and took up the corpse and buried him; and they went and told Jesus;" where the word occurs twice, once rendered "came," and once "went," the former referring to their arrival where the corpse was, and the latter to their starting for Galilee to tell Jesus. In John (6:17) we find this instance: "They entered into a boat, and were going over the sea to Capernaum;" where the word in question is rendered "were going," with reference to their start and progress, and with no reference at all to their arrival. In the case in hand we have only to suppose that these two writers have their minds on the time when the women started to the sepulchre in order, according to their own usage elsewhere, to see that they do not

contradict Mark; and at the same time it is not till we do this that we exactly understand their meaning. That Mark, on the other hand, refers to the arrival at the tomb is clear from the fact that in the preceding clause he mentions the purchase of spices by the women while on the way: "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week they came to the tomb when the sun was risen."

Second, a contradiction is charged in reference to the names of these women. The most casual reader of the Gospels has observed that there is a difference on this point. Luke says that Mary Magdalene, Mary of the mother of James, Joanna, and "other women" went; Mark, that Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome went; Matthew, that Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph went; and John, that Mary Magdalene went. Now if either Mark, Matthew or John had said that only those whom he mentions went, they would all have contradicted Luke; if Matthew had said that the two whom he mentions were all who went, he would have contradicted both Luke and Mark; and if John had said that the one whom he mentions was the only one who went, he would have contradicted all three of the other writers; but not one of them speaks thus. No exclusive term is used. If all these women went, then all these writers tell the truth. The only fair and just way, therefore, to deal with the several statements is to suppose that all of the women mentioned went, and that each writer, for reasons which we may or may not discover, chose to speak of them as he does. An omission is not a contradiction.

A third specification has reference to the number of angels said to have been seen by the women at the tomb.¹⁶ Matthew mentions the one who rolled the stone away, and represents him as speaking to the women, while Luke says there were two angels, and John also says that two were seen by Mary Magdalene. This case is precisely like that of the number of women. Matthew having mentioned the one who rolled away the stone, and who was the speaker, sees fit to say nothing about the other; while Luke and John, not having mentioned the removal of the stone, see fit to speak of both the angels without dis-

tinguishing the one who did the speaking. It is an every day occurrence to speak of having met a friend and had a conversation with him, without mentioning another friend who was present at the time; and yet, in referring again to the incident, to speak of having met both.

Fourth, a contradiction is charged in reference to the conduct of the women immediately after they left the tomb. Matthew says that they were told by the angel to go and tell the male disciples that Jesus had arisen and would meet them in Galilee. Luke says that they delivered this message, while Mark says that "they fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid." Whether this is a contradiction depends on the meaning of Mark. If he means that they said nothing even to the male disciples, there is a contradiction; but if he means that they said nothing to any except those to whom they were told to speak, there is none. The latter is the natural meaning of his words, for they stand in immediate connection with the angel's command to go and tell the disciples; and the fear which is mentioned as the cause of their not telling could not be a motive for not telling them, but only for not telling other men who might be enemies. In other words, their fear could not have been a motive for disobeying the angel; on the contrary, the greater their alarm, the greater their natural impulse to tell their brethren what they had seen and heard.

Fifth, it is charged that the writers contradict one another concerning the first appearance of Jesus to the male disciples. Matthew mentions first, that on a mountain in Galilee; Mark and John, that in Jerusalem on the night after the resurrection; Luke, that to Cleopas and his companion on their way to Emmaus; Paul, that to Peter alone (I Cor. 15:5); and this variation is the alleged contradiction." These statements would be contradictory if the several writers had said that the appearance which they mention first was first in order of time; but not one of them makes such a statement, though Paul says that the appearance to Peter preceded that to the Twelve. The variation is fully accounted for if we suppose that all these appearances took place, and that each writer made his own selection of those which he chose to mention, and intentionally omitted the others. The omission is not readily accounted for,

though there is a reason for it yet to be mentioned; but whether accounted for or not, it involves no inconsistency.

Sixth, it is alleged that Luke represents Jesus, at his first interview with the apostles, as commanding them to remain in Jerusalem, thus contradicting Matthew and John, who both represent him as meeting them in Galilee. The truth of this charge depends on the question whether the whole of the conversation in the last chapter of Luke (36-49), occurred at the first interview with the apostles. If it did, then the command (verse 49) to tarry in Jerusalem was given, as is alleged, at this first interview. It must be admitted that, with Luke's Gospel alone before us, we would thus conclude; but this would not be a necessary conclusion, for it is the well known habit of the Gospel writers to often pass from one incident to another widely separated from it, without a note of time. For example, in the midst of his account of the last supper, Luke introduces, without a note of time, the statement, "And there arose also a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be the greatest;" whereas this contention had arisen among them several months previous, as we learn both from Luke himself and from Matthew.¹⁸ Again, the conversation with certain of his disciples about following him is mentioned by Luke directly after that about the Samaritan village whose inhabitants would not receive him, and it is introduced by the words, "And as they went in their way;" yet it really occurred while they were yet in Galilee, and as they were about to take a boat for the eastern side of the lake.¹⁹ With this knowledge of the writer's habit, one could not be sure that the conversation in question, beginning "and he said to them" (verse 44), followed in point of time immediately upon the preceding; and consequently the charge of contradiction could not be made out, though it would have more plausibility in this instance than in any of the preceding. When, however, we turn to Luke's second narrative, and allow him to explain himself, as he did to Theophilus, his meaning is left without uncertainty, and the appearance of contradiction vanishes. In his introduction to Acts, as if for the very purpose of making clearer his condensed account in the close of his Gospel, he tells Theophilus that there was an interval of forty days between the first interview with the eleven and the one in which he gave them their last instruction and ascended to heaven (1:1-9).

The seventh and last specification which we shall consider under this charge is based on the passage in Acts last cited. It is charged that the statement about the interval of forty days is a contradiction of the preceding narrative, and that it is adopted in order to make room for the different appearances of Jesus.²⁰ It is difficult to have patience with critics who thus refuse to allow the later and fuller statements of a writer to modify and explain his earlier and more concise narrative, without the charge of fraudulent design. The author of these two narratives certainly had no thought that his friend Theophilus was in danger of seeing a contradiction between the two accounts, or he would have made some effort to guard against such a construction; and if he had the intention of deceiving, he would most certainly have made such an effort. The absence of the faintest trace of such an effort is proof sufficient that the need of it was not felt, but that, on the contrary, the writer was conscious of that candid truthfulness which casts aside all thought of guarding against suspicion. If a writer of the present day were to publish an account of having visited a certain friend at a certain date, and in connection with it were to repeat some conversation with that friend; and in a subsequent publication were to say that the visit lasted forty days, and that the conversation reported was separated by this interval, no sane man would think of charging him with contradicting himself; yet this is precisely the case before us.

We have now explained all the alleged contradictions in the several accounts of the resurrection which we consider worthy of notice, and we find that the charge is not sustained by a single specification. We may therefore safely dismiss the charge, and at the same time dismiss from our minds all thought of having to apologize, as some believers seem ready to do, for immaterial discrepancies. No discrepancies either material or immaterial have been discovered in these accounts after a search which began eighteen centuries ago, and has continued with little interruption to the present time.

NOTES

1. The hypothesis was advanced by Herder, and afterwards supported by Paulus and Schleiermacher, that Jesus was not actually dead when he was placed in the tomb, and that he revived and disappeared; but it has been thoroughly refuted by Strauss himself, as well as by believing writers. (See *New Life of Jesus*, i. §§3, 4, 5).

2. In any case it is only through the consciousness of the disciples that we have any knowledge of that which was the object of their faith; and thus we can not go farther than to say that by whatever means this result was brought about, the resurrection of Jesus became a fact of their consciousness, and was as real to them as any historical event." (Baur, *Church History*, i. 43).

3. Sup. Rel., iii. 444, 445.

4. Mark 9:10.

5. Strauss attempts to explain the origin of the story that a guard was placed over the sepulchre, in the following way: "In the dispute upon this point, a Jew may have said: No wonder that the sepulchre was found empty, for of course you had stolen the body away. 'We stole it away,' said the Christian; 'how could we have done that, when you had certainly set a watch over it?' He believed this because he assumed it." (*New Life*, i. 207). But it is certain that if such a conversation had occurred, it would not have stopped here. When the Christian said, "You had certainly set a watch over it," the Jew would have replied, "Now you are lying; and you know you are lying;" and thus the story would have been nipped in the bud.

6. Sup. Rel., iii, 457, 458.

7. "Now in this case, if the eating and the touching were historically true, it could not be doubtful that what appeared to the disciples was a human body, endowed with a natural life and a natural body; and if the showing and feeling of the marks of the wounds were so, there could be as little doubt that the human being was the Jesus who died on the cross; finally, if the entrance with closed doors were true, there could be no question that the natural corporeality and life of this human being was of a very peculiar, perfectly supernatural order." (Strauss, *New Life*, i. 407). "If Jesus possessed his own body after his resurrection, and could eat and be handled, he could not vanish; if he vanished he could not have been thus corporeal. The aid of a miracle has to be invoked in order to reconcile the representations. . . . It can scarcely be doubted that the intention of the writer is to represent a miraculous entry." (Sup. Rel. iii, 462, 466).

8. *Ibid.*, iii. 449.

9. *Origen Against Celsus*, b. ii c. 55.

10. "Divine power of love! sacred moments in which the passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God!" (Renan, *Jesus*, 357). "If wisdom refuses to console this poor human race, betrayed by fate, let folly attempt the enterprise. Where is the sage who has given to the world as much joy as the possessed Mary of Magdala?" (*Ibid.*, *Apostles*, 61).

11. *Ibid.*, 62.

12. *Ibid.*, 66.

13. *Ibid.*, 67, 68.

14. *Ibid.*, 172, 173.

15. Strauss, *New Life*, i. 417; Sup. Rel., 557-560.

16. Celsus stated this objection in these words: "It is related also that there came to the tomb of Jesus himself, according to some, two angels; according to others, one." Origen replies: "They who mention one say that it was he who rolled away the stone from the sepulcher; while they who mention two refer to those who appeared in shining raiment to the women who repaired to the sepulcher, or who were seen within sitting in white garments." (Origen against Celsus, book v. chapt. 56).

17. Sup. Rel., iii. 451, 459, 489.

18. Luke 22:24; cf. 9:46; Matt. 18:1.

19. Luke 9:51-62; cf. Matt. 8:18-23.

20. Strauss, *New Life*, i. 403; Renan, *Apostles*, 20.

Resurrection of Jesus

The Testimony of the Witnesses

The writers through whose reports the testimony of the witnesses comes to us having been named, and their authenticity vindicated, we next proceed to inquire into the qualifications of the witnesses themselves. We have considered these to some extent in the last chapter, but only in the way of inquiring whether the witnesses are liable to certain charges which have been preferred against them by their enemies. We now take up the inquiry as an original question, and will conduct it as it should be conducted in regard to any witnesses of important events.

The force of human testimony depends on three things: first, the honesty of the witnesses; second, their competency; and third, their number. We ascertain whether they are honest, by considering their general character and their motives in the particular case. Hence, in attempting to impeach a witness in a court of justice, it is common to call on men who know them, to testify as to his general reputation for veracity; and also to inquire whether he is personally interested in establishing the facts to which he testifies. Competency is determined by considering the opportunities of the witness to obtain knowledge of that to which he testifies, and his mental capacity to observe and remember the facts. The requisite number varies with the degree of probability attached to the facts. The testimony of

From *Evidences of Christianity*, Vol. 2, Louisville, Kentucky: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1891, pp. 146-162.

two honest and competent witnesses makes us feel more sure than that of one; and that of three, than that of two; but a limit is soon reached beyond which those who are convinced feel the need of no more, and those who are not yet convinced realize that more would not convince them. When this number has testified in any case, the number is sufficient, and a greater number would be useless.

Applying these tests to the witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, we find that their general character, judged by all that we know of them, is good. The sentiments uttered by the principal witnesses are those which to this day guide the consciences of the most enlightened men in the world; and no teachers have ever insisted more strenuously than they on the duty of strict veracity. As to their motives in testifying to the fact of the resurrection, they are above suspicion. The motives which prompt men to false testimony are fear, avarice, and ambition; fear of some evil to themselves or others, which is to be averted by the testimony; desire of sordid gain; and ambition for some kind of distinction among men. Can any of these motives have prompted the Apostles to falsely testify that God had raised Jesus from the dead? It is impossible to see any threatened calamity which they or their friends would have escaped by this testimony if it is false. On the other hand, they must have anticipated much danger to themselves if they should publicly proclaim it; for to publicly proclaim it would be to proclaim the chief priests and Pilate murderers, convicted as such by the act of God in raising from the dead him whom they had slain. For such an offense they could not expect anything but the severest punishment; or, if they hoped at first to convince these rulers, and to bring them to repentance, the hope was soon dissipated; for it was on account of this very testimony that they were arrested, thrown into prison, scourged, and pursued with all manner of persecution. Really the Twelve suffered the loss of all that men ordinarily hold dear in consequence of persisting in this testimony; and the honesty of no set of witnesses was ever so severely tested, or so clearly demonstrated. This is especially true of the Apostle Paul, who suffered more than any other witnesses. The demonstration is so complete that it has won the acknowledgement, especially with reference to Paul, of the most determined foes of the

Christian faith. Thus the author of *Supernatural Religion* says: "As to the Apostle Paul himself, let it be said in the strongest and most emphatic manner possible, that we do not suggest the most distant suspicion of the sincerity of any historical statement he makes."¹ Being honest, the witnesses believed that of which they testified; and if they believed it, it must be true unless they were mistaken. Whether they can have been mistaken or not, depends on their competency, and this we are next to consider.

Of the opportunities which these honest witnesses enjoyed for knowing that of which they testify, we are informed by their own statements. Of their mental capacity we have already spoken in full while discussing the charge that they were hallucinated. Under the head of competency, then, we have only to examine their several statements, and see whether their opportunities were such as to insure that they were not mistaken. We shall do this by considering, first, the testimony of the women; second, that of Cleopas and his unnamed companion; third, that of the Twelve; and fourth, that of Paul.

The women who went to the sepulcher on the third morning were Mary Magdalene, whose excellent character is sufficiently attested by the fact that she was the most intimate and devoted female friend of Jesus; Mary the mother of James and Joseph, of whom we only know that she was one of the company of Jesus; Salome, the honored mother of the two Apostles, James and John; Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, who, considering her relation through her husband to that murderer of John the Baptist and persecutor of Jesus, could have become a follower of the latter only through the most disinterested motives; and "other women," whose names are not given because, perhaps, they were not conspicuous in the church at the time that our Gospels were written, or because it was thought by the writer that the names given were sufficient in number. All that is said in our Gospels to have been seen and heard by these women was of course derived from them by the writers, and it is their testimony.

On reaching the sepulcher and finding it open they claim, as we learn from Mark and Luke, to have entered into it—a circumstance of which Matthew says nothing. On entering they

found the tomb empty, and soon they saw within it two angels, though Matthew and Mark mention only one of them, the one who had opened the tomb and who immediately speaks to the women. His words, only partly reported by any one writer, when put together in their natural order, are these: "Fear not: for I know that ye seek Jesus who hath been crucified. Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, for he is risen, even as he said. Remember how he spake to you while he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples he is risen from the dead; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall see him: lo, I have told you." As they ran from the tomb to carry this message, Jesus himself met them, and saluted them with the word, "All hail." "They came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped him." While doing this, again they heard his voice: "Fear not: go tell my disciples, that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."

While the three synoptic Gospels give jointly the details just recited, that of Mark, without explanation, informs us that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene, which implies that before the appearance to the women just mentioned she had separated herself from the others, for had she been with them they would have seen him as soon as she did. The fourth Gospel accounts for this separation, and gives the particulars of the appearance to Mary. It informs us that when she saw that the stone was removed from the tomb she ran to John and Peter, and said: "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him." As she had not entered the tomb, she inferred that the body had been removed from the mere fact that the tomb was open. From this passage we gather that her separation from the other women, implied in Mark's narrative, took place at the moment when they saw that the tomb was open, and that she did not go into the tomb with them. This circumstance Matthew failed to mention; consequently his narrative reads as if she continued with them. On hearing Mary's statement, Peter and John ran to the sepulcher, and Mary followed them. After they departed she stood for a while weeping, and "as she wept she stooped

and looked into the tomb." When she did so she beheld the two angels who had showed themselves to the other woman, but not to the men, and she observed that one of them sat at the head and the other at the feet of where Jesus had lain. She knew these spots not by having seen the body after it was laid in the tomb, but from having seen Joseph and Nicodemus take it in, and observing whether it was carried in head foremost or feet foremost. Her observation and her memory were very accurate. She testifies that the angels said (one of them of course doing the speaking): "Woman, why weepest thou?" She answered: "Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." At this instance, for a reason which she does not give, she "turned herself back" and beheld Jesus standing near, but mistook him for the gardener. He said: "Woman, why weepest thou?" And she answered: "Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." She evidently thought that the gardener would be glad to be relieved of the dead body. For an answer she hears her own name. "She turneth herself," being only partially turned toward him before, recognizes him, and exclaims, "Rabboni." He says to her: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God!"

With this testimony before us, we ask, Did these women have good and sufficient opportunity to know beyond question that they saw what they claimed to have seen, and heard the words which they reported? When the male disciples heard it all, they believed it not; but their disbelief arose not from considering deliberately the question which we have just propounded, but from the foregone conclusion that Jesus was not to rise, the very reason why some in our own day will not believe. But when they considered the evidence maturely they accepted it as true, and so must everyone today who considers it without prejudice.

To the testimony of the women in regard to the absence of the body from the tomb is added that of Peter and John. Luke says that after the report of the women, Peter ran to the tomb, stooped and looked in, and saw the linen cloths by themselves. John, in his more minute account, adds to this the statement

that both he and Peter went into the tomb, and saw the linen cloths lying, and the napkin that was upon his head not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up in a place by itself. This testimony not only shows that the body had disappeared, but it furnishes strong evidence that it had not been removed in any of the ways suggested by unbelievers. If some of the disciples had taken it to bury it in Galilee, they would have taken it with the shroud still around it; so of the gardener, and so of the Jews. Only in case the body went forth into life would it have been divested of the shroud in which all dead bodies were then buried.

Our records leave it in some uncertainty whether the Apostle Peter, or Cleopas and his unnamed companion, was the first among the male disciples to see Jesus after he arose; but it is certain the latter are the first whose testimony is reported. Of the appearance to Peter nothing is said except the mere fact. Their testimony is given more in detail than that of the previous group of witnesses. In substance it is this: that as they were walking to Emmaus, a distance of seven and a half miles from the city, Jesus joined them; and appearing as a stranger, opened conversation by asking what communications they were having with each other as they walked; and on learning, he proceeded to show them out of the Scriptures that it behooved the Christ to suffer all that Jesus had suffered, and to enter into his glory. They say their eyes were "holden" that they should not know him; and they say that while he was speaking to them by the way their hearts were burning within them. In answer to his first question, they said, among other things: "Certain women of our company amazed us, having been early at the tomb; and when they found not his body, they came, saying that they had also seen a vision of angels who said that he was alive." In this they confirm what is said of the testimony of the women. They added: "And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not." Now this last statement is entirely independent of Luke's statement in the previous paragraph, that Peter ran to the tomb, and saw the linen cloths by themselves; for they speak in the plural number, showing that they refer to more than one person. Their reference can be only to the visit of Peter and John described in

John's Gospel, and yet it includes that of Peter mentioned in Luke. Here is an undesigned coincidence of an unmistakable kind, and it furnishes strong evidence that the story of Cleopas, who is the speaker, is reliable. He and his companion proceed to state that when they reached their destination the supposed stranger, after earnest solicitation, went in with them, that he sat down to eat, took bread, blessed, broke, and gave to them, and then vanished. Just before he vanished they recognized him as Jesus, their eyes at the instant being "opened." Who could have invented this story? Who, wishing to invent a story of having seen Jesus, could possibly have given the instruction which he gave? There was not another man on earth who at that time possessed the ideas which were imparted. A conscious restraint upon their vision, which did not excite their suspicion at the time, but which was distinctly remembered after the interview was ended, accounts for their failure to recognize him sooner. If, on this account, their opportunity to know him was not so good as that of the women, the consideration just mentioned counterbalances this disadvantage, and leaves their testimony free from doubt.

The testimony of the Twelve is presented in two distinct forms in the New Testament, one in the closing chapters of the Gospels, and the other in the book of Acts. The former is their testimony as mere men to the one fact of the resurrection; the latter, their testimony as inspired men to the glorification of Christ in heaven, which involved his resurrection as a necessary antecedent. We shall consider the two divisions of the subject separately.

Their testimony as found in the Gospels is connected with five distinct interviews held with him—three in Jerusalem, and two in Galilee. The first in Jerusalem is described by Mark, Luke and John, but omitted by Matthew. All told, the details are these: Ten of the Apostles, on the evening after the resurrection, were in a room securely closed for fear of the Jews. The two from Emmaus had been admitted and had told their story, which was received with discredit. The company were "sitting at meat." The two had scarcely completed their story when Jesus stood in their midst without having passed through the door. His first word was, "Peace be unto you." At the first moment they were "terrified and affrighted, and supposed

that they beheld a spirit." He said: "Why are ye troubled; and wherefore do reasonings arise in your hearts? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me having." He also showed them his side. They still "disbelieved for joy," and they still wondered, till he asked if they had anything there to eat, and receiving a piece of broiled fish he ate it before them. They were then glad "when they saw the Lord," that is, when they saw it was the Lord in reality. He upbraided them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them who had seen him after he was risen. He closed by saying, "Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, so I send you." And when he had said this, he breathed on them and said unto them: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." How he disappeared at the close of this or of any other interview except the last, we are not informed; and this is one of the marvels of this wonderful testimony. It shows that the witnesses were not aiming to tell a long story of irrelevant particulars, but to state simply and briefly the fact on which faith in the resurrection must rest. As regards these facts, does their story admit of the possibility that they were mistaken? Can they be mistaken as to the fact that it was Jesus whom they had seen, with whom they had conversed, whose wounds in the hands and feet and side they had beheld? Can they have been mistaken as to his having entered without opening the door, which they had securely closed for fear that an enemy might enter? Surely the story must be a series of conscious falsehoods, or it must be true: there is no middle ground.

At the second interview, which occurred just one week, as we count time, after the first, eleven were present, and this interview seems to have been granted especially for the benefit of Thomas, who was not present at the first. When he was told of the first interview he exclaimed, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe." His idea evidently was that the ten had seen someone whose person and voice so closely resembled those of Jesus that, like twin brothers, they could not be distinguished; and as for the wounds, he thought that his brethren should have felt them as well as seen them before believing. The wounds he would admit

as conclusive evidence if they were real, for he knew that it was impossible for another man perfectly like Jesus in every other particular to also bear those wounds, and to be going about alive. The eleven were in the same room, with the doors closed as before, when Jesus a second time stood suddenly in their midst, and exclaimed: "Peace be unto you." Then addressing Thomas, he said: "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord and my God;" but whether he put his finger and his hand into the wounds or not, we are not informed. It appears rather that the sight of the wounds was more convincing than he had supposed, and that this, with the other evidence of his eyes and his ears, was enough. Jesus said to him: "Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." This ended the interview; and surely if the truth is told about it there was no chance for Thomas or any of the others to be mistaken.

The next interview was with seven of the disciples, including six of the Apostles. It was on the lake shore, and early in the morning. They were in their boat fishing, and he was about one hundred yards distant on the shore. The first evidence that it was he was the fact that at his command to drop their net on the right hand side of the boat, they caught an immense draught of fishes where they had fished all night and caught nothing. This caused them to hasten ashore. There they found that he had prepared for them a breakfast of broiled fish and some bread, which he deliberately distributed among them. He then entered into an elaborate conversation with Peter in their presence, at the close of which he walked away. Here there was none of the wild excitement which arose at his appearance to them on previous occasions; but all was calm and deliberate from beginning to end. No company of men ever met a friend unexpectedly and spent an hour in conversation with him, who could be more certain that it was he than these were that it was Jesus with whom they conversed. A mistake on their part is inconceivable.

The next appearance to the eleven was in Galilee on "the mountain where he had appointed them." Matthew says: "When they saw him they worshipped him; but some doubt-

ed." If this last remark means, as it has been construed by some skeptics, that they doubted all through the interview, we have one instance in which the evidence was not convincing to all who were present: but is this the meaning? The remainder of the account shows that it is not. The very next clause is, "And Jesus came to them and spake to them," which shows that at the moment of the doubt he was not very near to them and had not yet spoken to them. There is no difference, then, between the doubt on this occasion and on the first, when they thought for a time that he was a ghost. Let us observe, too, that the very admission of this doubt is an indubitable mark of naturalness and truthfulness in the narrative; for it could certainly have not been thought of had it not been true; and even though true, it would have been omitted if the author had been more anxious to make the case a strong one than to tell it as it was. After coming to them as stated, Jesus said to them: "All authority hath been given to me, in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." These are the words of the commission, under the authority of which they proceeded to labor and suffer all the rest of their lives. To have been mistaken in thinking that they had heard him would have been a fundamental mistake; and to have been doubtful would have given weakness in place of the strength which they ever afterward exhibited. Their opportunity for both seeing and hearing was too good to allow the supposition that they could have been mistaken.

The last of these interviews occurred in Jerusalem on the day of the ascension. Its incidents must be collected from the last six verses of Mark, verses 45-53 of the last chapter of Luke, and verses 4-11 of the first chapter of Acts. He pointed out more fully than before the prophecies which must needs be fulfilled in him; and he opened their minds that they might understand the Scriptures. He showed them particularly that his death and resurrection were in accordance with these Scriptures, and that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name to all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem." He commanded them to go into all the world and

preach the gospel to every creature, and promised them power to work signs and wonders in his name. He charged them, however, not to depart from Jerusalem until they should be clothed with power from on high, which he explains by the words: "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence;" and he calls this "the promise of the Father." They were bold enough to ask him, "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" but were told that it was not for them to know times and seasons. They were told the order in which they should carry their message to different communities: to Jerusalem first, then to Judea and Samaria, and then to all the earth. While this conversation was in progress he had led them from the city out across the Kedron, up the slope of the Mount of Olives, and past the nearer summit of this mountain to the vicinity of Bethany; and as he concluded he lifted up his hands to bless them, and was himself lifted up till a cloud received him out of their sight. They stood gazing into the sky where he had disappeared, until two angels stood by them, and told them that he would return in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven. Now here is the most protracted interview of all those described in our books; it was the most free and unconstrained on the part of the eleven; and even were there ground to suppose in previous interviews too great excitement on the part of the latter for reliable observation, there certainly can be none in this. We conclude that all these accounts were given by men and women guilty of conscious falsehood, or that they all describe real events. The honesty of the witnesses precludes the former alternative, and we have therefore no choice but to accept the latter.

The testimony of the Apostles as given in Acts begins with the scenes of Pentecost; for that which we have just considered from the first chapter is a mere supplement to Luke's Gospel. On the next Pentecost after the resurrection, the testimony of the Apostles was first given to the public; and it was given by all the Twelve; for they all stood up with Peter, and he was their spokesman. Peter approached the testimony by an argument from the prophecies of David, intended to remove from the minds of his Jewish hearers the antecedent improbability of the resurrection (verses 22-31), and then he presented the testimony of himself and his companions in these words: "This

Jesus did God raise up, whereof we are all witnesses." This testimony to the fact of the resurrection is subordinated in the sermon to that concerning the glorification of Jesus in heaven. The account shows that Peter was not qualified to speak on this latter subject; for we not only have Luke's statement that he and all the Twelve were now filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke in all the tongues known to the assembled multitude, but, what is more to the point of our present argument, we have the testimony of Peter and those for whom he spoke, to the same effect. He explains the phenomenon which had astonished the multitude by telling them that it was the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, that the Holy Spirit should be poured forth upon men so that they should prophesy (16-18); and he solemnly declares to them that this gift of the Spirit had been sent down from heaven by Jesus, who had been exalted by the right hand of God and had taken a seat on his throne (32-36). Now, whatever may be thought of the possibility of the audience being mistaken as to the nature of the gift bestowed on the Twelve, it is certain that they could not be mistaken in thinking that they heard them speaking in the various tongues with which they were familiar. There is perhaps nothing in human experience in which a man is less liable to mistake than in recognizing his native language when he unexpectedly hears it spoken. And it is equally certain that the Apostles were not mistaken in thinking themselves the subjects of this phenomenon. It was a matter of consciousness to them; so here again we have a case in which the alternative is to charge these honest witnesses with a most stupendous fraud, or to confess not only that Jesus arose from the dead, but that he was exalted to such a position and authority in heaven as to send forth the Spirit of God to continue the work which he had himself begun on earth. This testimony was repeated again and again, and it was the chief burden of the Apostolic preaching to the unbelieving world, as well as the chief cause of all the persecutions which they endured. See Acts 3:13-16, 20, 21; 4:1, 2, 18-20; 5:17, 18, 30-32, 40; 10:38-42. It is all epitomized in the closing statement of Mark's Gospel: "And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word by the signs that followed." When our first three Gospels were written, this work was in full progress, and the strongest evidence to the people that Jesus had risen

from the dead was not the personal testimony of those who saw him between the resurrection and the ascension, but the testimony of the Twelve who were going about among the people proclaiming Jesus as the glorified ruler of heaven and earth, living at the right hand of God, and by his own power performing the signs, wonders and miracles which they continually wrought in his name. This accounts for the meagerness of the evidence of the resurrection arrayed in the closing chapters of the Gospels—meagerness in the number of appearances of Jesus reported in each, but not in the conclusiveness of the evidence which is given. In the presence of more convincing and comprehensive evidence, it was not important to elaborate that which was less so.

In addition to all that we have cited from Acts and the Gospels, we have separate testimony from Peter and John in their own writings. In the first Epistle of Peter, there are repeated references to the resurrection of Jesus as an established fact, and to his present living power in heaven. See 1:3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 21; 3:18, 21; 4:11, 13. He gives none of the details of the interviews with Jesus by which he had gained a certainty of the fact of the resurrection; but he indirectly affirms what Luke says of him in Acts, by saying that he and others had preached the gospel "by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven" (1:12), thus affirming his inspiration, and his consequent power to speak authoritatively of things in the heavenly world. The Apostle John, in the opening of his first Epistle, bears the following testimony: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full." No doubt there is reference here to the manifestation of the "Word of life" both in the natural life of Jesus, and in his life subsequent to the resurrection; but the reference is more particularly to the latter; for otherwise the employing of ears, eyes and hands in identifying him would not be so insisted on. The passage is a reiteration by John in person of the testimony

given in the Gospels; and it renders the possibility of having been mistaken completely out of the question. In the opening statements of the Apocalypse, the same Apostle gives fresh testimony by describing a new appearance of Jesus to him, which occurred after the close of all the testimony given by the other Apostles, and after their death. He declares that Jesus appeared to him in a glorified form which he minutely describes, showing that he saw him distinctly; that notwithstanding the glory of his form he was "like unto the Son of man;" that he himself, overpowered by the sight, fell at his feet as a dead man; that Jesus came to him, laid his "right hand" upon him, and declared himself to be he who was dead, but is now alive forevermore; and that he then dictated in an audible voice seven epistles to seven of the churches in Asia (1:9-18). This testimony, let it be remembered, is admitted by infidels to be the genuine testimony of John; and as it is admitted that he was an honest writer, the only question about it is, Can he have been mistaken? We think that every unbiased mind in the world would promptly answer that the story was either made up from the imagination of the writer, or it describes a reality. This is the concluding section of the testimony of the original witnesses, as given in the New Testament. Let the reader judge, as he will answer to God, whether it establishes as a fact the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and his ascension to the right hand of God in heaven.

The testimony of Paul given in his epistles furnishes none of those details by which we can judge whether he or the other witnesses of whom he speaks could have been mistaken; but it is a reiteration of the main fact in very positive terms. He presents the witnesses in solid array as follows: "I delivered to you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep; then he appeared to James; then to all the Apostles; and last of all he appeared to me also" (I Cor. 15:3-8). Like the Gospel writers, he selects for mention a certain number of the appearances of Jesus, and omits the others; but

he mentions more of them than any other writer, and he mentions one—that to James—omitted by all the others. This passage shows that he had already made the Corinthians familiar with this evidence, having made it the foremost subject matter of his preaching, and this accounts for the absence of those details which are so carefully given in the Gospels and in Acts. But the chief value of Paul's testimony in the Epistles is found in what he says of the powers which he had received from the risen Christ. Whatever may be thought of his being mistaken about miracles wrought by other persons, he could not be mistaken in his claim to work them himself. On this point his testimony is explicit. To the Romans he says: "I will not dare to speak of any things save only those which Christ hath wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ" (Rom. 15:18, 19). Here, by "the power of signs and wonders" and "the power of the Holy Spirit," he unmistakably means the miraculous powers exercised by the Apostles. To the Corinthians he says: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience by signs, wonders and mighty words" (II Cor. 12:12). Here there are three things to be noted: first, that his expression for the miracles which he had wrought is precisely that which was used by Peter in his sermon on Pentecost for the miracles of Jesus; that is, signs, wonders and mighty works, which shows that he speaks of the same class of works; second, that these were then known to the Corinthians as "the signs of an apostle;" that is, the indispensable proofs that a man was an apostle, and that all the Apostles were known to be workers of such miracles; third, that this language was used in writing to a people who knew whether he had wrought such miracles among them, and a part of whom were his personal enemies, denying that he was an apostle; under such circumstances it is inconceivable that he should have claimed to work miracles among them if he had not. We have this evidence in addition to the admitted veracity of Paul, that he wrought these miracles in the name of Christ, and that therefore Christ was not only alive, but in the possession of infinite power.

The testimonies which we have now considered combine to prove that Jesus certainly arose from the dead, and ascended up to heaven. In thus establishing as real the great miracle of the New Testament on which all the others depend for their value, all ground and all motive for denying the latter are removed. If Jesus rose from the dead it was because he was what his disciples represent him to be, the Son of God; and from this it follows that he was possessed of all power.

There is no need, therefore, that we go back over the accounts of miracles in the Gospels, and look into the evidence for these in detail; the whole ground is now covered, and we are brought to the conclusion that the New Testament writers are credible when writing about the miraculous as well as when writing of the natural and the ordinary.

NOTE

1. *Supernatural Religion*, iii. 496.

Reconciliation

The chief source of human misery is the alienation of the soul from God. Man can but feel that God is entitled to his affections and to his complete obedience; and while these are withheld even in heart, he is doing violence to his own nature, and inflicting misery upon himself. The son who has learned to hate his father and mother is not more necessarily wretched than the man whose heart is estranged from God. God is the moral center of the universe, and to move in harmony with his will is the great condition of moral enjoyment in heaven and on earth. The being who departs from this orbit becomes a "wandering star, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Such are all human souls when first arrested by the sound of the gospel; and the end of all religion is to restore them to the lost harmony, to reconcile them to God. When this is done completely, so that the will of God becomes the absolute will of the creature, and the soul seeks happiness in striving to please God, the work of redemption is accomplished so far as it respects the soul.

To reconcile is to conciliate again. It not only implies that the parties were at enmity, but that they had previously enjoyed friendly relations. It is not to bring together two strangers, and make friends of them; but to conciliate again old friends who had become estranged. Such is its scriptural meaning; for God and the man were once at peace in the garden of Eden, and

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 7, Bethany, W.V., 1864, pp. 471-475.

each individual man, when his infant spirit first came from the creating hand of God, was void of enmity towards his Maker. We became "alienated, and enemies in our minds by wicked works," says Paul, and hence the need of reconciliation.

The Protestant sects have greatly mistaken the reconciliation proposed by the gospel, and their whole scheme of conversion is based upon this mistake. They conceive that God's wrath was to be placated, and a species of opposition to be overcome, before he would be willing to be reconciled to the sinner; that he was made favorable to reconciliation by the death and intercession of Christ; and that he becomes actually reconciled to each sinner in answer to prayer. In accordance with this idea, they often represent God as holding the sword of justice suspended over the sinner's head, while Jesus kneels in prayer before him, and pleads that the fatal stroke be stayed a little longer. While this species of intercession is going on in heaven, the saints are pleading on earth. The sinner, desirous of making peace with God, has come forward with streaming eyes, and groans which move the pity of all human hearts, to plead with God for mercy, and to receive the assistance of all the saints in urging the plea. God is reminded that all are ready, and waiting for him to be gracious. Sometimes the prayers are answered, and there is great rejoicing that God has become reconciled to another penitent sinner. Sometimes all the prayers and tears and groans prove unavailing; God still hides his face in anger, the saints turn away perplexed, and the sinner begins to doubt the reality of all religion.

The starting point of this grand mistake consists in supposing that reconciliation between God and man is like that between man and man. When earthly parties become estranged, it is seldom that both parties are not guilty of wrong, and both cherish animosity. Hence, in the work of reconciling them, the feelings of each have to be changed toward the other. But in the estrangement between God and man, the entire wrong is on the part of man; he alone has a feeling of enmity; God stands where he ever did, and the whole distance between them has been made by the departure of man. God can come no nearer to him, without leaving himself; without sanctioning some part of the wrong that man has done. The whole distance must be retraced by man. When this

is done, so that man cherishes no more enmity, and his will in everything yields to God's will, the reconciliation is complete. For this reason, there is not a syllable in the Scriptures about reconciling God to the world; but much about reconciling the world to God. "God was in Christ," says Paul, "reconciling the world to himself." And in the name of all the apostles, he says, "We pray you, in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God."

While it is true that God cannot change so as to be any more favorable to the sinner, it is equally true that for the sinner's good, he need not. Instead of the death of Christ being designed to overcome an unwillingness on God's part to save sinners, it was the result of his extreme desire to do so. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). This willingness to bestow such a gift shows that, instead of needing to be entreated to save us individually through Christ, he is even more willing to bestow other gifts than this first and greatest. "He who spared not his only Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. 8:32). This argument applies especially to things necessary for our salvation. There are some things which we ask of God, which he does not give us, and some which he delays to give. Hence he teaches us in the parable of the unjust judge and importune widow, that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint" (Luke 18). But remission of sins, by which reconciliation is effected, is not one of these things. God never did, for one moment, keep in waiting for reconciliation with him, a sinner who approached in the right manner. So attests every case of conversion recorded in Acts, and so must it be, according to the law of pardon for both saint and sinner.

In order to get a full understanding of the subject, it is necessary to note still another fact. While God cannot change, and need not, yet the change necessary to reconciliation is produced by him. Man, if left alone, never would retrace a single step of his departure from God; would never abate in the slightest his opposition to God's will. It speaks the praise of God's unspeakable love, that though he could not come nearer to a sinful man, he left him not to eternal misery, but sent after him a force to bring him back to himself. "It pleased the

Father that in him should all fulness dwell, and having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, whether they be things in heaven, or things in earth. And you that were once alienated, and enemies in your minds by wicked words, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death" (Col. 1:19-22). Thus the work of effecting this reconciliation is declared to be the work of God, and the death of Christ the chief means of effecting it.

The death of Christ! — how it slays the enmity of the human soul! What human heart that has ever heard the story correctly told, any longer retains enmity toward the true God? There may remain in such a heart, through the weaknesses and lusts of the flesh, some reluctance to obeying the divine will, but enmity, there is none. No human being who has gazed upon the cross, however wayward his life may be, is willing to acknowledge aught but reverence for the name of God, so wonderfully has the enmity been slain thereby.

But the cross of Christ has no effect on him who hears not of it. To him all is the same as if Christ had never died. How does it reach his soul? Is it through the word of truth, or is it by some influence distinct from and above the truth? There stands the cross of Christ, and yonder stands the sinner—whole nations of sinners. For ages they stand there, far apart, and no communication between the one and the other. The influence distinct from and above the truth is looked for and waited for in vain. But there stands between the two a living preacher of the gospel, who catches the words from the cross, and speaks them to the sinner. Now the work of reconciliation begins, and it is through the word of truth.

But the word of truth, though its story be that of the cross, could have no such effect, unless it came to the sinner's ears by the authority of the living God. The mere word of man, on such a theme, would sound like an idle tale. But God provides for this. He cannot himself draw nearer to the sinner; but having sent his Son to die for us, he sends ambassadors, clothed with the authority of his own throne, to bring us the terms of peace. The apostle tells the whole story in a few words. "All things are from God, who has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself,

not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation. Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God" (II Cor. 5:18-20).

The word of reconciliation, then, has power, because it is the word of God's ambassadors; and ambassadors speak by the authority of the throne they represent. Would you reconcile a sinner to God? Begin not to offer prayers which indicate that the change must be wrought in God; but address yourself to the sinner. Repeat to him the words of God's ambassadors. Ring them in his ears, till his enmity abates, till he realizes the authority which commands him, the love that entreats him, the hope that beckons him; and till he retraces his departure from God by coming back according to apostolic teaching. He is then reconciled to God; he is a new creature; old things have passed away; behold, all things are new.

Grace, Graces, State of Grace

The theological systems which have divided the sectarian world, were all originally constructed for the purpose of presenting Bible truth in a clearer light than that in which the Bible itself presents it. They are sometimes sufficiently clear upon matters that are already so clear in the Bible as not to be misunderstood, but in matters more recondite, and in some very plain matters, they "darken counsel by words without knowledge. "

It has been the peculiar glory, and is to be known as the peculiar shame of Calvinism, to mystify the subject of *grace*, and to attach to the word a meaning that comes as near being no meaning at all, as can well be imagined. I speak of it as the peculiar shame of Calvinism, not because Arminianism is devoid of it; but because its prominence in all other systems of Protestant theology is due to the predominating influence which Calvinism has exerted over them. Calvinism has always had a small number of adherents, comparatively, but it has always been domineering, has exhibited a great array of learning, and has great control over even that portion of the religious world who despise it. The foundation corner-stone of the whole system is embodied in the one expression, "*Sovereign grace*." "There is no word that it loves so much as the word "*grace*." "Not satisfied with the term as it is used in the English Scriptures, it rings many changes upon it, and speaks of

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 7, Bethany, W.V., 1864, pp. 58-62.

"sovereign grace," "saving grace," "almighty grace," "free grace," "special grace," a "state of grace," "the covenant of grace," "communion in grace," "the grace of faith," and, finally, to cover all the ground, it puts the word in the plural number and speaks of "saving graces."

Though all these expressions, and I know not how many more of the kind, are found in the Westminster Confession, I have searched it in vain for *a definition of grace*. It defines many words, and minutely describes many things; but it deigns to throw no light upon this word *grace*, except to trick it out in a multitude of epithets, and scatter it broadcast over almost every page of its doctrines. If you turn from the Confession to the confessors, and ask almost any living sectarian to give you an intelligible definition of *grace*, you will find him as unable to answer clearly as the Confession seems unwilling. I presume that the nearest approach you could get to a definition would represent it as some kind of divine impartation to the soul, *a something* which the Holy Spirit brings from heaven, and by some mysterious process infuses into the soul of the sinner to make him a Christian. Indeed, this is the thought, and almost the phraseology of the Confession. It says, "In sanctification, God's Spirit *infuses* grace" (Larger Cat. Q. 77). As this grace is from God, it is called *God's* grace; as it is infused only in those chosen in God's sovereign right from all eternity, it is called *sovereign* grace; as it irresistibly converts the soul into which it is infused, it is called *almighty* grace; as those in whom it is to be infused were chosen without any foresight of faith or good works as causes or conditions leading thereto, it is called *free* grace; because it is specially infused into the elect, it is called *special* grace; when a man has some of it in him, he is said to be in a *state* of grace; an imaginary covenant that God made with Christ away back yonder in eternity, promising to make this infusion, is called the *covenant* of grace; the fellowship enjoyed by those who have some of it in them is called *communion* in grace; and because faith is infused in the same way and at the same time, it is called *a* grace; while repentance is another grace, and these two, with I know not what others, make up what are called *graces*. This seems to be the philosophical pedigree of this noted family of Ashdodical expressions, but amid them all we

find no other conception of the head of the whole family, than that grace is *something infused by the Holy Spirit*.

The same Holy Spirit which infuses this mysterious something, or plurality of somethings, appears also to have the power of stirring them up so as to keep them in lively exercise. Hence, in answer to the question, "What is sanctification?," our gracious Confession answers, "Sanctification is a work of God's *grace*, whereby they whom God hath, before the foundation of the world, chosen to be holy, are in time, through the powerful operation of his Spirit, applying the death and resurrection of Christ unto them, renewed in their whole man, after the image of God; having the seeds of repentance unto life, and all other saving *graces*, *put into their hearts*, and those *graces so stirred up, increased, and strengthened*, as that they more and more die unto sin, and rise unto newness of life."

Without dwelling any longer upon the darkness and confusion in which the subject is enveloped in the imagination of sectarians, we propose to briefly investigate the Scripture idea of *grace*. In order, however, that we may do so successfully, we must be guided by the usage of the original term; for so powerful has been the mystifying influence of sectarian thought and phraseology upon our own minds, that very few even of the brethren have got entirely clear of the mist on this subject.

We remark, then, that the original word is primarily used to designate an emotion experienced by one intelligent being towards an other. It may be felt by God in reference to man, by man in reference to his fellow-man, and even by man in reference to God. It is said of Jesus when a child, that he "increased in wisdom and stature, and in *charis, grace*, with God and man." Here the feeling expressed by the Greek word *charis*, the original for *grace*, is one which both God and man experienced toward the child Jesus. If it expresses the idea of something infused, then the infusion must have come from man as well as from God, for whatever the word means is attributed to both alike. Again, Stephen says that David found *charis* before God, and, in the same speech, that Joseph found *charis* in the sight of Pharaoh (Acts 7:10, 46). Whatever, then, David obtained from God under this title, Joseph obtained from the wicked king Pharaoh. The term is so far from expressing the

idea of some mystic impartation or infusion in these and many similar passages, that our Calvinistic translators, who retain the term *grace* wherever the context would at all admit of its mystic sense, have here rendered it *favor*. This is the primary and literal meaning of the word; and this is the rendering which it should have invariably throughout the Bible. The "grace of God," is simply the *favor* which God feels toward men. To call it *sovereign, saving, or free, is simply to multiply epithets without meaning: for everything in God is sovereign; all that he does for man is saving in its effects; and all favor is, from its very nature, free. To be "in a state of grace," if the expression can be said to have a scriptural meaning at all, means simply to enjoy the favor of God, in contrast with incurring his displeasure. To "fall away from grace" is to fall away from the favor of God.*

When used to express a feeling of man towards God, the meaning of the term is the same; but as all favor which men have towards God, is awakened by knowledge of his favor and love towards us, it is better expressed by our word *thanks*, than by *favor*. Paul very frequently makes use of the expression *charin echoo too Theoo*, literally, "I have favor to God;" but our idiom has a different phrase for the same idea and our translators have done well to render it, "I *thank* God." God's favor to us depends not upon kindness extended to him by us; our favor to him does depend upon his kindness to us; but though thus differing as to cause, the favor itself is the same.

From this primary meaning of the term originated, by metonymy, a secondary meaning. As we speak of kindness, and *a* kindness, mercy, and *a* mercy; so the Scriptures speak of favor and *a* favor. Kindness is a feeling, *a* kindness is an act expressive of that feeling, and called *a* kindness because it gives expression to kindness. So *a* favor is an act which gives expression to favor, and is so called on this account, the cause being put for the effect. If we retain the term *grace*, it is the same; for *a* grace is something conferred as an expression of *grace*.

From this usage of the term in the Scriptures, the idea of *infusion* is as remote as from the other. It is used for acts performed by God for the good of men, and also for acts performed by men for one another. It cannot, indeed, express what

man does for God; because while we may have a feeling of favor to God, we cannot confer *a favor* upon him. Paul says, "unto me is this *grace* given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3:8). Here the *grace* given is defined as the peculiar privilege of preaching to the Gentiles. It was *a favor* which God had given to him, but not to Peter or John in the same extent. Here was no spiritual infusion, but simply a designation of a suitable field of labor. On the other hand, Luke says, "Festus, willing to confer *grace* upon the Jews," asked Paul if he would go to Jerusalem to be judged (Acts 25:9). Now surely Festus had no divine afflatus to infuse into the Jews, that Luke should thus speak; but everyone can see that it was merely *a favor* which he wished to confer. The contribution of the churches in Macedonia and Achaia for the poor saints in Judea, is also called *a grace*, in harmony with this usage (I Cor. 16:3; II Cor. 8:17). But we need no other specifications to justify the conclusion that the original term means, primarily, *favor*; and when used of an act or endowment, it means *a favor*. This is as simple as the alphabet, and if it could be implanted in the minds of the sectarians, it would be like striking a bright light in a dark place.

Whilst the subject of grace has been mystified, and in its mystified form has been the hobby horse of Calvinism; yet, no man has ever exalted its praises too high. It is the fountain, rich and inexhaustible, whence all our blessings flow. It was through this "favor of God" that Jesus "tasted death for every man;" and when the glorious transaction had been proclaimed to the world, the Apostle exclaims, "The *favor* of God which brings salvation to all men has appeared." It is through the same *favor*, in sending us the gospel, sustained by overwhelming evidence, and sanctioned by threatenings and promises of unspeakable import, that we are enabled to *believe* and *repent*: hence when Apollos visited Corinth, it is said that "he afforded much aid to those who *through favor* had believed," and it is also said that God had *granted* to the Gentiles repentance unto life. It is this Scriptural and simple thought which has been perverted to the idea that repentance and faith are each a "saving grace" infused into the soul by the Holy Spirit.

It is also through mere *favor* on the part of God that those who do believe and obey the gospel are saved. "By *favor*," says Paul, "are you *saved through faith*." The fact that we believe has no power to place God under obligation to save or to justify us; but after all that we can do, justification is through *favor* and not through *debt* (Rom. 4:1-16). The hope of glory is equally dependent on it; for Paul says that through Christ "we have access by faith into this *favor* in which we stand, and rejoice in the hope of glory." That we now "stand in the favor" of God, is the only ground on which we can hope for glory; for it is only those whom he favors who can ever attain it. This expression is the one to which sectarians refer when they speak of being in a "state of grace;" but light and darkness scarcely differ more than the two expressions. The one declares that the soul is full of some mysterious afflatus from God; the other, simply that God looks down with *favor* upon the individual, and extends to him all the *favours* which are necessary to his welfare. The favors of a fellow man may not aid us much; but the favor of God is sufficient to guarantee everything that a Christian can really need. Paul found it so when he had prayed that the thorn in his flesh might be removed. God decided that he should still endure it, but said, "*my favor is sufficient for you; for my strength is made perfect in weakness*." The Apostle could, therefore, exclaim, "If God be for us, who shall be against us?" And in the light of his own experience, he could exhort the brethren, "Let us come boldly to the *throne of favor*, that we may obtain mercy and find *favor for help* in time of need." For the same reason "*favor*" finds a place with "mercy and peace," in every apostolic salutation.

Justification By Faith

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

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

These conditions will suggest to the thoughtful mind the true method of ascertaining the teaching of the Scriptures on any given subject. Men have too often formed their conceptions of Scripture themes by opposition to some error, or by

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses E. Lard, editor, Vol. 3, Lexington, Kentucky, 1866, pp. 113-129.

deduction from some other truth. Thus the doctrine of a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion is derived, not from any plain statement of it in the Word of God, but from the previously admitted theory of total depravity. On the other hand, the popular theory of baptism, which counts it an empty rite unconnected with pardon, is the result of extreme opposition to the Romish idea of "baptismal regeneration;" and the theory of justification by faith only, to the Popish doctrine of salvation by meritorious works. Such theorizing is always dangerous and generally leads to incorrect conclusions. Based upon a partial collation of Scripture statements, it generally carries with it just enough of the appearance of truth to deceive the unwary. It is necessary to a true theory of Scripture teaching, that the Scriptures themselves furnish every thought, and that every thought to which they give utterance on the subject be allowed its proper place in the theory. In order to form such a theory, we must gather separately from the Scriptures all the individual thoughts which they furnish, and allow them to arrange themselves in the order in which they are naturally fitted to each other, or in that in which they are already arranged by the inspired penman. In this way a theory can be formed which is accurate, because it is true in every point; and complete, because it embraces every idea furnished by the Scriptures. It will be like a casting, taking all its elevations and depressions from the Scripture mold in which it is cast.

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

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

"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3:28).

"You see, then, how that by works a man is justified; and not by faith only" (Jas. 2:24).

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

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

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

But Watson does not rely upon this assumption; he merely states it, and then passes on to the assumption on which he chiefly depends, which is, that "Paul and James do not use the term justification in the same sense." The distinction for which he contends is stated as follows: "The former uses it, as we have seen, for the pardon of sin, the accepting and treating as righteous one who is guilty, but penitent. But that James does not speak of this kind of justification is most evident, from his reference to the case of Abraham. 'Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar?' Does James mean that Abraham was then justified in the sense of being forgiven? Certainly not; for Paul, when speaking of the justification of Abraham, in the sense of his forgiveness before God, by the imputation of his faith for righteousness, fixes that event many years previously, even before Isaac was born, and when the promise of a seed was made to him; for it is added by Moses, when he gives an

account of this transaction: 'And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.' (Gen. 15:6). If, then, James speaks of the same kind of justification, he contradicts Paul and Moses, by implying that Abraham was not pardoned and received into God's favor until the offering of Isaac. If no one will maintain this, then the justification of Abraham mentioned by James, it is plain, does not mean the forgiveness of his sins, and he uses the term in a different sense to Paul." (Vol. ii, 257).

In this extract the writer does not inform us what kind of justification James is speaking of; he merely denies that it is the kind that Paul speaks of, and asserts that the latter uses the term in the sense of forgiveness of sins. He assumes that up to the time referred to in Genesis 15:6, when Moses says, "He believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness," Abraham was an unforgiven sinner, or, in modern phraseology, an unconverted man. That then, upon his exercising the faith referred to, he was "pardoned, and received into God's favor." But, unfortunately for the argument, this assumption is inconsistent with the facts of Abraham's history, as stated by both Moses and Paul. The period of Genesis 15:6 was immediately subsequent to the battle with the kings, and the rescue of Lot. Before this he had left his native country, at the call of God, and had received the promise: "I will bless him that blesses thee, and curse him that curses thee, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." He had been protected in Egypt, had built an altar wherever he pitched his tent, and had just returned from receiving a blessing from Melchisedek, and the encouragement from God: "Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." Such had been his relation to God, as described by Moses; and Paul, commenting on this record, says: "By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go into a land which he should afterward receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise; for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Here, now, is a man of faith; a faith which leads him away from his father's house and his native land, to be a stranger in a strange

country, and when there to be so contented with the everlasting city built by God that he erects no permanent home on earth. It is a faith by which he "obeyed" God, and received the most precious blessings from the lips of God, and of God's royal high-priest; yet here is a Methodist doctor, the great champion of the doctrine of justification by faith only, declaring that Abraham was not yet justified in the sense of forgiveness. How strange that familiar facts can thus be hidden from view by the blinding effect of zeal for a favorite dogma! And how passing strange that an inconsistency so glaring should have escaped the notice of this distinguished theologian, and of his many thousands of admiring readers. It needs but half an eye to see that if faith only, or even faith and the most self-sacrificing obedience, could secure pardon in the patriarchal age, Abraham must have received forgiveness for the sins of his early life long before the period of Genesis 15:6. It was at least fifteen years before this that he left his native land by faith, obeying God, who commanded him to go. This method of reconciling Paul and James must, therefore, be incorrect. Whatever may be the kind of justification of which James speaks, the assumption concerning Paul's meaning, which is essential to the argument, is proved false, and this vitiates the whole argument.

We may now spend a few moments in considering Watson's statement concerning the justification of which James speaks. He says: "The only sense in which James can take the term justification, when he says that Abraham was justified by works when he offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar, is that his works manifested or proved that he was justified; proved that he was really justified by faith, or, in other words, that the faith by which he was justified was not dead and inoperative, but living and active." Will the reader please read this quotation again, and see if it tells him what kind of justification James speaks of? What is the matter with our clear-headed and perspicuous expounder of theology? What mean this halting, and limping, and stammering? Notice: "The only sense in which James can take the term justification is, that his works manifested or proved that he was justified." But how can this be called a sense of the term justification? Is to justify a man the same as to prove that he is justified? But, not

satisfied with this, he makes another effort, and says the sense is that works "proved that he was really justified by faith." But what sort of a "sense of the term justification" is this? It certainly would require a man of more than five senses to see it. But still another attempt is made, and he says the sense of the term is "that his works proved that the faith by which he was justified was not dead and inoperative." And this is another sense of the term justification used by James. "The only sense in which James can take the term" thus resolves itself into at least three senses in the space of one short sentence, and neither of these senses seems appreciable to a man of common sense. If James intended to say that Abraham's works *proved* anything, he could just as well have said it as to have said that by works Abraham was *justified*. Such confusion on the part of a writer whose pen generally leaves a stream of light behind is certain proof of a difficult cause.

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

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

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

From the eighteenth verse of the first chapter of Romans to the sixteenth of the second chapter, Paul sets forth the moral condition of the Gentiles; showing, in the outset, that "the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse" (1:18-20); and advancing from this to an exhibition of the gross corruption into which they had sunk by their inexcusable ignorance. At the seventeenth verse of the second chapter he takes up the case of the Jew; and after showing his superior advantages, asks him: "Thou, therefore, who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makes thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you" (2:21-24). And still further: "What then? Are we better than they? [We Jews than they Gentiles]. No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (3:9). This conclusion forms a premise from which the apostle next proceeds to argue the ground for their justification. Seeing that "all are under sin," he concludes: "Therefore, by deeds of law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (3:20). This is a negative proposition, denying that we can be justified by deeds of law, but not showing how we can be justified. The apostle next proceeds to set forth briefly the primary ground of justification in the blood of Christ, and then shows on what condition we are justified, by stating the conclusion: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without deeds of law" (3:21-28).

It will now be no difficult task to determine what works are meant by the expression "deeds of law;" for which we will substitute, for the sake of uniformity, the equivalent expression, "works of law." Some have mistaken it for works of the Jewish law, and a theory of justification based upon this idea, and first propounded by Bishop Bull, of the Church of England, has been received by many. It affirms that Paul is speaking of works of the Mosaic law, affirming that we are justified by faith without these; while James speaks of gospel obedience, and affirms that these are necessary to justification. The Corn-

mon Version is very likely to lead one into this idea; for it uses the definite article both before the words "law" and "works." This is not authorized by the Greek, as we have stated above, nor is it demanded by the English. The context, indeed, forbids it. It is not *the* works of *the* law; because Paul has reference both to the Jewish law, and to the Gentile law, that law which the Gentiles had among themselves, the works of which were "written in their hearts" (Rom. 2:14, 15). He had proved that the Gentiles were under sin according to this law, as the Jews were according to their law. It was, therefore, not merely by the works of the law that they could not be justified, but by works of law; by works of any law under which man had lived. In order to such justification they must be guilty of no transgression; for he alone can be justified by works of any law who has done no act forbidden by that law, and omitted none required of it. The reason why neither Jew nor Gentile could be justified by such works is, that they were all under sin. But nothing short of perfect obedience to law keeps one from being under sin. "He that keeps the whole law, and yet offends in one point, is guilty of all" (James 2:10). Paul's works of law are opposed to being under sin; but no works can be thus opposed except works of perfect obedience. The works, then, of which Paul speaks are clearly of perfect obedience to moral law.

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

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

The same idea of works of law is maintained by Paul in his argument on justification in the Epistle to the Galatians, which was written about the same time with that to the Romans, and for a similar purpose. He there says: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. 3:10). In this argument the apostle omits one of the premises. Fully stated, it would be as follows: "Every one who fails to do all that is written in the law is under the curse; but as many as are of the works of the law make this failure; hence, as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." By those who are of the works of the law, are meant those who were seeking justification by works of law; and the argument shows that the reason why they failed was because their obedience was not perfect. As perfect obedience to moral law never has been rendered by man, and never will be, therefore it remains fixed forever, "that by works of law shall no flesh be justified."

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

We now turn to the epistle of James, and inquire in what sense he uses the term works when he says we are justified by works and not by faith only. The context must in this case, as in that of Paul, furnish the solution of the question. James introduces the subject at the fourteenth verse of the second chapter, by asking, "What does it profit, my brethren, though a man say he has faith and has not works? Can faith save him?" He does not answer the question; for to ask it is to answer it. He asks another question: "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say to them: Depart in peace; be warmed and filled; notwithstanding, you give them not those things that are needful to the body, what does it profit?" Here, the good wishes, without the corresponding actions, do no good. "Even so," he continues, "faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone." What kind of works are these? Certainly not the works of which Paul speaks, for they alone would suffice, without faith. They are works which faith must have so as not to be alone, and they are spoken of as subordinate to faith. The apostle repeats the idea: "But will you know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" Still we see that the works are such as accompany faith, and not, therefore, works of perfect obedience previous to faith. We do not yet see precisely what kind of works they are; but the apostle proceeds to illustrate his meaning. His illustrations are these: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered up Isaac, his son, upon the altar?" "Likewise, also, was riot Rahab, the harlot, justified by works when she had received the messengers and sent them out another way?" Now what kind of works are these two? Certainly not works of perfect obedience to moral law. On the contrary, they would have been most criminal violations of the moral law, had they been performed under ordinary circumstances. One was child-murder, according to the moral law, and the other was treason. That which made them innocent was the express command of God. How this command was made known to Rahab, the brief narrative of Joshua does not inform us in express terms, but it justifies the conclusion that it was through the spies themselves, whom she credited as servants of the God of Israel, sent on this mission by the inspired authority of Joshua. To Abraham the command came direct from the voice of God. Both of these works belong to the same class with the

gazing of the bitten Israelites upon the brazen serpent, and the bathing of Naaman, the Syrian, in the Jordan, to heal his leprosy. They were works of obedience to positive law, as distinguished from moral law. I need not pause here to distinguish these two kinds of works, further than to remark that the former are always such as the moral law does not require, and such as derive their propriety exclusively from the fact that they are commanded. The doctrine of James, then, is that we are justified by faith not without works of obedience to some positive law. That of Paul is, that we are justified by faith without previous works of perfect obedience to moral law. James asserts nothing of Paul's works; Paul denies nothing of James' works. The works of which they speak are entirely different, so that the declaration of each apostle harmonizes perfectly with that of the other. The man of faith, who is so far from having done the works of Paul's argument that he acknowledges himself a wretched and miserable sinner, is moved by faith to perform some work of the class embraced in James' argument, appointed by God as a condition of pardon; and then, to use James' phraseology, he is justified by faith not without works; or, to use Paul's phraseology, his faith is imputed to him for righteousness. Here is the true ground of harmony between the two apostles, and a few more words will relieve it from all objections.

All the writers in favor of justification by faith only have treated the subject as though the requirement of even a single act of obedience as a condition of justification would be inconsistent with Paul's argument, and would nullify the grace of God. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is the breadth of the heavens between the man who attempts to show a clear record of perfect obedience, entitling him to justification as a debt, and the man who pleads guilty to a life of sin, but comes to God inquiring what to do, and willing to do anything, however great the sacrifice, in order to obtain pardon. Pardon is necessarily, from its very nature, a matter of grace or favor, and justification through pardon cannot possibly be otherwise. If God should require, as a condition of pardon, one, two, or even a thousand acts of obedience, still the pardon would be a favor. If for the pardon of a single sin he should require the consecration of every other moment of life

to his undivided service, still, when this one sin is forgiven, it is a matter of grace and not of debt. It is only he who deserves justification on the ground of perfect innocence that is above the need of justification by grace. To deserve pardon is a contradiction in terms. Justification by works, in Paul's sense, involves no pardon; and implies that there is no sin to be forgiven; but this, we have before seen, is an impossibility. While it is true, then, that justification is, and of necessity must be, without Paul's works of law, it may still be dependent on the works of which James speaks, and it certainly is so if James speaks the truth. That it is so does not in the least conflict with Paul's argument, nor vitiate the grace of God.

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

First, then, as it respects the sinner. James positively asserts that faith without works is dead. But when faith first originates in the mind it is without works, and remains so until the first work of faith is performed. All this time it is dead. In what sense is it dead? Many seem to think that a dead faith is no faith at all. This is not the meaning, for it is faith—actual, existing faith. It may be everything that faith ought to be or can be, in itself considered. It may be faith accompanied by repentance, by prayer, and by fasting; but it is faith without works. The absence of works is the only limitation which James places upon it to render it dead faith. Even the faith of the demons is a real faith, for it makes them tremble; it is faith accompanied by that same wretchedness that brings about the sinner's repentance, differing from it only in the absence of all hope and of all gratitude. The dead faith, then, is simply faith that does not secure justification; faith as it exists before obedience, before it is perfected by works. But, as we have said above, it exists in this condition until the first act of formal obedience to positive law is performed. That first act, with the sinner, can be no other than baptism; for baptism is the only positive command enjoined upon the sinner, and it is the first overt act required of the sinner in coming to God. Faith, then,

whatever else may accompany it, remains a dead faith, ineffective for justification, until it leads the believer into the water; then it is no longer without works, and the sinner is justified by faith not without works.

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

Three days of unspeakable gloom and anguish pass over him, without one ray of light, or one moment's peace of mind. Could there possibly be imagined a clearer demonstration of the impotency of faith only to secure justification? Could the doctrine of James, that faith, be it ever so great, in the absence of works is dead, be more strongly affirmed? Why does not the man find peace with God? His agony continues without abatement till Ananias comes in, sent by the Lord Jesus himself. After restoring his sight, he says to him: "And now, why do you tarry; arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "He arose, and was baptized; and receiving food, he was strengthened." Not, then, till he arose and was baptized did he find peace with God, and break his long, miserable fast. Not till then was he justified by faith. He was justified by works, by an act of obedience to positive law, and not by faith only. His own experience confirms the doctrine of James, and shows that baptism is the work that must accompany the sinner's faith ere he is justified.

This fact accords perfectly with the position assigned to baptism, in the scheme of redemption. Being placed after faith and repentance as a condition of remission of sins, and being a work of positive law, deriving its value and propriety exclusively from the fact that it is commanded, it necessarily belongs to the class of works referred to by James, and connected with justification. This connection of baptism with justification has not escaped the notice of some eminent of the Church of England, and Watson is himself constrained to admit it with some qualifications. Bishop Tomine says: "Faith, including repentance for former sins, was, as far as the person himself was concerned, the sole requisite for justification; no previous work was enjoined; but baptism was invariably the instrument, or external form, by which justification was conveyed." Watson justly pronounces this a confused statement; for it contains an attempt to take hold of baptism without letting go faith only. The two can not be held in the hand together. But still Watson concedes something in favor of the position which the bishop and some other Episcopalian writers assign to baptism. He says: "It will not be denied to Dr. Whitby, that the apostles baptized upon the profession of

a belief in the messiahship and sonship of our Lord; nor is it denied to Bishop Tomline, that when baptism, in the case of true penitence, was not only an outward expression of the faith of assent, but accompanied by a solemn committal of the spiritual interests of the baptized to Christ, by an act of confidence, the power to do which was, no doubt, often given as a part of the grace of baptism, justification would follow" (*Theological Institutes*, vol. ii, p. 260). The charge of confusion which he prefers against Bishop Tomline may be retorted upon him here with interest; for it requires close analysis of this sentence to extract any meaning from it. Stripped of the unnecessary verbiage by which he aims to guard the faith contemplated in the case, it amounts to about this, — that when a truly penitent sinner, exercising the faith of confidence, was baptized, justification followed; and that the power to exercise that faith was often given in apostolic times in the act of baptism. This is very far from being a clear and accurate statement of the true relation of baptism to justification; but it shows that even our great champion of justification by faith only, could not overlook the fact that such a relation does really exist. For this purpose alone we have referred to it.

While thus aiming to set forth the true relation of works to justification, we have by no means forgotten that the justification of the New Testament is almost constantly represented as justification by faith. This fact must not be overlooked by one who is searching for the exact truth on this subject. Not only are we justified by faith, but by faith imputed for righteousness. Paul declares that Abraham's faith was imputed to him as righteousness, and adds: "It was written not on his account only, that it was imputed to him, but also on account of us, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. 4:23, 24). We, then, who live under the Christian dispensation, are justified by having our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ imputed to us for righteousness. Whatever relation, therefore, may exist between works and justification, works must be subordinate, while faith is the chief thing. This is indicated by the manner in which James treats the subject; for his remark that we are "justified by works and not by faith only," implies that faith is the chief thing, and seems only to demand a subordinate place for works.

It has been a puzzle to many minds how works can have any connection whatever with justification, when at the same time faith is imputed to us for righteousness. But there was no appearance of inconsistency between the two to the mind of James, for he makes one illustrate the other. He says: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered up his son Isaac upon the altar. And the scripture was fulfilled, which says: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Thus Abraham's justification by works is declared to be a fulfillment of the very Scripture which says that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. This circumstance shows clearly that James had a conception of the whole subject quite different from that of modern theologians. The connecting link between the two thoughts is presented in a sentence which lies between them in the text. He says: "You see that faith worked with his works, and by the works was the faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which says: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Thus it was a perfected faith which was imputed to him for righteousness, and the faith was made perfect by works. In the first place, "the faith worked with his works;" that is, his faith, instead of lying dormant or remaining alone, produced works, and exerted itself in connection with these works, and by this circumstance it became a perfected faith. Now the word rendered perfect here does not mean insusceptible of improvement; but it means mature, or complete, as a full-grown man, or a fruit-bearing tree, is perfect. When faith is made perfect in this sense it is not necessarily brought to its highest attainable degree of excellence, but it is brought to its chief and primary effect for salvation, the justification of its possessor. In other words, it is made perfect as a condition of justification. Bloomfield translates the clause: "By works his faith was rendered complete;" and explains the words "rendered complete," by the expression, "made available to justification." This is undoubtedly the sense which the context requires. If, then, it be true that Abraham's faith was made thus complete by works, it follows, as a necessary conclusion, that previous to works his faith was incomplete. Faith, therefore, previous to the obedience of faith, is incomplete; and, what is the exact thought of the passage, it is incomplete as a condition of justification. Thus, the faith of

Saul, strong as it was, and great as were its effects upon his inner man, was not imputed to him for righteousness, so as to give him peace with God, until he arose and was baptized. When his faith worked with his works in baptism, by the works the faith was made perfect, and the Scripture was fulfilled which says: "He believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." So it is in the case of every other sinner, who from the heart obeys the same form of doctrine.

We have thus far discussed this subject chiefly as it relates to the sinner. We have not forgotten that, while Paul and James discuss it without exclusive reference to either saint or sinner, they both illustrate their conclusions by the case of Abraham when he was a saint. They make no discrimination between the two characters in reference to justification, and this is sufficient proof that they intend none to be made, at least in the principles, and not of the details, that they both treat. A moment's reflection will show that no such discrimination can be made. If the sinner can be justified only by the pardon of his sins, the saint requires equally the pardon of his; the only difference is in the number and perhaps the enormity of the sins. True, Paul says: "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" (Rom. 8:1); but he undoubtedly includes in walking after the spirit, compliance with the conditions on which a Christian's sins are forgiven; for John expressly declares that "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." We cannot be justified from these sins by works in Paul's sense of the term "works," because it is the absence of some of the works required of the saint that renders his justification again and again necessary. If it were of works, he, like Abraham, in the case supposed by Paul, would have whereof to boast; he could boast that he was no longer dependent upon God's favor for justification, as he once had been, and as all sinners are. No man ever became capable of making this boast. His justification at any period of life, and in the hour of death, differs not in principle from his justification at the beginning; it is always by faith imputed for righteousness. At what period Abraham was first justified we are not informed; for when he is first introduced on the page of history he was an obedient believer; and, from the fixed principle of the divine

government, he must have already been justified from the sins of his early life. At the time of his return from the battle with the kings, Moses notes the fact of his justification again. The faith which was then imputed to him for righteousness was not alone; for it was continually accompanied by works of positive law, in the sacrifices which he continually offered for the sins of himself and his family. His faith, taking hold of the promise of a seed, and constantly working with his works, was imputed to him for righteousness. Then again, when the same faith, after the seed had been given in Isaac, took so strong a hold of the promised posterity through him that he believed God would raise his son from the ashes of a burnt-offering to fulfill the promise, it was once more imputed to him for righteousness, being here made perfect by a special positive command designed fully to test its strength. At either of these periods, if Abraham had been made to stand before God in judgment upon his works, they would have been found imperfect, and he could not have been justified by them. So teaches Paul. In so far as he had done right, of course God approved; but in so far as he had failed to do his whole duty, he was condemned, and it was necessary that his faith, perfected by works, should be imputed to him for a perfect righteousness, which he did not, and could not actually possess. So it is with the Christian, with this single exception, that he is subjected to no special tests like those which so greatly tried the faith of Abraham. As Abraham was under the positive statute of sacrifice for sins, the Christian is under the positive law of confession so as to secure the benefits of the one sacrifice which has been made once for all. "We have an Advocate with the Father, who is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, if we confess them, and to cleanse us from all iniquity" (I John 1:9).

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

ed sense, is made, through forgiveness of his short-comings, altogether righteous in the sight of God.

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

Repentance

The importance of thoroughly understanding the conditions of pardon cannot well be exaggerated. We speak now, not of understanding what these conditions are, but of possessing a thorough and separate knowledge of each one of them. That faith, repentance, and immersion are the conditions of pardon as respects the unconverted, is well understood among the disciples, and has been widely proclaimed by them to the world. There are some speakers and writers, indeed, of a class who cannot long remain contented even with the truth, who have become wearied with the discussion of these topics, and have almost entirely abandoned it. The consequence is that hundreds of sinners are brought into the church who pass through the required forms more because the church requires it, than because they see that they are complying with the indispensable conditions of pardon. In the meantime the church in a great degree loses its identity, and forgets that there is anything grand and attractive in the plea for primitive Christianity. Sometimes the members of such a church hear so much of the points in which sectarian parties are claimed to be far ahead of us, that they would feel gratified to be assured that they and their brethren generally are only a little behind the sects of the day.

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses E. Lard, editor, Vol. 1, Georgetown, Kentucky, 1864, pp. 172-182.

The chief defect with such speakers is that they have never studied these elementary themes sufficiently to understand them thoroughly, or to preach them successfully. It would be a curious experiment to call upon each individual preacher and writer among us to furnish, *ex tempore*, a definition of *faith*, or of *repentance*. How many there are who would be prepared with a prompt answer, it would be hazardous to affirm; but the little observation we have made justifies the presumption that the best definitions would not be given by those who have become weary with "preaching faith, repentance, and baptism."

A failure to exercise close thought, and clear discrimination upon these themes, like a slight variation of the mariner's compass when starting on a long voyage, may lead to wide and disastrous departures from the pathway of truth. They not only constitute the starting point of the Christian life, but they serve as a key to unlock the doors of the temple of truth on that side of it where Protestants are struggling to get in.

We have not assigned ourselves the task of enlarging the field of view on all three of these topics, although on all it is much needed; but propose only to get the subject of repentance into a little clearer light. There is certainly much in the conceptions of both Catholics and Protestants, and even of some among our own brethren, to encourage such an attempt. By substituting in their translations, "Do penance," for the command, "Repent," the Catholic priesthood impose upon their deluded victims all forms of self-torture as a means of atonement for sins. By a misunderstanding of the nature of repentance, the victims of Protestant error are wrought up to groans, and tears, and outcries, which are often protracted through days and weeks together, or terminate in fits and spasms assumed to be the work of the Holy Spirit. And what is still more surprising, someone appears occasionally among the disciples to argue that men must repent before they believe. So long as this state of things continues, there will continue to be an imperative demand for close study of this subject, and for persistent proclamation of the truth concerning it.

The prevalent confusion upon this subject in the minds of those who read the Bible in English, is owing in part to the fact that in our version the word *repent* represents and con-

finds two Greek words quite distinct in their meaning. These words are *metanoëo* and *metamelomai*. Dr. George Campbell, in his dissertation on *metanoëo* and *metamelomai*, has proved that they are used differently in the New Testament, by showing that wherever the duty or doctrine of repentance is taught the inspired writers invariably use *metanoëo*. This being so, in order to understand the subject of repentance we have only to search into the meaning and usage of this word.

The etymological meaning of *metanoëo* is so apparent as to strike every mind at all acquainted with Greek. Compounded of *meta* and *noëo*, it signifies *to perceive afterwards*, and supposes its subject to think differently from what he did at some former time. It indicates, therefore, *a change of mind*, and *to change the mind* is the best expression in English of its primary meaning. We have an instance of this meaning in the New Testament, notwithstanding the following remark by Dr. Bloomfield: "*Metanoia* properly and primarily signifies a change of mind or purpose. But it is so rare in this sense that no commentator on the New Testament has adduced an example." (*Commentary*, Matt. 3:2). The example I refer to is in the 12th chapter of Hebrews, where Paul says of Esau who had sold his birthright, "You know that afterwards when he wished to inherit the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place for *metanoias*, *a change of mind*, though he sought it carefully with tears." Now it was not sorrow for sin, nor any religious change, either in himself or in his father Isaac, that he was seeking; hence it is altogether improper to render the term here *repentance*. But Isaac had given the blessing to Jacob, and Esau was entreating him to *change his mind* so as to take it back from Jacob and give it to him. The term *metanoia* is here used, therefore, not in its religious, but in its primary sense of simply *a change of mind*. So clearly is this the case, that it is quite surprising to hear Dr. George Campbell, who admits that the change Esau sought was such as we have described, say, "I acknowledge that it is only by a trope that this can be called either *metanoia* or *metameleta*." He undoubtedly fell into this mistake by retaining in his mind the religious sense of *metanoia*.

A word often acquires some modification of its primary signification by being employed in connection with a new sub-

ject; and especially is this the case when, in its new connection, it becomes, as *metanoia* has, a kind of technical term. In all such cases, however, the primary meaning furnishes a key to the acquired signification. In searching, therefore, for the New Testament meaning of *metanoia*, we shall be aided by bearing in mind its primary sense. When the Greek-speaking Athenians first heard from the lips of Paul, that God, who had hitherto overlooked idolatry of the Gentiles, was now commanding all men everywhere *metanoein, to repent*, this word necessarily conveyed to them the idea of a change of mind, and the connection further showed that the required change had reference to the worship of idols and the service due the true God. If we would seek for a still more accurate conception of this change, we must start with the primary sense of the word as a foundation, and allow this to be modified and limited by the connections in which we find it employed, until we ascertain its exact force in apostolic usage.

Dr. George Campbell, and some others after him, have insisted that the apostolic sense of *metanoia* is *reformation*. Now reformation is a change of *conduct*, not a change of *mind*. True, it *implies* a pre-existing change of mind, but it differs from a change of mind as an effect differs from its cause. If, then, *metanoia* is used in the sense of reformation, it must be by a metonymy which puts the cause for the effect.

We can settle this question only by a careful examination of New Testament usage. In many passages either of these meanings would harmonize with the context, but there are some which forbid the sense contended for by Dr. Campbell. When John the Immerser says, "Bring for *fruits* worthy of *repentance*," by *fruits* he evidently means those acts of a better life which constitute reformation. He styles them fruits worthy of or suitable to repentance, because they are acts which one who has repented will do. But here repentance and reformation are contemplated as two distinct things, the latter being demanded as a suitable *result* of the former. Repentance, then, with John, is not a change of conduct, but a change of mind. The same distinction is observed in Peter's command, "repent and turn;" where *turning* to God, which is the essential thought in reformation, is distinguished from repentance. Again, when Jesus says, "If your brother trespass against you

seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to you, saying, I *repent*, you shall forgive him;" it is clear that the offender is supposed to express by the words *I repent*, a change of mind, and only an *intended* change of conduct. It is true that his turning again and saying "I repent," is in itself a partial change of conduct; but this the offended party could see, and need not be told of it. The change which the offender wishes to make known must have been unseen, and therefore a change in the mind. Moreover, reformation is a change of too permanent a nature to be accomplished in reference to the same misconduct *seven times in a day*. So clearly is this the case that Dr. George Campbell, the original champion of the term *reform*, felt compelled in this passage to retain the word *repent*. He renders the passage, "if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if *metanoese*, *he repent*, forgive him; and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day return to thee saying *metanoo* 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him." (*Campbell's Four Gospels*, Luke 17:3-4). The incongruity of representing a man as offending you seven times in a day, and each time coming to you to say, "*I reform*," forced him to return here to a rendering which he had theoretically repudiated. We need look no further for proof that *metanoia* means a change of mind, and not of conduct. We have now ascertained, however, that reformation is a fruit of the change represented by *metanoia*, and this may assist us in the sequel in limiting the meaning of the latter term.

Seeing, now, that *metanoia* carries its primary signification with it into the New Testament, we are next led to inquire what specific change of mind it designates. The mind includes the intellect, the will, and the sensibilities. To be exact in our conceptions we must locate the change expressed by *metanoia* in one or more of these. The *Westminster Confession of Faith*, which has exerted a more controlling influence over Protestant minds than any other creed extant, defines the change in these words: "Repentance unto life is a saving grace, wrought in the heart of the sinner by the Spirit and word of God, whereby out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, and upon the apprehension of God's mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, he so

grieves for and hates his sins, as that he turns from them all to God, purposing and endeavoring constantly to walk with him in all the ways of new obedience." (*Larger Catechism*, Q. 76). A most bunglesome definition, truly; and sufficiently obscure to make us thank God that he has not left us to man-made creeds for our knowledge of divine things. Upon a careful analysis of it, however, we find that it declares repentance to consist in a certain grief for and hatred of sin. All the causes of the definition which precede this, declare only the causes which lead to repentance; and all that follow declare only the results of it. The change itself is located in the emotional nature, and is well expressed in popular phraseology by the words, "godly sorrow for sin."

We must now examine the term in the light of limiting words and clauses, and see if this definition is correct. Paul says to the Corinthians, in reference to an epistle which had grieved them: "Now I rejoice, not that you were made sorry, but that you sorrowed *eis metanoian*, to *repentance*. For godly sorrow *worketh metanoian*, *repentance* to salvation not to be repented of." (II Cor. 7:9-10). Here it is declared that godly sorrow *works* or *produces* repentance, and that the Corinthians sorrowed *to* repentance. Godly sorrow for sin, then, and repentance are two distinct things, the latter being *a result* of the former. The same distinction is apparent in Peter's discourse on Pentecost. When he said to the people, "Repent and be immersed," they were already pierced to the heart with sorrow for sin, and were crying out, "What shall we do?" Repentance, then, was to follow this sorrow for sin, and was the next change to take place. To confound the two is to confound a cause with its effect; the same mistake which we have already exposed in Dr. Campbell's definition. The latter by defining *metanoia* *reformation*, puts the effect for the cause; while to define it as *sorrow for sin* puts the cause for the effect.

We now have before us premises sufficient for ascertaining with accuracy the definition we are seeking. Repentance is a change in the mind. It is produced by sorrow for sin, and it leads to a change of conduct. Now the only change of mind which sorrow for sin does produce, and which, in turn, leads to reformation, is a change in the will. No change of a moral character takes place which does not immediately spring from

the will; and sorrow for past misconduct can effect no reformation except by changing the *will* which controls all action. To be philosophically accurate, therefore, we must define it as *a change of the will produced by sorrow for sin and leading to reformation*. This definition is accurate; for it definitely locates the change of mind. It is complete; for it indicates both the cause to which the sacred writers attribute it, and the efforts by which its reality is tested. It is free from redundancy; for a change of will produced by other considerations than sorrow for sin, or one which failed to produce a change of conduct, would certainly not be the repentance of which the apostles spake.

Having now fixed the exact Scriptural meaning of *metanoia*, we next inquire what is its best representative in English. The Catholic version, "do penance," is so far from the truth as to need no comment whatever. We have also demonstrated that Dr. Campbell's rendering, "*reform*," is not true to the original. As to the term *repentance*, it is used in popular speech, and defined in popular creeds, in a sense which likewise fails to give the true idea. We have seen, however, in the course of our investigation, that this term is found in the *English Testament* under limitations which make it the exact representative of the original term. In this state of case, if we had some other term of exactly the same import, and free from the inaccurate popular sense which attaches to *repentance*, our recourse would be obvious and easy. We would adopt that term in our version and our speech, and thus at once remove all confusion on the subject by employing an unambiguous word. This has been done in reference to the term *baptism*. Having acquired, in popular usage, a sense different from that which it bears in the English Testament, the substitution therein of the term *immersion* at once removes all ambiguity, and restores to the English its original fidelity to the Greek. But, unfortunately, our language furnishes no such term for our present purpose. We are left, therefore, to the necessity of retaining the word *repentance*, and compelling our contemporaries by its usage in the English Testament, to see and acknowledge its true meaning.

The efficacy of this expedient, however, depends in part upon the condition that *metamelomai* be not also rendered

repent. Unless it has the same meaning with *metanoeo*, it certainly should be rendered by some other word than *repent* in order to bring out its true meaning. We have already observed the fact stated by Dr. Campbell, that this term is never used when the *duty* of repentance is spoken of. The same author also observes that *metanoeo* "denotes properly a change to the better," but *metamelomai* "barely a change, whether it be the better or worse." This remark is true with some qualification. It is strictly true in reference to *metamelomai*. In reference to *metanoeo* it is true only as respects its *religious* usage. In its primary sense, in which Paul uses it for the change of Isaac's mind sought by Esau, it is not clear that the change was to be for the better. When connected with matters of duty, however, it always supposes some previous wrong-doing and requires a change for the better. But *metamelomai* is used even in reference to a good act; as when Paul says, "though I grieved you with a letter, *ou metamelomai, I do not repent, though metameloman, I did repent*; for I perceive that that letter grieved you only for an hour." Now this version makes him say he had *repented* of writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, which was a good deed. He cannot mean that he had undergone a change of will produced by sorrow for sin and leading to reformation, for there was no sin in the case, and so far was he from reforming that he was now repeating the deed by writing another letter. This makes it perfectly clear that *metamelomai* is used in a sense different from that which we have found attached to *metanoeo*.

What, then, is the exact meaning of *metamelomai*? Dr. Campbell, in his celebrated dissertation says it means, "I *repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the word." Now in its familiar acceptation *repent* means to be sorry for *sin*, and to say, I repent of an action, implies that I consider it a sinful action. But such is not the force of *metamelomai*, seeing it is used in reference to that which is *no sin*. Paul so used it in the passage just quoted above, and also in the following: "Godly sorrow works repentance in order to salvation *ametamelaton not to be repented of*." "The Lord sware and *ou metamelathasetai will not repent*. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." In all these passages the term *repent*, even in its popular sense, is entirely incongruous, for it

contemplates a change from sin, and there is no room for the thought of sin in either case. From the passage in reference to the Corinthian letter, however, we can determine the exact import of the word by asking ourselves what change must have taken place in Paul's mind. He learned that the letter had grieved the Corinthians, and a knowledge of this caused the feeling which he expresses by *metamelomai*; but this feeling passed away when he heard that their grief brought them to repentance. Now the only feeling which a good man would experience, under such circumstances, is expressed in the term *regret*. This is the exact feeling that would be awakened, and when it was known that the pain inflicted had resulted in the desired benefit, the good man would regret no longer. This much and no more, then, can we make out of Paul's words, and this meaning suits exactly the other two passages. "Godly sorrow works repentance in order to salvation not to be *regretted* " and "the Lord sware, and will not *regret it*. **Thou** art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."

Thus far we have examined the **usage of *metamelomai* only** as connected with good deeds. When connected with evil actions, as in the case of Judas, and of the young man who first refused to work in his father's vineyard, but afterwards *regretted it* and went, it **of course expresses regret for sin**. But it is evident that the idea of sin arises entirely from the connection in which it is used. Judas experienced a feeling more intense than our term regret ordinarily expresses, and a verb formed from *remorse*, if we had one, would come nearer expressing it; but we learn this not from the term *metamelomai*, but from the fact that he threw down the money and went and hung himself. The term, therefore, even here, *expresses* no more than regret, but the context shows that it was a degree of regret equivalent to remorse. We conclude, then, that *regret* is the proper representative of *metamelomai* in all its occurrences, and by the adoption of it in our version all danger of confounding it with the repentance necessary to salvation would be removed.

Dr. Conant, in his labors for the American Bible Union, introduced this rendering of *metamelomai* in the first edition of his version of Matthew, and if he had retained it he would have deserved the thanks of the English reading community.

But in the last edition of his work this valuable step in advance is retraced, and his readers left to the old confusion of the common version.

Having now traced the distinction between these two Greek words, we can more definitely locate the point of contact, which sometimes exists between them. We *say sometimes*, because when *metamelomai* has reference to an act not in itself sinful, it can have no connection whatever with repentance. But when it has reference to sins committed, it expresses that sorrow for sin, of which, when it is sufficient to change the will, repentance is the result. Repentance always springs from *regret* for sin; but regret, even when so intense as to lead to suicide, may fail of producing repentance, by failing to change the will so as to produce reformation.

A great deal of the error and confusion extant upon religious topics may be dissipated by correct definition of terms. It is for want of correct definition of both faith and repentance that the latter has been supposed to precede the former in the order of mental operations. The advocates of this error suppose repentance to be sorrow for sin, and saving faith to consist in yielding up the will to Christ; and knowing that sorrow for sin necessarily precedes a change of the will, they very readily and quite confidently reach the conclusion that repentance must precede saving faith. Their fundamental mistake consists in confounding repentance with sorrow for sin, which leads to it, and then confounding faith with what is really repentance. The change of will, as we have seen above, constitutes repentance and not faith. When, by a correct definition of repentance, it is seen that it occupies the very place assigned by these errorists to faith, it is at once apparent that it does not and cannot *precede* faith.

We do not forget that in two passages of Scripture, where Mark is describing the preaching of Jesus, and where Paul speaks of his own preaching in Ephesus, the arrangement of the terms seems to make repentance antedate faith. Jesus preached saying, "Repent and believe the gospel;" and Paul preached "repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." Now it is not denied that repentance towards God may precede faith in Jesus Christ. It necessarily did so with all who repented under John's preaching, for they repented

toward God before the Messiahship of Jesus was preached to them. It is true also that the preaching of Jesus and of Paul may have brought many men to repentance toward the God in whom they already believed, before they were convinced that Jesus is the Christ. But it is denied that repentance toward God can precede faith in God; or repentance toward Christ, faith in Christ. This denial is sustained by the facts just **referred** to; for the very foundation of the repentance preached to the Jews and proselytes was the faith they already had in the God of Israel. And it is also sustained by the fact that even the advocates of this theory find themselves compelled to admit a certain kind of faith before repentance; and as we have seen above, the kind of faith which they locate after repentance is really repentance itself.

There is another passage in our common version, which, to the mere English reader, would offer stronger support to the theory of repentance before faith than these just noticed. It is the statement of Jesus to the Pharisees, "John came to you in the way of righteousness, and you believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him; and you, when you had seen it, *repented* not afterwards *that you might* believe him." Here repentance seems not only to precede faith, but to be necessary in order that men *might* believe. But, unfortunately for our theorists, the original term is *metamelomai*, not *metanoeo*. It was *regret* and not *repentance* which the Pharisees should have experienced. This shows that the passage does not teach repentance before faith; but still it leaves *regret* before faith, and suggests the inquiry how a man can regret not having believed, before he does believe, and in order that he *may* believe. He certainly could not do it unless the cause of his not having believed was something wrong in himself. But this was precisely the case with the Pharisees. It was their spiritual *pride* which made them reject the ministry of John, causing them to shut their eyes against the proofs of his mission. When, now, they saw even publicans and harlots acting more candidly toward him than themselves, and becoming righteous under his teaching, they should have been filled with regret and even shame; and this feeling would have removed the obstacle to their faith. This very regret, however, necessarily presupposes faith even while opening the way to a

new object of faith. The pre-existing faith of the Pharisees in God furnished the ground for regret that they had allowed the publicans and harlots to outstrip them in righteousness, while this *regret* would have prepared their minds for a new object of faith, the divine mission of John.

The Calvinistic idea that repentance is a direct gift from God is refuted by our definition, and at the same time those passages in which repentance is said to be *granted* to men are made plain. Consisting in a *volition*, or *change of will*, it cannot possibly be an immediate gift; and to call it so is no less absurd than to speak of an *involuntary volition*. But consisting of a change of will produced by sorrow for sin, he who supplies the considerations which awaken this sorrow may be properly said to *give* repentance. But God's goodness, on the one hand, and his final punishment of sin on the other, furnish the means as viewed by Jesus and the apostles, of exciting this sorrow; and, therefore, when repentance is induced it is, indirectly, a gift from God. Without the motives which God supplies no man could repent of his sins.

The devotees of the mourning bench have sometimes been troubled with the question: How long should a man repent before he is prepared for baptism? Our definition removes all possibility of making this a question; for repentance is a volition, and therefore must be instantaneous. The question really has reference to the sorrow which leads to repentance; and if it be pressed in this form, the answer must be, that the man must sorrow *to repentance* or a change of will, whether the time be long or short. The same is true as to the intensity of sorrow. Its entire value consists in its tendency to change the will; and he whose will is changed has sorrowed enough, and long enough. The jailer was immersed the same hour in which he began to sorrow for his sins, and Saul of Tarsus delayed only till he met with a disciple who could teach him his privilege and lead him into the water. The victims of protracted mourning at the present day, need only an Ananias to come and say, "Why do you tarry? Arise and be immersed and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Before dismissing this subject, we may observe that the preachers of the current reformation have been often charged

with neglecting to enforce the duty of repentance. There never was a charge more unjust. So far is this from being true, that whilst they have said no less than their contemporaries upon the subject, they have outstripped them all in effecting that change of *will* which constitutes repentance. Their constant appeal to the sinner has been, *will* you abandon your sins, *will* your turn to God? Their arguments, their exhortations, their warnings, are all directed against the stubborn *will* of the sinner, which to change is to bring him to repentance. Their lamentation over the impatient has ever been that of Jesus, "How often I would have gathered you together, but you *would* not," you were not *willing*; and their unceasing invitation is, "Whosoever *will* let him take of the water of life freely." Without as clear a conception of repentance as they might have attained, they have yet been striking for it with an energy and a precision which has distanced all competition, and secured to them an unprecedented success in bringing sinners to Christ. That their conceptions may become still more accurate on this and on all the elementary themes of the gospel, and that their zeal and success may still more abound, is the greatest demand of the age in which we live.

What Is Repentance?

The critical world is still unsettled as to the best English rendering of the two Greek verbs, *metanoeo* and *metamelomai*. Two different renderings of each are given by two scholars working under the same rules for the Bible Union. One renders *metanoeo*, *repent*, and *metamelomai*, *regret*. The other renders *metamelomai*, *repent*, and *metanoeo*, *reform*. Again, a new translator of considerable merit, whose version of Matthew is passing through the "American Christian Review," renders *metanoeo*, *amend your life*, and *metamelomai*, "to regret one's conduct. "

This diversity of rendering arises, in part, from a desire to avoid the confusion introduced into the common version by rendering both words *repent*, and in part, I conceive, from an imperfect understanding of the meaning of *metanoeo*. When the exact meaning of this term is ascertained and agreed upon, there will no longer be any diversity of opinion as to the best English representatives of them both. In former efforts to settle this meaning, many good things have been said as to the etymological meaning of the word, but not sufficient attention has been paid to its Scriptural usage. It very often happens that a word acquires, in use, a meaning somewhat different from that indicated by its etymology. We should not, therefore, slight either of these sources of information, but make a judicious use of both.

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 5, Bethany, Va., 1862, pp. 114-118.

It has been clearly shown from the etymology of the word, that it indicates *a change of mind*. But when used in a religious sense, it is limited by the subject to a change of mind *in reference* to the will of God. This general idea should be allowed to follow the word into the New Testament, unless its usage there clearly excludes it. Two of the renderings above mentioned, however, fail to give expression to it. *Amendment of life*, and *reformation*, both *imply* a change of mind, but neither of them expresses it. There is, therefore, the same difference between them and *metanoia*, that there is between the *expression* of an idea, and its implication in another idea that is expressed. A change of mind is one thing, and reformation, or amendment of life, is quite another. If, then, *metanoia* means a *change of mind*, neither of these terms can accurately translate it.

These observations present the inquiry whether *metanoia*, as used in the New Testament, expresses a change of mind, or a change of conduct. It is not a question as to whether either of these ideas is excluded; for those who contend that it expresses change of mind admit that it implies a corresponding change of conduct, *et vice versa*. But what the word *expresses* in Greek, we wish to express in English, so that whatever was *implied* in the Greek, may be implied in the English.

A few well known instances of the use of the word, when carefully examined, will settle this question. When John the Immerser says, "Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance," by *fruits* he evidently means a better course of conduct; and by fruits worthy of, or suitable to, repentance, he means a course of conduct such as one who has repented will pursue. But here the change of conduct and the repentance are contemplated as two distinct things, the one of which is merely suitable to the other. Repentance is not, then, according to John's preaching, a change of conduct, but a change of mind, of which a change of conduct is the suitable result. Again, when Jesus says, "If thy brother trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, *I repent*, thou shalt forgive him," it is equally clear that the offender is supposed to express, by the words, "*I repent*," a change of his mind, and only an intended change of conduct. So, in Peter's command (Acts 3:19), "Repent, and turn," turning to God, which is a

part of the required change of conduct, is made distinct from repentance. In many other passages an internal change is the only one that can be expressed by the word, whilst in all of its occurrences, this idea is as suitable to it, to say the least, as any other. The case, then, as to New Testament usage, stands thus: Its etymological meaning is a good one in every instance, and in many instances the only possible meaning. Therefore, we must allow this meaning to follow it wherever we find it; and this being so, we cannot correctly render it by either *reformation*, or *amendment of life*.

Seeing, now, that *metanoia* means a change of mind, we are next led to the inquiry, what specific change of mind does it represent in the New Testament? Let it be observed that the word *mind* is a generic term, including both the intellect and the moral nature. In which of these does the change take place? Is it, in other words, mere sorrow for sin, however intense or protracted? We are compelled, by the force of irresistible evidence, to answer this question in the negative. Paul says to the Corinthians, in reference to a letter which had grieved them, "Now I rejoice, not that you were made sorry, but that you *sorrowed to repentance*. For *godly sorrow worketh* repentance to salvation, not to be repented of." Here, instead of treating repentance as equivalent to godly sorrow for sin, he makes it the *result* of such sorrow. This distinction is also apparent from the sermon of Peter on Pentecost. When he said to the people, "*Repent* and be immersed," they were already pierced to the heart with remorse, so as to cry out, "What shall we do?" Repentance, therefore, was something to be done after the soul was filled with sorrow, and was the next duty to be performed by souls in this condition. It stands midway between sorrow for sin, on the one hand, and reformation of life, on the other. Reformation is a result of repentance, while repentance is a result of sorrow for sin.

What, then, shall be our definition of *metanoia*? If we say, *amendment of life*, we give not its meaning, but that which results from it. Besides, this phrase does not adequately represent even the result of *metanoia*. If a man have a dozen wicked habits, and abandon two of them, he has *amended* his life, though he has not fully *reformed*. *Reformation* is a better term than *amendment of life*, but even this expresses a mere result

of repentance. Shall we say, then, that it is sorrow for sin, resulting in reformation. This is the most popular definition of the term, and would probably pass current among the majority of good thinkers. But it is faulty, in that it makes sorrow, which, as shown above, is the immediate *cause* of repentance, a part of the thing itself.

But we now have premises before us sufficient to ascertain with entire accuracy the definition we are seeking. *Metanoia* represents a change of mind produced by sorrow for sin, and resulting in reformation. Now, the only change of mind which sorrow for sin does produce, and which, in turn, produces reformation, is *a determination to sin no more*. This, then, is repentance—a *determination to reform, produced by sorrow for sin*. We use the word *determination*, because it corresponds in etymological meaning so nearly with *metanoia*. Determine means to bring the mind to a settled conclusion, as *melanoeo* means to change the mind to a new purpose. The entire mental and moral change contemplated is this. Faith in reference to the goodness and severity of God, leads to sorrow for sin. This sorrow leads to a determination to reform. The proper fruit of this determination is actual reform, which is begun by confession and immersion, and perfected by a subsequent holy life.

This definition enables us to distinguish clearly between *metanoeo* and *metamelomai*. *Metamelomai* expresses sorrow for sin, but not such as results in a determination to reform. If you add this determination to the meaning of *metamelomai*, you make it equal to *metanoeo*.

Having now ascertained the meaning of *metanoia*, we next inquire, what is its best representative in English? We have seen that neither *amendment of life* nor *reformation* will answer the purpose, for neither of them expresses the right idea. We are left, then, to *repentance*, as our only alternative. We cheerfully admit that this term, as currently used, does not express accurately the true idea; but this arises entirely from misunderstanding its meaning as employed in the English New Testament. That it is there employed in the sense we have just attributed to *metanoia*, is evident from the fact that in the passages by which we have determined the meaning of the latter term, we have used *repentance* as its representative. The command, "Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance," shows

the distinction between repentance and reformation, which is its fruit. So the command to the weeping Jews on Pentecost, "*Repent,* " and the statement of Paul that the Corinthians "*sorrowed to repentance,* " show that the English word *repent*, however, misused by the people, is, in the English Testament, distinguished from sorrow for sin, and expresses a result of such sorrow. Seeing, then, that the word is used correctly in the English Scriptures, instead of rejecting it therefrom, our proper course is to make the Scriptures correct the minds of those who read them, as to its meaning. The same is true of the word *faith*. It is currently understood and used in an unscriptural sense; yet no one, for that reason, proposes to displace it from the English Testament. Seeing that it is correctly employed there, we make use of the English version itself, to correct public opinion. Let us pursue the same course in reference to the term repentance, and we shall be saved the labor of defending inaccurate and unpopular renderings of the original word.

These last observations are, of course, dependent upon the supposition that *metamelomai* shall not also be translated *repent*. The best version of this term that I have seen, is that of Dr. Conant, who renders it *regret*. This rendering suits, very happily, all the occurrences of the word and its derivatives. The young man who at first refused to work in his father's vineyard, "afterward *regretted* and went" (Matt. 21:29). When the Pharisees had seen even publicans and harlots believing John, they did not afterwards *regret* their former unbelief, so as to believe him (Matt. 21:32). When Judas saw that Jesus was condemned, *regretting*, he brought back the thirty pieces of silver (27:3). "The Lord swore, and will not *regret it*, thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. 7:21). "The gift and calling of God are without *regret*" (Rom. 11:29). And finally, the passage in the seventh chapter of II Corinthians, already quoted in part, is freed from all confusion by this rendering. "Though I grieved you in the letter, I do not *regret it*, though I *did regret it*. for I perceive that that letter grieved you only for an hour. Now I rejoice, not that you were grieved, but that you were grieved into *repentance*. For you were grieved according to the will of God, that you might be damaged by us in nothing. For grief according to the will of God, works out repentance in order to salvation, *not to be regretted.* "

Before dismissing the subject, I must remark, that *metanoia* is used once in the New Testament, not in its religious acceptation, but in its strict etymological sense, of a *change of mind*. It is in Paul's remark that Esau "found *no place of repentance*, though he sought it carefully with tears." Here the term *repentance* is most inapposite; for it was not repentance that he sought with tears, but *a change in Isaac's mind* concerning the prophetic blessing which he had already given to Jacob. It should be rendered, then, "He found no place for *a change of mind* though he sought it carefully with tears." See also, Dr. Robinson's Lexicon on this word.

In conclusion, let me express the hope, that all of our thinking brethren will turn their attention to the closest investigation of familiar words and themes, so as to attain a still clearer understanding of the word of truth, and a still purer speech. It is highly gratifying to see, by the publication of the new version, above referred to, in the Review, that we have at least one brother too deeply immersed in the profounder study of the Word of God, to be disturbed by the pressing storm. The Lord grant that the number may be greatly increased.

Is Baptism A Positive Institution?

The time was when every preacher in the Reformation had one or more discourses on Positive institutions, and with many it was a favorite subject. The purpose was, by showing the nature of such institutions, and the necessity of strict obedience to them, to argue that baptism, being one of them, must be observed with unswerving strictness. Of late, however, such discourses are not very often heard, and a few of our preachers have made the discovery that the fathers were all deluded in supposing that baptism is properly classed among positive institutions. If I understand the process by which this conclusion is reached, it depends entirely on a new and incorrect definition. A positive institution is defined as one that is purely arbitrary, or one for which no reason can be discovered. This definition would certainly exclude baptism, but it would not stop there; it would exclude all the positive institutions and commands that God ever gave. What appointment or command of God can be named, for the existence of which some reason cannot be found? For even the most trivial requirement of the Jewish law at least this reason can be assigned, that it taught the Jews unquestioning obedience to God—a lesson of unspeakable importance to every human being. Not only can we see this reason, but it was seen and felt by those who lived under the law. Adam in the Garden of Eden could see this reason for the prohibition of the fruit on a certain

From The Apostolic Times, Lexington, Kentucky, June 26, 1873.

tree; Nadab and Abihu could see it for the prohibition of strange fire; and Uzzah, for the command that the ark should be touched by none but consecrated hands. When the brazen serpent was erected, when Abraham was commanded to offer Isaac, when Naaman was commanded to dip himself seven times in the Jordan, the same reason could be seen in each case.

Now it is true that positive institutions vary much in the extent to which the reasons for them are apparent. Some approach closely to the appearance of being purely arbitrary, while others appear quite reasonable in many respects, though none are perhaps altogether free from peculiarities concerning which it is difficult to assign an adequate reason. For example, many more reasons can be given for the command in reference to the forbidden fruit, than for that in reference to sprinkling the cured leper seven times with the blood of a bird; and it is easier to account for the sprinkling in the latter case, than for the fact that it must be done seven times rather than three times or some other number of times. But in none of these particulars lies the essential difference between a positive and a moral command of God. A positive command for which an abundance of reasons may appear is as readily distinguished from a moral command, as one for which the least amount of reason can be discovered.

The essential difference is this — that a moral law is one which would be obligatory on man even without an express divine command, while a positive law is one which is obligatory only because it is commanded. In other words, the difference has reference to the source of the obligation to obedience, and not to the reasonableness of the appointment, all differences in the latter respect being incidental and not essential. Both kinds are commanded of God, for there is no moral obligation that he has not enforced by precept; but the precept is the only source of obligation in positive commands, while in case of moral commands the precept only enforces that which was right in the nature of the case.

This distinction is exemplified and clearly illustrated by the case of Abraham when required to make a burnt offering of Isaac. The moral law of God required him to love and protect

his son, and this was right in the nature of the case. But he was commanded to slay his son and burn his body on the altar. This was a positive command, and the act became a duty only because it was commanded. In this case the act commanded would have been a crime if not commanded; but this is an incidental circumstance not belonging to the nature of positive law. In many instances the required act would simply be idle and worthless without the command which requires it.

It is now easy to see that baptism is a positive institution; for, although many reasons may be given to show its fitness, a significant divine institution, still it remains true that the only ground of obligation to be baptized is the fact that the Head of the church commands it. But for that command the institution could not possibly have come into existence; or if it had, it would have been an idle ceremony which no man's conscience would have required, the neglect of which would have been no sin, and the observance of which would have been no obedience to God.

The Thief on the Cross

The thief on the cross, as we commonly style him, is almost as widely known as Jesus. But no man knows his name or his father's name or any of the details of his career. He is known almost exclusively by the single brief sentence which he uttered in his dying hours. That well known sentence is, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

In the earlier part of the six hours which he hung upon the cross he had united with his fellow thief in reproaching Jesus. They hear the reproaches cast upon him by the multitude and, in the expressive language of our old version, "cast the same in his teeth." And one of them said, "If thou art the Christ, save thyself and us." But the one of whom I speak, after his mind had no doubt run with immense sweep over many things, as a man's mind often does in extreme peril, and after his heart had perhaps passed through some changes of sentiment, called out to the other, saying, "Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss."

What an acknowledgement! How few criminals in the agonies of the gallows or other punishment fully acknowledge, however severe the torture they are suffering, that it is the due reward for their deeds. That was honesty. "This man," he

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex.: The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 25-28.

says, "has done nothing amiss." How did he know Jesus had done nothing amiss? He had not heard the trial before Pilate, for he was closely confined in prison when that was going on. How did he know, then so that he could say in his dying hour that Jesus had done nothing amiss? We must remember that he had not always been in prison. Up to a few days or weeks before, he had been roaming about as a free man, practicing his diabolical business of highway robbery. This led him often, no doubt, to the synagogues and in the open where men went to hear Jesus to find out who in that crowd had money, so that he could rob them on their way home. But while thus engaged he saw the miracles wrought by Jesus and he heard those wonderful speeches made to the multitude, but, like many a sinner of the present day, while his mind was convinced his heart was not moved. But now that eternity was right by him, and the very next step will be right into it, everything appears very different.

After rebuking his fellow robber that even the fear of God did not keep him in his dying hour from reproaching a fellow sufferer and that wrongfully, he turns to Jesus. I suppose his former life had taken out of him his polish and politeness. So he simply says, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." I think that if I were convicted of highway robbery, and were suffering death either on the cross or on the gallows, I would not want to be remembered. I would ask my friends and kindred to forget my name and my existence. Don't let my grandchildren know who their grandfather was. Never write my name down. Try to forget it. And if I thought of my God and had any request to make of him, I would say, "O Lord, let me drop into eternal oblivion." Why does this highway robber want to be remembered? and why does he beg Jesus, "Remember me"?

He had never conferred any favor upon Jesus, for which he should be remembered. And if Jesus should remember him not, but forget him in the day of final judgment and rewards, possibly he might think there was a chance for his escape. Why didn't he ask Jesus to forget him and let him be left out? His mind seems to have been very active. Perhaps he had been naturally a man of very active brain. And I suppose he meant in that petition, not remember me the robber, but remember

me the penitent robber, knowing that he was a penitent robber, and knowing, I suppose, that Jesus knew that he wanted to be remembered as the penitent robber. And how could he perceive that Jesus would yet come in his kingdom, when he sees him very near his last moments on the cross and knows that life will be extinct in a few moments? How did he perceive that Jesus would come in his kingdom? and when?

A very distinguished infidel writer mentions this circumstance and says, if that account is true, which he did not believe, it would represent the dying thief as having more faith than any one of the apostles. For when he was nailed to the cross every one of them gave up hope, and remained in blank despair until the third morning. Well, he did have a faith in Jesus which none of the apostles had. He believed from the evidence that he had seen and heard, that Jesus spoke the absolute truth, and that when he declared that he was going to set up a kingdom, he would do it in spite of death and hell. It would be sure to be done.

But why believe this kingdom was to be set up in some future time after he was dead and buried? In the first place, it was a singular conviction of his mind that Jesus would be able to do anything after he was dead. And what good will his remembering me do after I am dead and gone to hell? A wondrous faith! And yet after all, that request of his is not very different from that which every dying man should make. Jesus, remember me a sinner? If he does I am gone. No matter whether I have been a robber or a genteel sinner, I am gone. But, Jesus, remember me a penitent sinner, and I can hope for an answer similar to that that was given to this dying stranger.

Remember me a penitent sinner. For we have faith that Jesus regards penitent sinners, that he will remember them in mercy, that he will remember them for their everlasting good, blotting out their sins. How strange and singular it was that, when the Lord of glory was put to a cruel death by cruel men on false charges, that two highway robbers, condemned justly to death and acknowledging their guilt, were crucified one on his right and the other on his left. How striking an illustration of the fact that he came to this world to save sinners is this

fact that he was crucified between two thieves and saved one of them. And observe, too, that the answer that Jesus gave to the poor wretch was greater than he had requested him to give. "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." He did not know when that was to be. It was in the vague future. But the answer was, as you remember, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." I wish I could have seen the face of that robber after he had heard that sentence. I would love to have seen whether it seemed to remove his pangs or not. I am sure that it did, not only lessen the pangs of his soul, but the pains of his body also. He died in less pain because he felt assured that the last breath on earth would be the entrance into paradise with Jesus. How strange and unexpected a sight it must have been to men and angels that Jesus, when he came up after the conflicts of life here, had a companion with him and that companion was a thief. It seems to me that all heaven must have been astonished at that sight.

But what about the other robber who was as close to Jesus as this one? Jesus had not a word to say to him. No response to any of his reproaches, no comfort for his future. He allowed that man to die alone, and to go, as soon as death overtook him, as all impenitent sinners must go. What a contrast we have here between the penitent and the impenitent. And what an appeal there is here to all of you who know the truth and to many of you who are going to preach the truth, to gather up all the knowledge of God and of all the good things that you can find to get men to repent of their sins, so that if they live they may live penitent sinners and if they die, die penitent sinners.

Immersion in the Holy Spirit

An article in the last number of the Quarterly entitled "Baptism in one Spirit into one Body," has struck the public mind as quite a novelty in the literature of the Reformation. It is not only novel, but it is contradictory to some conclusions very generally received among us, and upon a subject which the brethren have studied with great diligence. Of this the author was fully conscious, and in anticipation of the reception which awaited his article, very justly remarked that "no view is to be rejected merely because it is new." The lover of truth should never be a dogmatist, nor conclude that on any subject he has nothing more to learn. But he should stand ready, whenever his conclusions, even those of which he is most confident, are challenged upon the basis of new reasons, to renew his investigation. We say, upon the basis of *new* reasons, because the mere reiteration of old and oft refuted arguments against any proposition can impose no such obligation. The novel conclusion of the article in question is sustained by a course of argument equally novel, and with an ingenuity unsurpassed on the pages of the Quarterly. It demands, therefore, the most careful consideration, and we propose to review it deliberately and thoroughly.

I have for some years been convinced that the immersion in the Holy Spirit is not fully understood, and that it needs investigation and discussion *de novo*. The same may be said of

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses E. Lard, editor, Vol. I, Georgetown, Kentucky, 1864, pp. 428-442.

the entire subject of the Holy Spirit and his work in human salvation. Although there are some propositions upon this subject which are well defined, and well settled among us, yet on no other subject are there so many points in which we feel distinctly and painfully the want of certainty. It is a surprising fact, that amid all the myriads of volumes with which the presses of the past century have been teeming, we should have had no masterly and Scriptural work on the Holy Spirit. The work of Jenkyn comes nearer meeting the demand than any other; but it is marked by defects which are inseparably connected with Calvinism, and it stands almost alone. Even among our own brethren nothing more has appeared than a few well written essays on special points in the great range of inquiry. The most complete and Scriptural exposition of the subject is to be found in the Campbell and Rice debate; but there only a single branch of it comes under review. The range of the discussion upon which we are now entering must be still more limited; but if it should be the means of stimulating inquiry, and, as a final result, of leading some sound student of the Bible to give the world such a volume as we have indicated, it would not be by any means fruitless.

The main issue presented by the article under review is this: was the immersion in the Holy Spirit confined to certain persons who received miraculous gifts, or is it enjoyed by all disciples alike? The latter is the conclusion in which the writer's course of reasoning terminates. A number of reasons are offered in support of this conclusion; but it is unnecessary to refer to them at all, if, as the writer declares, it is *actually asserted*, that we become members of the one body by "being immersed *in* one Spirit *into* it." If this be asserted in the passage under consideration, it is not to be questioned, and needs no further proof than this assertion affords. We may say further, that if the author has given us the right rendering and collocation of the words, they certainly contain this assertion: for he would have them read, "*we were all immersed in one Spirit into one body.*" This is not the collocation of the words which he gives in the formal rendering of the verse; but he contends that this expresses the meaning correctly.

Previous to offering this new rendering, and in the very first paragraph of his article, he makes this observation: "The

question, how is it that by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body?, has, heretofore, caused no little perplexity; and as long as it is put in the words here used, it will never cause less." If he should find that the new rendering proves no less perplexing than the old one, perhaps the latter will grow somewhat in his favor. And really the *perplexity* which the new rendering must cause, is the very first result of it which strikes the mind. If it be true that the immersion by which we get into the one body is immersion in one Spirit, then, instead of coming in by a kind of double immersion, of Spirit in Spirit, and body in water, it will be difficult to prove that the immersion in water is any part of the process whatever. Suppose it were denied that baptism in water brings us into the one body, or has any part in doing so. You answer, Paul says, "as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put him on," and this language proves that we are baptized into Christ, which is the same as being baptized into the one body. I say, yes, very true; we *are* baptized into Christ, but this is not *water* baptism; it *is Spirit* baptism; for "we were all immersed in one *Spirit* into one body." You fly to Romans six, and quote, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death;" but I again answer that as it is *in one Spirit* that we are baptized into one body, wherever a baptism is mentioned which brings us into Christ or the one body, we are bound to understand it as the baptism in Spirit, unless there are some qualifying words to give it any other reference. Thus, by the admission that it is immersion in the Spirit which brings into one body, I shut you off from every method of proving that immersion in water is a part of the process. If you appeal to the commission as recorded by Matthew, and quote, "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," I may still assert, that though the immersion administered by the apostles brought them into the name, it is the immersion in the Spirit which brings them into the one body. When you quote that except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God, I could admit that a birth of water is necessary to entering the organized kingdom; but that the immersion in the Spirit alone brings us into the mystical body of Christ. You might consider this caviling; but you would find it somewhat puzzling; and, with your very best efforts you would fail to show by a direct

declaration concerning immersion in water, what I show concerning immersion in the Spirit, that it *brings us into the one body*.

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

Again, the apostles on the day of Pentecost are expressly declared to have been immersed in the Holy Spirit. On your hypothesis this immersion brought them into the one body, and previous to it they were not in the body; but their immersion in water took place previously, therefore it was not this that brought them into the body of Christ. Now, is there not something puzzling in these facts? And even if the puzzle could at last be successfully solved, does not the new rendering of this passage in the 12th chapter of I Corinthians rob us of some of the passages on which we have relied to prove that by immersion in water the penitent believer is brought into Christ and into his death?

But an effort may be made to save some of these passages in their true sense, by the rule of criticism, that when the word immersion occurs unqualified we must understand it in its primary Scriptural sense, of immersion in water. Indeed, this effort is made in reference to Paul's statement, "*there is one baptism.*" I meet this effort in two ways. *First*, I propound a rule of interpretation equally imperative, that when it is clearly ascertained that a certain effect is attributed to a certain cause, wherever that effect is mentioned, that cause is implied, unless there is some limiting expression to indicate another cause. By the application of this rule, as it is positively asserted that immersion in the Spirit brings us into the one body, wherever immersion, unqualified, is mentioned as bringing us into one body, or into Christ or as effecting the same change under other forms of expression, we must understand it as immersion in the Spirit. This rule would hold good, unless it were also explicitly declared that we are *immersed in water into one body*; in which case the term immersion, in such

passages as we have supposed, would be ambiguous. But there is no such declaration as this.

Upon this rule, the statement of Paul in Ephesians four, that there is *one baptism* would bear quite a different meaning from that which the writer gives it. The seven units there enumerated by the apostle are specifications under the exhortation to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" (see the connection, Eph. 4:3-6), and the baptism there mentioned must be that one by which "*unity of the Spirit*" is attained, and maintained. Moreover, it stands connected with the "one body," and must therefore be understood as the baptism which brings us into the one body. But the baptism which meets both these demands is that in the Spirit; for "we were all immersed *in one Spirit into one body*;" therefore the *one baptism* of Paul is the baptism in Spirit and not in water.

There is not only something puzzling in all these conclusions, but they show that the establishment of the writer's criticism would completely revolutionize our course of argument in reference to the office of immersion in water. There is no one to whom this would be more repugnant than to the author himself.

But, in the second place, the rule of criticism that the word immersion, when unqualified, must be understood in its primary sense of immersion in water, is strictly correct; and, unfortunately for the rendering and interpretation for which the writer contends, it applies to his text as well as to other passages. When Paul says, in this passage, that "we were all immersed into one body," this rule requires us to understand the term "immersed" of immersion in water, unless it is so limited as to compel us to understand it differently. But the writer assumes that it is so limited here, and locates the expression "*in one Spirit*," immediately after the term "immersed" for the very purpose of thus limiting the meaning of the latter term. But this is certainly a mislocation in fact, if not in meaning. The apostle locates this expression at the beginning of the sentence, so as to read, "In one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." Now, with this arrangement of the preposition, the expression "in one Spirit," limits the term *we*, instead of the term *immersed*. Assuming that *we* were first *in one Spirit*, it asserts that we were *immersed into one body*;

and makes the latter event take place subsequent to the former. This suits the Baptist idea that a man must first be in the Spirit, which in New Testament phraseology, is equivalent to having the Spirit in him (Rom. 8:9), and must afterwards be immersed into the body, which is the church. Indeed, it corresponds precisely to their conception of the case of Cornelius and his friends, who were *first in the one Spirit*, and afterwards *immersed into the one body*. According to Paul's real collocation of his own words, therefore, the term "immersed" in this passage still means immersed in water, and the only difficulty in the case is found in determining the meaning and proper rendering of *en eni pneumati*.

Before proceeding to grapple with this difficulty, it may be proper to start the inquiry, may it not, after all, be true, that one or the other of the conclusions to which the writer's rendering seems to drive us, is the correct conclusion?

First. Is it not true, that we are brought into the one body by immersion in the Spirit? If so, it is certainly not proved by the passage we have been considering; for, as we have just seen, this passage, even with the rendering in question, contains an entirely different proposition. Again, by the rule which requires the term immersion, when not otherwise limited, to be understood as immersion in water, it is certain that in the latter sense, we are immersed into Jesus Christ, and into his death. This is the one immersion which brings us in the unity of the Spirit into the one body. Moreover, it is certain that neither of the two immersions in the Holy Spirit which are expressly so styled in the Scriptures brought its subjects into the one body. The apostles constituted a part of the body of Christ before they were immersed in the Spirit; and Cornelius and his friends were immersed into the one body, born out of water into the kingdom, *after* they had been immersed in the Spirit. Now, how is it possible for us to maintain that all are brought into the one body by immersion in the Spirit in face of the fact that this is not true of the only persons who were unquestionably so immersed? Even if we had an express declaration that immersion in the Spirit brings us into one body, we would find extreme difficulty, if not an impossibility, in attempting to reconcile it with these facts.

Second. Is not the Baptist hypothesis the true one—that we are all first in the one Spirit, and afterwards, by immersion in water, brought into the one body? If so, we must find the historical facts upon the subject in harmony with this idea. But we find the apostles all in the one body *before* they were immersed in the Spirit; and we find the twelve disciples in Ephesus immersed by Paul "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5-6), *after* which Paul laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit. And lest these should be considered anomalous cases, it was some days, if not weeks, after the Samaritans had been immersed by Philip, that the Holy Spirit came upon them in answer to the prayer of Peter and John: "for as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8:14-17). In all these cases the Baptist idea is reversed; and so it appeared to Paul and Peter in reference to all other cases; for Paul says: "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6); and Peter commands, "Repent and be immersed for the remission of sins, *and you shall* receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

We now proceed to the inquiry, what is the real meaning of the expression, *en eni pneumati*? rendered by the writer, *in one Spirit*, and in the common version, *by one Spirit*. That *en* means in, and must be so rendered when there is nothing to rule otherwise, cannot be denied. And that *en eni pneumati*, standing alone, should be rendered *in one Spirit*, is equally undeniable. But *en* is sometimes rendered by, and must be so, when either the context, or the harmony of Scripture statement requires it. If we were to consult the context alone, there would be found nothing in either the grammatical or logical structure of the sentence to forbid the use of *in*. But we have already seen that other facts and statements in the New Testament forbid the idea expressed by the rendering, "*in one Spirit we were all immersed into one body.*" This alone is sufficient ground for inquiring whether there is any other admissible rendering which will better harmonize with other unambiguous passages. If the laws of the language admit another rendering, we are compelled to seek it; and if New Testament usage furnishes any other in similar connections, we are invited to adopt it.

Now it so happens that there are just three forms in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is expressed by *pneuma* in conjunction with a preposition. These three are *dia* with the genitive, *hupo* with the genitive, and *en* with the dative. Of these three, all of which are rendered *by* or *through* the Spirit, the last occurs *most frequently*; so that the very expression under discussion, which the writer so unhesitatingly renders *in one Spirit*, is the Greek form most frequently rendered *by the Spirit*, and used in declaring that something is done by the Spirit as an agent or actor. That it is correctly thus rendered, will be apparent upon examination of a few of these passages. We find no less than *four* occurrences of this usage in the very chapter which contains the text in dispute, and in the immediate context. We read in the third verse, "No man speaking *en pneumati theou, by the Spirit of God*, calls Jesus accursed; and no man is able to say that Jesus is the Lord, but *en pneumati agio, by the Holy Spirit*." In neither of these cases can we render it *in* the Spirit, because it is evidently the purpose of the writer to express an agency of the Spirit; and because men can say that Jesus is Lord *by* the Spirit, though they be not themselves *in* the Spirit. It was *by* the Spirit as the source of all evidence, and not *in* the Spirit, that men were able to believe in and acknowledge the Lordship of Jesus; and when a man called Jesus accursed, it was proof not merely that he was not *in* the Spirit, but that he did not speak *by* the light which the Spirit afforded through his divine testimony.

Again, in the ninth verse we read, "To another is given faith *en to auto pneumati, by the same Spirit*; to another the gift of healing *en to auto pneumati, by the same Spirit*." Now, the parties on whom these gifts were conferred were all *in* the Spirit, but these gifts were conferred *by* the Spirit, and this is what the apostle here affirms. In the ten verses of this chapter, from the third to the thirteenth, there are twelve things said to be done *by* the Spirit, and *en pneumati* is the prevailing expression, only varied for the sake of euphony by *dia pneumatos* once, *kata pneuma* once, and leaving *en pneumati*, to be understood throughout the tenth verse.

As this criticism constitutes a capital point in this inquiry, I will be excused for accumulating evidence upon evidence in its favor. The two forms *hupo pneumatos* and *en pneumati*, are

used in the same sense by Matthew and Luke in describing the same event. Each says that Jesus was "*led by the Spirit into the wilderness*" (Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1), Matthew using the former expression, and Luke the latter. Peter and Paul do the same thing. In declaring that the prophets of old spake "as they were moved *by* the Holy Spirit," Peter uses *hupo* with the genitive; while Paul, in speaking of the mystery which was not made known to other generations, "as it was revealed to his holy apostles and prophets *by the Spirit*," uses *en* with the dative. (Comp. I Pet. 1:21 with Eph. 3:5). In view of all this evidence, we hold it is undeniable that the expression *en pneumati* is frequently used by the apostles in expressing what is done *by* the Spirit, and that it may be rendered *by the Spirit* wherever it is more suitable either to the context, or to the nature of the subject under discussion in a particular passage.

I think it may now be affirmed that we have established three propositions: *First*, That to render the passage in question, "we were all immersed *in* one Spirit into one body," would be a mislocation of the apostle's words, and untrue to fact. *Second* That it would be equally untrue to render it, "*in* one Spirit we were all immersed into one body," meaning thereby, that we were first in the Spirit, and afterwards immersed into the body. *Third*, That the passage may be rendered, so far as grammatical propriety is concerned, "*by* one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." This last rendering being entirely consistent with New Testament usage, and the only alternative if the first two are rejected, we shall be compelled to adopt it provided it yields a sense in harmony with the context and with other known facts upon the same subject. This is now to be tested.

The writer objects to this rendering, and the meaning it yields, for several reasons which he does not "consume space to state," and for one which he does state. He says, "The long and not very smooth ellipsis which it requires us to supply lies strongly against it." Now, it would be very acceptable to us if the ideas of the apostles were always expressed in such a way as to avoid an ellipsis; but certainly the necessity of supplying an ellipsis is no very serious objection to a certain rendering, provided, the passage is so worded as to readily suggest that ellipsis. But, after all, is there any ellipsis in the passage? It

states that "By one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." The sense is as complete as when it is said we are saved "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." It may, and does, require the supply of a number of words in each of these cases, to show *how* these things are so; but these additional words constitute an *explanation*, and not the supply of an *ellipsis*. The writer supplies what he styles the *ellipsis*, in these words: "By the teaching of the one Spirit through the apostles, we have all been induced to submit to the one baptism in water, and by that act have all become united to and are therefore component members of the one body." I confess that if this were an *ellipsis*, it would be a frightfully long one, and as awkward and unsightly as it is long. But the writer, in the hurry of a closing paragraph, has obviously mis-called an *explanation* by the name of an *ellipsis*; and even as an *explanation*, I fear he has thrown it into the contortions which disfigure it rather for the purpose of making it look ugly. Having a more affectionate regard for it, myself, I can smooth its features and dress it up more handsomely in this style: By one Spirit, as the divine agent moving us thereto, we were all immersed into one body; I declare, that to my eye, this looks very smooth, and it is certainly not very long. It looks, indeed, very much like some of its kindred in the same chapter: for when it is said (vs. 3), that "no man speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed, and no man is able to say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit," the same *explanation* is needed. It is not by the Holy Spirit as actually inspiring every believer, but by the Holy Spirit as the source of all divine evidence of the Lordship of Jesus. When it is said that we must be "*born of the Spirit*," a similar *explanation* is needed, but there is no *ellipsis*.

But we have another passage which presents a still more striking parallel to the one in question. It is I Corinthians 6:11, where Paul says, "you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *en pneumatī, by the Spirit* of our God." Now, they were not washed in the Spirit, neither were they sanctified or justified *in* the Spirit of God. But these were all done *by* the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus. Neither of them, however, was done *directly* by the Spirit. The act of justifying is the prerogative of the Father;

and the Spirit can be said to justify only as he leads us to comply with the conditions of justification. Sanctification is the work of the Spirit, but it is accomplished *through the truth*. As for the washing here mentioned, it evidently refers to the effect of baptism, in which they "*washed* away their sins calling on the name of the Lord." In what sense had this been done "by the Spirit of our God"? Evidently, in the same sense in which Paul says in the same Epistle that, "*by* one Spirit we were all immersed into one body." It was done, in one sense, by themselves; for they obeyed the gospel in immersion. It was done in another sense, by Paul, and Timothy, and Apollos, for they had been immersed by these men. But in still another sense, it was done by the Holy Spirit, for he both directed the administrator in commanding and performing the immersion, and also influenced the subject to submit to it. By the Holy Spirit, therefore, strictly and properly, the Corinthians had been *washed*, and by the same Spirit, in the same act, they had been immersed into one body.

I can but regard it as a serious defect in the article, that the writer did not state more fully his objections to this rendering, and the meaning which it so obviously expresses; and especially, as he must have known that it is the only rendering at all likely to prevail against his own. I attribute this, however, to a fact quite apparent throughout his article, that he had no great confidence in the correctness of his own position, but threw it before the brotherhood rather with the expectation, if not, indeed, the hope, that it would be thoroughly refuted. It is not his way of arguing a question when he is confident that he stands upon unassailable ground.

In the absence of formally stated objections, I can only revert to such as suggest themselves to my own mind. After what I have said concerning the grammatical issue involved, I can think of only one objection likely to strike the mind of a candid reader, which is this—that it appears far-fetched in the apostle, when referring to the person by whom they had been immersed into the one body, to say that it was by the Spirit, instead of saying that it was by Paul, and Timothy, and Apollos, and others, by whom they had actually been led into the water. But this objection is at once set aside, when we remember the purpose for which the whole statement was in-

roduced. The purpose of the whole context was to establish the identity of that one Spirit by whom all spiritual manifestations were effected. He starts the proposition, in the fourth verse, that there are "diversities of gifts, but the *same* Spirit." He then specifies: "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the *same* Spirit; to another *faith* by the *same* Spirit." Other gifts are specified, and he adds, "But all these work that *one* and *self-same* Spirit, dividing to each one severally as he will." Lest it should appear strange to us that he should so earnestly insist upon a proposition which none of us ever doubted, we must remember that to the Corinthians this subject of spiritual manifestations was entirely new, and there were two obvious sources from which they might imbibe the error that Paul is here so earnestly combating. In the first place, the inability of the human mind to comprehend how the same Spirit could speak at the same moment, on a thousand different topics through a thousand different and widely separated individuals, would naturally suggest that these manifestations were the work of a multiplicity of spirits. Again, when they observed that one inspired man had only the gift of tongues, and could not work other miracles, whilst another could work miracles but could not speak in tongues; that one had the gift of healing, but could not prophesy, whilst another could prophesy, but could not heal, it was difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were different spirits, and of different kinds of supernatural power. That this error did actually prevail in the church is rendered certain by Paul's formal attempt to eradicate it. His course of argument consists in showing them that all these diversities of gifts were wrought by one and the same Spirit, distributing to the brethren, as he severally chose, limited and various degrees of his own supernatural power. And finally, in order that they all, both those who had gifts, and those who had not, might know still more definitely what Spirit this was, he tells them it was the same Spirit by whose direction and influence they had all been immersed into one body. Thus we see that the course of his argument most naturally and logically brought him to mention the Holy Spirit in connection with that ordinance by which they had become one body.

We may further remark, here, that the mention of the Holy Spirit in this connection must have had a more vivid effect upon the minds of these brethren, than it can have upon ours. For they recollected that when Paul came among them preaching Christ, he accompanied the word with "demonstrations of the Spirit, and of power," and claimed that he spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches." The whole of this, too, was for the express purpose, that their faith might not rest "in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" (1 Cor. 2:1-13). The Holy Spirit was a visible working power and authority in their presence, and it was with most explicit reference to him that the Corinthians, "hearing, believed and were immersed" (Acts 18:8). When, therefore, Paul refers to the fact that it was "by one Spirit," they had all been immersed into one body, they could be at no loss to understand his meaning. The only reason why our minds do not as readily catch the same thought, is because the Holy Spirit did not exhibit himself, when influencing us, in the same startling "signs and wonders, and diverse miracles" in which he appeared to them. This shows the importance of transferring ourselves to the exact position of parties addressed in the Scriptures, if we would understand allusions which are made to their condition or past history.

That the interpretation of the passage in question which we have now given is the correct one, is confirmed by evidence in the passage itself. That the last clause of the verse, "and were all made to drink into one Spirit," refers to the reception of the Holy Spirit, I would say is indisputable, had it not been disputed by most of the Commentators. (See Bloomfield *in loco*). They refer it to drinking the wine in the Lord's Supper—a reference quite foreign to the subject of the context, and having nothing to suggest it or justify it except the word *drink*. But the drinking in that institution is drinking the blood of the Lord Jesus; not drinking the Holy Spirit. The term *drink* certainly expresses the idea of receiving within us what is drunk; and when used of the Holy Spirit it is scarcely possible that it does not refer to the reception of the Spirit within us. Why the term *drink* should be used in the connection, I would rather account for from the refreshing effects of receiving the Spirit, like a draft of cool water to a man parched with thirst;

than by the writer's conceit that it was suggested by the accident of drinking some water when one is immersed.

If we are right in thus understanding the last clause of the sentence, we are right in our interpretation of the first clause. For after saying that "we were all *immersed in one Spirit* into one body," it would be but a useless repetition to add, "and we were all made to drink into one Spirit." The reception of the Spirit is the fact affirmed in the last clause, and it is presented as something additional to what was said in the first; but if the reception of the Spirit is declared in the first, the last is not an additional fact, but a repetition. We conclude, therefore, that the first clause does not refer to the reception of the Spirit at all. On the contrary, it declares that it was by the Holy Spirit that we were induced to be immersed and become one body; while the last clause declares the additional fact that we all then became partakers of the refreshing influence of the Spirit as a guest within us.

We now dismiss the consideration of this passage; fully persuaded that the common version of it, and the meaning of it as commonly understood among our brethren are correct. With a few paragraphs upon the universality of immersion in the Spirit, we will bring our article to a close.

There seem to me but two methods by which it can be proved that all Christians are immersed in the Holy Spirit: *First*, by producing a declaration of Scriptures to that effect. *Second*, by proving that what is called immersion in the Holy Spirit, is identical with something said to take place with all Christians. The writer attempts the proof upon both of these methods. His main reliance under the first method, is upon the passage which we have just dismissed, and which fails to sustain him. He also makes use of a declaration or prophesy uttered by John the Immerser: "He shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit." He says of this prophesy, "To limit the word *you* in this passage to such persons only as were miraculously endowed, seems to me to be a most unwarrantable restriction." Now, this remark would undoubtedly be correct, if we were compelled to look at John's words alone. But when we are permitted to see a prophesy and its fulfillment both at the same glance, we are not at liberty to interpret one without some reference to the other. The fulfillment, indeed, is often

the only key to a proper interpretation of the prophesy. When this prophesy began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, there were one hundred and twenty disciples in Jerusalem, but it is certain that only the twelve apostles were then immersed in the Holy Spirit. This would require us to limit it forever to them unless we find it extended to others. Consequently, the reader of Acts naturally goes forward from the second chapter, under the impression that it is so restricted, until he is surprised, in the tenth chapter, as all the apostles were, to find the same gift bestowed on Cornelius and his friends (Acts 11:15). This is sufficient proof, that whether the restriction is authorized or not, John's words do not establish the universality of immersion in the Spirit. The writer himself admits that his argument upon these words is not decisive.

We may further observe, that John's prophesy may be, for aught that yet appears, one of those in which the prophet looked to all the wide flowing consequences of the event predicted, and swelled his words beyond their literal fulfillment, to take in this whole area. For it is true that though the immersion in the Holy Spirit may have been confined, as respects the Jews, to the apostles, and as respects the Gentiles, to Cornelius and his friends, yet from this beginning all the good effects of it were spread abroad to all believers, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free. Such prophesies, like that to Abraham, that all the families of the earth should be blessed in him, must always await their fulfillment for the correct adjustment of their limitations.

Under the second method of proof which we have designated, the writer presents one argument which involves the whole question. He says: "If the soul of the inspired man is literally immersed in the Spirit which dwells in him, why not as well the soul of the uninspired be literally immersed in the Spirit which dwells in him?" The argument involved in this question is an attempt to prove the universality of immersion in the Spirit by showing that that which takes place in us all by the indwelling of the Spirit is the same thing that is called an immersion in the case of those who were immersed in the Spirit. If this can be clearly shown the attempt must prove successful. But to establish the identity of two effects, each must be unmistakably and clearly defined. This he well knew,

and he has therefore attempted a definition of immersion in the Spirit. He says correctly that it pertains to the soul; and that it is a literal immersion of the human spirit in the Holy Spirit. It was during his debate with Mr. Caples in the fall of 1860, that this position was first advanced in public discussion, after being thoroughly canvassed in private conference; and I recollect distinctly how it thrilled the vast concourse of brethren who were present, like a sudden emission of new light from heaven; while it astounded Mr. Caples and his friends so completely that nothing more was said about proving *pouring* from the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

This definition is undoubtedly correct. But an immersion of the human spirit in the Holy Spirit necessarily implies *a contact* between the two; and the contact of Spirit with spirit is not contact in its physical sense; but implies vital action of the one Spirit upon the faculties of the other. Such vital action must be contemplated as the chief part of the immersion; otherwise, it would be like the immersion of an inanimate block of wood in some inanimate liquid. The promise of immersion in the Spirit would have been a very empty promise, if it meant nothing more than the envelopment of one spirit in another, like the envelopment of a globule of floating gas in the surrounding atmosphere. The Saviour promised more than this, and there was more than this in the fulfillment of the promise; for when he immersed them in the Holy Spirit he brought about an action of that Spirit both upon their memories and their perceptive faculties. Their memories were quickened and rendered infallibly correct; and their perceptive faculties were lifted to the immediate perception of divine truth.

The writer denies that miraculous endowment was a part of the immersion, and distinguishes it as the work of the Spirit, while the immersion was the work of Jesus. He says it is positively false that the baptism and the endowment are identical; and that it can never be shown that the endowment is an invariable indication of the baptism. There is truth in this distinction; but it is truth which is still consistent with what we have said above. To make this appear, we have only to discriminate more closely in reference to what constitutes miraculous endowment, as distinguished from immersion in Spirit. Now to speak in tongues, to heal the sick, to prophesy, and to

do any miracle is an endowment conferred by the Holy Spirit. These, of course, are distinguished from the *immersion* in the Holy Spirit. But before the Spirit conferred these powers, and in order to conferring them, he was placed in immediate contact with the human spirit, so that the latter became energized by the former. In order to justify calling it an immersion, this divine energizing must have pervaded at least the entire intellectual nature of the human spirit; for it is the intellect that we find directly affected. To separate this from the immersion is to take away from it all vitality, and reduce it, as we have said above, to a mere material immersion like that of one inanimate thing in another. We conclude, therefore, that whilst the power to work miracles, both physical and intellectual, was an endowment conferred by the Holy Spirit, the direct inspiration of the human soul was an essential part of its immersion in the Holy Spirit. This being the case, no one is immersed in the Holy Spirit in whom this inspiration does not take place. But Christians in general, whatever may be said of direct operations on their *hearts*, certainly are not subjects of an immediate impact of the Holy Spirit upon their *intellects*; therefore, Christians in general, are not immersed in the Holy Spirit.

We may reach the same conclusion by another course of argument. There are two events which in the Scriptures are called immersions in the Holy Spirit. There are certain other events similar to these two, which are not called immersions in the Holy Spirit. If, upon examination, we find these two classes of events precisely alike, then the fact that one of them is styled an immersion in the Spirit would justify us in applying the same term to the other. But if, upon examination, there is a marked difference between the two classes, it would be unwarrantable to thus extend the appellation; for no one could know but that this difference constituted the very reason, in the divine mind, why one was called an immersion in the Spirit, and the other was not. Now, upon examination we do find a very great distinction between what is styled immersion in the Spirit, and the indwelling of the Spirit common to all Christians—no less distinction than that in the former the intellectual powers of the subject were completely pervaded and possessed by the Holy Spirit while in the latter there was

nothing of this kind. It is, therefore, *unscriptural* to call the latter immersion in the Spirit.

These two cases of immersion in the Spirit, are still farther distinguished from all other cases of inspiration or miraculous endowment. In all other cases, unless it be that of the Apostle Paul, of which we have no information, the Holy Spirit entered persons in answer to the prayers of apostles, and in connection with the imposition of their hands. In these two, it came upon them direct from Jesus Christ, the administrator of the immersion in the Holy Spirit. The fact, therefore, that these two were administered by Christ, and all others by the apostles, does constitute a material difference between the two; and this difference may be the reason why the latter are not called *immersions* in the Spirit. It would, therefore, be an unwarrantable extension of Scripture phraseology, and would involve the obliteration of distinctions maintained in the word of God, to say that even those brethren who received miraculous gifts by imposition of hands, were immersed in the Holy Spirit.

We have now discussed the salient points in the article before us, and though there are some minor matters mentioned in it of a speculative character, to which we have decided objections, we here dismiss it. We do so with our confidence not at all shaken, but rather strengthened, in the correctness of the views to which the brethren have been accustomed upon this subject. The truth can never suffer by the most thorough and sifting discussion; it must always gain by it. Error alone is afraid of objections, or becomes irritated when they are presented. Truth smiles at the opportunity of more thoroughly vindicating itself, and enters every conflict with calm and hopeful confidence. Let us, then, have all the objections which any man can offer against anything we teach, and let us consider them candidly.

The Witness of the Spirit

(Number I)

"The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" (Rom. 8:16).

In order to our eternal happiness, we must become children of God. In order to our happiness in time, we must know that we are such. He who is in doubt on this subject must be not less unhappy than he who knows he is not a child of God. Indeed, the advantage is on the part of the latter; for he is likely to cast the subject out of his thoughts, and put off the evil day to the last; but the very fact of being in doubt supposes a man to be awakened upon the subject, and to have made some efforts to become a child of God, but such efforts as leave him still uncertain whether his sins, which he mourns, are actually forgiven. His soul hangs in trembling suspense; now thrilled with hope, the more ecstatic from its very uncertainty, and now sunk to the very verge of despair. Such is the experience of thousands of the orthodox worshipers of today. They never attain to more than a "hope" that they are born again; and to often entertain serious doubts is the best evidence that this hope is well grounded. To hear a man express himself with confidence would be to them a ground for suspicion that he was self-deceived. Their religious enjoyment fluctuates with the phases of their hope; and there are no songs

From *Biographies and Sermons of Pioneer Preachers*, arranged and Edited by B. C. Goodpasture and W. T. Moore, Nashville, Tenn., 1954, pp. 327-338.

more popular than those which give expression to these fluctuations. What else has given popularity to these famous lines:

How tedious and tasteless the hours,
 When Jesus no longer I see;
 Sweet prospects, sweet birds, and sweet flowers,
 Have all lost their sweetness to me.
 The midsummer sun shines but dim,
 The fields strive in vain to look gay;
 But when I am happy in him,
 December's as pleasant as May.

Or, why else should men, professing to be Christians, ever sing these doleful strains:

'Tis a point I long to know;
 Oft it causes anxious thought:
 Do I love the Lord, or no;
 Am I his, or am I not?

How unutterable must be the distress, at times, of men who can sing these songs with the spirit and the understanding! And yet, so common is this experience, that men look upon it as the common heritage of those who obey Christ. I dropped in one night at a protracted meeting, and heard the preacher addressing a company of some thirty young converts. He was warning them against certain sins and temptations which they must expect to encounter, and, among others, against what he called the "*sin of despair*." He defined it about thus: "The time will often come, my young friends, when you will seriously doubt whether you have ever been born again. I suppose I can appeal to the experience of every Christian in the house tonight for proof of this. All of us experience seasons when we hang our harps on the willows all the day long, and cannot sing the songs of Zion. When these seasons come over you, beware lest you give up in despair, and turn away again to the weak and beggarly elements of the world." I could but feel pain that such a prospect should be held out before young Christians, and I wondered if this is the unhappy lot which our heavenly Father has assigned us.

Turn to the Bible, and let us see whether there is not something better within our reach than this limping and halting gait at which the people go. The experience of David is that

which most of all gives shape to our modern religion, and just as you might expect, here you find the very fluctuations of hope and despair which we have described. Hear him, in the Twenty-third Psalm: "The Lord is my shepherd, I *shall not want*. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will *fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me.*" What exultation and confidence are here! Who that had listened to these strains, could, for a moment, imagine that the same heart and lips gave utterance to the following plaintive notes: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Why art thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring? O, my God, I cry in the day-time, but thou hearest not; and in the night season, and am not silent." Yet, these are David's feelings as expressed in the Psalm next preceding the one just quoted. Truly, our modern experiences have at least one model in the Word of God. But David lived in a darker dispensation, when the sun of righteousness had not yet risen and thrown his bright light upon the world. When you turn from his to the experience of the apostles, you find all the difference that there is between the uncertain shadows of twilight and the clear light of noonday. Where do you read of Paul, or Peter, or James, or John expressing any doubt as to their relations to God? Not one single note of uncertainty can be found in all their writings. On the contrary, you hear Paul declare: "We are *always confident; knowing* that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord" (II Cor. 5:6-8). To the Romans he says: "Being then *made free from sin*, you became the servants of righteousness." To the Ephesians: "In whom we *have* redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." And to the Thessalonians: "Knowing, brethren, beloved, your election of God." Here all is the language of confidence, of certainty. And so with the other apostles. Peter does not look upon the election of his brethren as a mystery that cannot be solved in life, and that never can be certainly known till the judgment; but he writes, in tones of confidence, to strangers scattered throughout the provinces, as being "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the

Spirit unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ." And John exclaims: "Beloved, we *are now the sons of God*: and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is."

Now, the secret of all this confidence on the part of the apostles and early Christians is found in the passage before us: "The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God." If the spirit of God testified to the fact, how could they doubt it? No wonder, that with such testimony, they were always confident. But, then, you remind me, that our doubters of modern times are the very men with whom this passage is the greatest favorite. In the midst of all their doubts and conflicts, these words are constantly on their lips. Even the preacher, of whom I spoke as addressing some young converts, had, just before that speech, made them all believe that they had the witness of the Holy Spirit itself, bearing witness with their spirits that they were children of God. Yet he was then telling them that they would be certain, in many future days, to doubt this testimony of the Spirit. What was the trouble with the man? Could he and his young converts really doubt what the Spirit of God would testify to? I suppose not. And yet, they are full of doubt while dwelling upon and relying upon the very passage of Scripture which gave the apostles their unwavering confidence. What clearer proof could we possibly have that their understanding of the passage is different from that held by the apostles. And how do they understand it. Why, in the process of their conversion, they have experienced certain emotions, which they are taught to believe are the result of a direct impact of the Holy Spirit upon their spirits, and which they understand as a testimony which the Holy Spirit bears to them that they are children of God. But the trouble is, that they can never be altogether certain that it was the Holy Spirit which they felt. Sometimes they feel as if it certainly must have been; and sometimes they fear that it was merely the workings of their own spirit, mistaken for those of the Holy Spirit. Thus they are tossed to and fro upon the waves of doubt, while the ghostly experience, like a specter in the distance, becomes dimmer and dimmer as time removes farther away, and the shadows of failing memory fall

upon it. The Lord deliver us from such uncertainty, and lead us into the clear light that shone upon the path of the early disciples!

It is easy to see the sense in which the apostles understood this passage, or, rather, the sense in which Paul used it. He supposes an individual asking himself the question, "Am I a child of God?" and sitting down deliberately to find the answer. Now, this is a question of fact, and is to be determined, like any other question of fact, by competent evidence. Further, it depends upon two other facts: 1st. What character constitutes a child of God? 2nd. What character have I? If I can learn with certainty what a man must do and be, in order to be adopted into the family of God, and then ascertain, with equal certainty, what I have done and what I am in those particulars, the question is settled. If what I am, and what a child of God is, are the same, then I am certainly a child of God. If they are different, then I am certainly not a child of God, and there is no doubt about the matter either way.

Each of these subordinate questions is to be settled by evidence, and the witnesses are named by the apostle in the passage. The first is the Holy Spirit. He is the only competent witness whose testimony we have on the first question; for the question as to what character a man must have to be a child of God, depends entirely upon the will of God; for "the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God," and "the Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God." The apostles had heard Jesus testify; but he had not told them all the truth; nor could they, with certainty, remember all that he had said. It was left for the Spirit to bring to memory all that Jesus had spoken, and to lead them into all the truth. Upon the Spirit, then, they depended for all their knowledge of the will of God. If they wished to know what constitutes one a child of God, they learned it from the testimony of the Spirit. They had no other way to learn it, and no other way was needed, for this was infallible. What they learned thus, they spoke with equal infallibility to the world. "God has revealed these things to us through his Spirit," says Paul; "which things we also speak; not in words which man's wisdom teaches, but in words which the Holy Spirit teaches." Others, then, heard the testimony of the Spirit through the lips of those inspired men, and in this

they heard the very words of the Spirit. These words, again, were written down, so that those who had not the opportunity of hearing the living voice of the apostles might have the same words in writing, and suffer no disadvantage, as compared with those who first heard them. We stand in the position of this last class. We have no testimony of the Spirit by inspiration of our own minds, neither have we the living voice of inspired men to inform us; but we have, what is just equal to this in value, the written depositions of the Spirit of God; and these testify, in unmistakable terms, what a man must do to be a child of God.

Lest someone should doubt whether it is scriptural to represent the statements of the Scriptures as the testimony of the Spirit, listen to a few examples of Scripture usage. Nehemiah, in the prayer of the Levites, uses this language in reference to God's dealings with the children of Israel: "Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and *testifiedst* against them by *the Spirit in thy prophets*." Peter says the old prophets searched "what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it *testified* beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." And, still more to the point, in the tenth chapter of Hebrews, Paul, after stating that "by one offering Christ has perfected *forever* them that are sanctified," says: "Of this the *Holy Spirit is a witness* to us;" and immediately quotes a passage from the 31st chapter of Jeremiah as the Spirit's testimony. These passages show that the Spirit's communications to the inspired men themselves—those made through them to living contemporaries, and the same when written down for the instruction of future ages—are all alike regarded and treated as the testimony of the Spirit. Paul, in the passage we are discussing, had reference, no doubt, to all these forms of testimony, for his language is unrestricted, and, therefore, includes all the testimony that the Spirit has given on the subject in hand. But to us, the reference must be practically limited to the written testimony, for this is all we have.

The whole matter of the Spirit's testimony resolves itself into this: that the Holy Spirit, through the Scriptures, testifies that men who pass through certain changes, and maintain, afterward, a certain character, are children of God. Whatever

may be men's theories of spiritual influence, you will find no believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures who will deny that the Spirit does thus testify, or who will not affirm that he communicates ideas on this subject in any other way. And when you come to the details of the testimony itself—whatever may be men's theories of conversion—you will find few to deny that the man who believes with all his heart in the Lord Jesus Christ, who really repents of his sins, and who is really baptized, becomes a child of God. Some will insist that baptism is no part of the process; but none will deny that the true believer, when truly penitent and truly baptized, is a child of God. Here, then we have the unquestioned testimony of the Spirit describing a certain character, who, unquestionably, becomes a child of God.

But, when a man has heard this testimony of the Spirit of God, he is not yet quite ready to say whether he himself is, or is not, a child of God. There is another witness yet to be examined before a conclusion can be reached, and though his testimony is given so briefly and so silently as to be sometimes overlooked, it is, on this account, none the less indispensable. This witness is your own spirit. He is the only witness who can tell you, with certainty, whether you have believed with all the heart, or whether you have really, through sorrow for sin, turned away from it. And still further, in the present distracted condition of the public mind on the subject of baptism, your own soul must testify for itself—as it will answer to God in the great day—whether you have been really baptized.

In respect to our own spirit's testimony, especially, have our friends of the religious parties generally misunderstood this passage of Scripture. They understand the text as if it read: "The Spirit itself bears witness *to* our spirit that we are children of God." This would make but one witness, the Holy Spirit. But Paul has two witnesses, for he says: "The Spirit itself bears witness *with* our spirit." This is an exact translation of the Greek. Now, when I testify *to* my brother, there is but one witness; but when I testify *with* him, he and I are both witnesses, and my testimony agrees with his. This is just Paul's idea. The Holy Spirit itself bears testimony which agrees with the testimony of our own spirit, that we are children of God. The point of agreement is just this, that the

character which the Holy Spirit asserts to be that of a child of God, agrees with what my own spirit asserts to be my own character.

Perhaps someone is ready to object, just here, that it is rather a strange mode of speech, for a man to represent his own spirit as being a witness to himself. But this is not the only passage in which Paul speaks in this way. When speaking of the unbelief of Israel, in the ninth chapter of Romans, he uses this language: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, *my conscience also bearing me witness* in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart." In the Greek we have here the same verb as in our text, so that, more exactly translated, it would read, "my conscience also bearing witness *with* me." Here are two witnesses, himself in the aggregate testifying to the brethren, and his conscience, which does not in every man agree with the spoken words, asserting within him the same thing.

We now have the subject sufficiently before us, to begin to feel the solid ground beneath our feet. When the Holy Spirit testified to Paul what character God would adopt as a child, he could not doubt it; and when he honestly inquired of his own spirit what his own character was, he could not doubt the answer that was given. When these two characters agree, to doubt that you are a child of God is to doubt either your own consciousness, or the words of the Holy Spirit. While you are in your senses, you cannot doubt the former; and until you become a skeptic, you cannot doubt the latter. This is true, not only of your first becoming a child of God, but also of your continuance in the Father's family. It is this more particularly that Paul speaks; for the brethren to whom he was writing had all been in the service of God for some length of time. The Holy Spirit testifies what character a man must sustain, in order to continue in the Father's house, and not, like the prodigal son, wander away and squander what the Father has given in riotous living. My own soul testifies at every point whether these are the traits of my own character. And here it is that I feel most called upon to glorify the favor of God; for at almost every point my own spirit testifies that I come short of the character that the Holy Spirit's testimony prescribes, and were it not for one gracious provision, the answer would

always be, I have become a prodigal. That gracious provision is made through the blood of Christ; for a part of the Spirit's testimony is this, that if the children will confess their sins, they have an Advocate with the Father, who is faithful and just to forgive their sins, and to cleanse them from all iniquity. My own spirit leaps with joy at this, while it testifies that in humble penitence I daily confess to God my daily sins, and thus, from day to day, the Spirit itself still bears witness with my spirit that I am even yet a child of God. This is no airy and unsubstantial means of determining this momentous question, such as prevails in the sectarian world. It is incomparably more solid and reliable than that which modern visionaries have blindly substituted for it. It impels a man, by all the force of his desire, to know his prospects of heaven, to study closely the elements of character prescribed in the Word of God for his imitation, and then to look deeply within himself, not for some mysterious whisperings of the Spirit of God, but for those fruits of the Spirit which characterize the child of God. He who intelligently applies this test, can no more doubt his conclusions than he can his own consciousness, on the one hand, or the Word of God, on the other.

It is not usual, in the New Testament, to find these two witnesses brought together in the strict logical connection which Paul, in our text, makes them assume. Usually the writer alludes to but one of them at a time, presuming upon the reader's acquaintance with the other. One or two, out of many instances, will suffice for illustration of this statement. Paul says to the Corinthians: "Examine yourselves, whether you are in the faith." But how could they decide, by examining themselves, without some standard by which to judge themselves? This standard is furnished in the Spirit's testimony, and the disciples were well acquainted with it. Again, John says: "Hereby we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit which he has given us." But no man knows that he has the Holy Spirit, except by its fruits, as they are developed in his life; and for a knowledge of these he is dependent on the testimony of his own spirit. In every view of the subject, you find a continual necessity for the testimony of both the witnesses, and you always find their testimony sufficient to set the mind at rest, or to make the soul feel the certainty of its orphaned or its alienated estate.

And now, sinner—poor, wandering sinner—would you be a child of God, and an heir of glory? The way is before you. It is no uncertain way. I call you not to dreams and airy visions, but to the highway of the Lord, where your feet, at every step, will tread upon a rock; where the clear light of heaven will shine on your path; or, if the tempest beat upon you, you may never lose your way. You have sinned against heaven, and are no longer worthy to be called a son of God, yet he will receive you, he will fold you to his arms like a tender, forgiving parent, and the tears of your penitence will drown all your sorrow, and melt away into eternal peace. God help you to come, and to come without delay.

The Witness of the Spirit

(Number II)

(Editor's Note: Though it bears the same title and discusses the same text as the former lesson, this one is different in content.)

I propose, not a discussion of the Holy Spirit's office as a witness of Christ, but of that specific office indicated in these words, "The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." This passage is commonly misunderstood as if it read, "The Spirit itself bears witness *to* our spirit, . . ." The orthodox interpretation makes it refer to that mysterious influence in the heart, the experience of which is held to be the assurance of pardon. It is altogether vain to talk to one who claims this experience about the Scripture terms of pardon, for he always appeals to the *witness within*, which with him is more certain than the Word of God.

The passage before us expresses in a condensed, and yet sufficiently elaborate form, the ground on which Paul bases his conviction that he was a child of God. If a man were asked, therefore, what evidence he has of his sonship, his answer, if he reasons like Paul, should be—*The Spirit itself bears witness with my spirit that I am a child of God.* But the popular

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 5, Bethany, Virginia, 1862, pp. 544-549.

interpretation of this answer utterly fails to satisfy those who rely upon it most devoutly, and this should long since have caused them to suspect the correctness of the interpretation. We have learned to suspect everything that the world has been teaching, and to inquire fearlessly into every subject that is open for investigation. We therefore march boldly up to this long venerated sentence, and institute a candid inquiry into its meaning.

It supposes me to be interested as to a question of fact, a fact concerning the relation I sustain to God. It assumes that, like all other questions of fact, this is to be settled by competent testimony. It implies, therefore, a judge who is to decide the question, and witnesses who shall bear testimony; for all these are essential to the trial of such a question. In this case, *my understanding* is the judge, acting deliberately upon my own relations, and to it must the testimony be addressed. The testimony must, therefore, be submitted in an intelligible form, and the witnesses must be unimpeached, in order to a safe verdict.

Who the witnesses shall be in any given case, depends upon the facts to be established. They must be acquainted with the truth or falsity of the facts assumed. But the fact in question in this instance depends upon two other facts, which must be settled first. It is impossible for me to intelligently decide that I am a child of God, unless I ascertain, *first*, what kind of a man a child of God is; *second* what kind of a man am I. If the witnesses who answer these questions agree in describing the same character, the main question is settled in the affirmative. But the first of these questions depends upon the *will of God*, as to whom he will adopt into his family. I must, then, call in a witness who is competent to testify as to God's will. But the only being accessible to us since the ascension of Jesus Christ who is competent to this task, is the Holy Spirit. We are dependent upon him for all that we can know of the present will of God, and even for all we know of what Jesus said when here. This enables us to see the propriety of the position as a witness which is assigned him in our text. We can depend upon his evidence, for "he searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," and he is called "the Spirit of truth."

If I have learned by the testimony of the Holy Spirit what must be the character of a child of God, I have not yet decided whether I am one, until I have carefully inquired as to my own character. I must call in a witness who is competent and will testify honestly upon this fact. This inquiry has respect to all my conduct, by day or by night—most secret words, my un-muttered thoughts and feelings. There is only one witness accessible this side the judgment seat of Christ, competent to testify on these topics, and that is my *own spirit*. My own spirit, by its memory and its consciousness, testifies to my understanding what my own character is. That it is competent to testify, admits of no doubt; and in order to be sure that it testifies honestly, I have only to be honest with myself. I involuntarily rely upon its evidence, and that so confidently that the whole world cannot make me doubt it. If a man should be found doubting the evidence of his own consciousness, he should consider himself insane for it is the insane alone who can be deceived by it.

That these two are the witnesses upon whom Paul relied, he distinctly asserts in our text. The word translated in the common version "beareth witness with," is *summartureo*. It affirms that its subject testifies together with some other witness. Its subject here is "the Spirit itself," and it is followed by "our spirit," in the dative case, dependent on the *sum* in composition with *martureo*. Strictly translated, it would read, "The Spirit itself testifies together with our spirit that we are the children of God." The correctness of this criticism is beyond dispute. Both spirits, then, are witnesses, and each bears its proper testimony, as indicated above.

Lest anyone should regard it as an anomaly that Paul should represent my own spirit as testifying to me—or more strictly speaking, one faculty of my mind testifying to another—we call attention to another very distinct instance of the same thing, in an entirely different connection. In Romans 11:1, he says, "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, *my conscience also bearing me witness* in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart." This is the Common Version, but we have in the original the same *summartureo*; hence it would more properly read, "my conscience testifying together with me." Thus he makes a distinction be-

tween his conscience and himself—himself representing what was immediately accessible to his readers, and his conscience another witness invisible to them, and who does not always concur in the testimony of the lips.

When the Holy Spirit testifies to Paul what character God would adopt as a child, he could not doubt it; and when he honestly inquired of his own spirit what his own character was, he could not doubt the answer that was given. When these two characters agreed, to doubt that he was a child of God would have been to doubt either his own consciousness or the words of the Holy Spirit. He had, then, a most solid ground of being "always confident," only provided that the evidence of these two witnesses was perfectly intelligible to his understanding. We now inquire into the manner in which that evidence was communicated. In this inquiry we may omit the consideration of the testimony of our own spirit, for about that there is no dispute, and confine our attention to that of the Holy Spirit.

To Paul himself the Holy Spirit testified in two different ways — Being an inspired man, divine communications were made directly to his understanding. He says, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them who love him. But God has revealed them to me by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." Whatever, therefore, was in the mind of God, was in the possession of the Spirit, and this Spirit was in Paul communicating to him whatever it was important for him to know. This was in accordance with the Savior's promise to the Apostles, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." By means, then, of a direct communication of ideas to his understanding, the Spirit testified to Paul, and to all the inspired men, the will of God concerning the characters who should be recognized as his children. He undoubtedly has reference to this in the words of our text, and so far as he himself personally was concerned, this was doubtless his chief reference.

But the Holy Spirit also testified to Paul in another method. In Hebrews 10, after asserting that the one sacrifice of Christ is sufficient for the remission of sins for ever, he says

he has the Holy Spirit as a witness of this, and then immediately quotes from the prophet Jeremiah. His words are, "Whereof the Holy Spirit is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them in those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." The argument is this — Since the Holy Spirit declares that God will *remember no more* the sins of those in the new covenant, he becomes by that assertion a witness that there is no more offering for sin. But the testimony borne by this witness is the word of the Prophet. The Apostle Peter expresses the same thought, when he says that the prophets searched "what, or what manner of time the Spirit which was in them did signify, when it *testified* beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." So the old prophets themselves thought, for in the prayer of the Levites, recorded in the ninth chapter of Nehemiah, they use this language—"Yet many years didst thou forbare them, and testifiedst against them by thy Spirit in thy prophets; yet would they not give ear."

In these two ways did the Holy Spirit testify to inspired men. But the great mass of the brethren who were contemporary with Paul were uninspired, and hence necessarily excluded from that testimony which consisted in direct communication of ideas to the understanding. — But in this they suffered no real disadvantage as compared with inspired men; for what the Spirit revealed to the latter by direct inspiration he immediately, through them, communicated to the brethren. "Which things," says Paul, "we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth." When, therefore, the brethren heard either from the Apostles or from other inspired teachers in the various congregations, a statement of the characteristics of the children of God, they were receiving "the witness of the Spirit."

In the course of time the Holy Spirit ceased to communicate ideas to men by direct inspiration, and inspired teachers disappeared from the churches. From that time to this no man has heard the Holy Spirit testify orally through the lips of an inspired man, nor inwardly as he did to the Apostles. Testi-

mony cannot be given without a communication of ideas; hence direct testimony of the Spirit to the understanding would be simply inspiration. He, therefore, who claims to have received such testimony, claims no less than inspiration. Ere inspiration ceased, however, all the testimony which the Spirit had delivered orally was committed to writing, and in addition to this, much was submitted in the epistles which had never been spoken, but appeared first in the written form. By this provision the generations who have not known a living and inspired teacher, have nevertheless been guided into all the truth to which the Apostles attained, and that, too, by the unambiguous testimony of the same Spirit.

To sum up the whole matter, the Spirit itself testified together with the spirits of the first Christians, through the Old and New Testament Scriptures, through the words of living inspired men, and, in the case of the inspired themselves, through immediate communications to the understanding. But the same Spirit testifies now only through the Old and New Testament Scriptures. The whole process of this joint testimony, as respects ourselves, is this — We hear the Holy Spirit itself testify, through the Scriptures, what character shall become a child of God, and who of those that become such are to be recognized as a continuing in that relation. We hear from the testimony of our own consciousness what our own character, in all its secret workings, is; and when these two agree, we know that we are the children of God.

This is no airy and unsubstantial means of determining this momentous question: it is incomparably more solid and reliable than that which modern visionaries have blindly attempted to substitute. It impels a man by all the force of his desire to know his real position, in the sight of God, to study closely the elements of character prescribed in the Word of God for his imitation; and then to look deeply within himself, not for some mysterious whisperings of the Spirit of God, but for those fruits of the Spirit which characterize the life of him who is a child of God. He who intelligently applies this test, can no more doubt his conclusion than he can his consciousness on the one hand or the Word of God on the other.

I am happy to be able to close this article by a quotation from Dr. Chalmers, whose Lectures on Romans is a standard

work. His mind was not altogether clear on this passage, as it could not well be while under the shackles of Calvinism; but he caught some very clear glimpses of the truth, and expresses himself thus: "The part that the Spirit of God hath had in this matter is, that he both graves upon us the lineaments of a living epistle of Jesus Christ, and tells us, in the epistle of the written revelation, what these lineaments are. The part that our own spirit has is, that with the eye of consciousness we read what is in ourselves, and with the eye of understanding we read what is in the book of God's testimony. And upon perceiving that such as are the marks of grace which we find to be within, so are the marks of grace which we observe in the description of that Word without, that the Spirit hath indited, we arrive at the conclusion that we are born of God."

Religious Duties of Children

It is now well understood in the religious world, that before infants arrive at years of moral accountability, their eternal welfare is not endangered. The Savior regarded all such as already accepted by God, and similar in character those who compose the heavenly kingdom. Even those theologians whose theory of man requires them to regard all infants as totally depraved, have in late years provided a supplement to the theory, by which those who die in their infancy are regenerated by the Holy Spirit in the act of dying, and thereby saved. Whatever the theory, then, it is well settled that at this tender age children are safe.

There is another proposition almost as well settled; that at a subsequent period, every child must yield positive obedience to the requirements of the gospel in order to make its salvation sure. At what exact age this change is fully consummated, it is somewhat difficult to determine, and the question is often a very perplexing one to conscientious parents. The best way to determine it is by the religious knowledge and moral development of the child, rather than by its number of years. A child who cannot understand the design of immersion and the Lord's Supper; or who cannot appreciate the obligations imposed by them; or who has not yet acquired strength of purpose sufficient to maintain a religious course of conduct with

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 7, Bethany, W.Va., 1864, pp. 536-539.

some consistency, is certainly not prepared to become a member of the church. The last of these three conditions requires more maturity than either of the former.

To accurately define the point of maturity at which a child should be taught to confess the Savior and be immersed, would meet a great want of this generation. The perplexity which parents often feel upon the subject, and the appeal so often made by preachers more zealous than thoughtful, to little children, that they are not too young to die, and, therefore not too young to obey the gospel, sufficiently indicate the extent of this want. But it is not for this purpose particularly that I now write. I desire to fix more especial attention on that period lying between the time of infantile purity, and the time at which it is proper to be immersed for the remission of sins. Within that period, are there any religious duties for them to perform? Or should they lead an entirely irreligious life? These are primary questions. We need not dwell upon them very long; for if any Christian should hesitate to answer the first in the affirmative, he certainly will not hesitate to answer the latter in the negative. But if our children, during this period, do not lead entirely religious lives, they must perform some religious duties: for they now have some knowledge of right and wrong as respects the will of God, and when they do wrong they feel guilty. They must either bear that sense of guilt, and feel that for the time there is no relief, while they go on adding to it every day; or there must be some way for them to find comfort. They must either know God and Christ, yet never by word or deed do homage to them, or there must be some way in which they can offer worship. The only escape from this alternative is to assume that they ought to be kept totally ignorant of God, and thus be reared in atheistical darkness—a conclusion abhorrent to the soul of every Christian.

From these reflections we are prepared for the conclusion that there is something that children should know and do in the way of religion, before they are old enough to be immersed. This conclusion is sustained by the Word of God: for Paul says, "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger; but bring them up in the instruction and discipline of the Lord." This is the reading of Ephesians 6:4, as rendered correctly by Brother Anderson. If it required us to bring them up only in

the *instruction* of the Lord, the question would arise, why give them a knowledge of the Lord's will except that they may do it. Evidently, that we may do the will of God is the great object for which it is made known to us. But the apostle does not stop here; he adds, that we must bring them up in the *discipline* of the Lord. Discipline has specific reference to the conduct. It forbids some things and enjoins others. The discipline of the Lord requires obedience to his commandments.

Now this apostolic command has no expressed limit; hence we have no right to limit it except by the possibilities of the case. It specifies no particular age at which the instruction shall begin, and by this very omission requires us to begin as early as we can. It specifies no particular portion of the Lord's discipline to which we should subject them, and therefore leaves us to impose all that they can intelligently observe. The capacity of the child to learn and to do, is the only limit to their instruction and discipline.

Is not this, indeed, the universal law of God's government? The parable of the talents, and that of the pounds, show that God holds men accountable according to their capacity; and Paul lays down, upon the subject of giving, the law that "One is accepted according to what he has, not according to what he has not." When a man or a child does all that he can, there is no principle known to the human mind which can require more; yet, in the service of God neither conscience nor the Bible is satisfied with any less.

With this fixed principle as our guide, we cannot have difficulty in determining the religious duties of children. There are three conditions of pardon in the gospel scheme, faith, repentance, and immersion. Of these three, children too young to comply with the last, can comply with the former two. As soon as the little mind can learn the story of the cross, it can, and it does believe it. There is no room for the question whether it ought to believe; for ere you ask the question, it believes already. Again, it no sooner discovers that certain things are sinful in the sight of God, than it finds itself guilty; and in its unimpassioned moments, without waiting to be commanded, it repents. If, then, the child can believe with all its little heart, and repent of all its known sins, who shall say that this is not its duty?

But there are several things necessary to holy living, besides these three. We must, in addition to the observance of ordinances, love God; thank him for his goodness; supplicate his mercy; pray for what we need; and minister to the wants of the poor. Can the little children of whom we speak do these things? They certainly can love God and the Savior, and every well instructed child does love them. If poorly instructed, it may simply fear God, and tremble at his name; but if informed of his real character, the little heart responds with affection as instinctive as that for his own father, or some indulgent relative. Moreover, to learn that he is the giver of all good is to thank him at once for all his kindness, and to ask him for protection in the future. The child, conscious of sin, and sorrowing over it, can pray for mercy, and for all needed good: and if it can do so, honestly and intelligently, who will say that it ought not? Who, rather, will not insist that it shall? The child can also be benevolent; and every one to whom it is even suggested, will be ready, with a little tear of sympathy in its eye, to part with some of its own good things for the benefit of the suffering.

To sum up the result of these reflections, I conclude with all confidence, that the child who is yet too young to be immersed, should believe in and love the Lord; should repent of all its known transgressions; should render thanksgiving, supplication, and prayer to God; and should practice benevolence as a religious duty. If these are all it can yet do, the Lord requires of it no more. If it fails to do these, then either the child or the parent is at fault, and it is almost certain not to be the child. Christian parents, think of this. Ponder solemnly the duty you owe that little child whom God has committed to your care. It has a God to glorify; but it cannot glorify him or know him without your aid. It may be snatched from your embrace by the icy hand of death, and O how bitter will be your thoughts, if you send it into the presence of a God it has not learned to love, defiled with little sins of which it has not repented. We are sending many of the little lambs into the presence of the great Shepherd; let us be able to say, of them all, Lord, they know what they were able to learn, they have done all that they were able to do. It has been my lot to have one such little one torn from the very center of my heart, and

borne to the silent land; but her dying lips bore witness that she loved the Savior; and for years before, her nightly prayers and the tears of penitence which sometimes glistened in her eye, bore witness that she was being brought up in the instruction and discipline of the Lord. I have had no higher honor, though I have had no deeper sorrow, such is the weakness of my soul, than to commit such a child to the keeping of him whom she knew and loved so well.

The Church and the New Testament

It is true, in one sense of the terms, that we are indebted to the Church for the New Testament, and not to the New Testament for the Church. It is true, because the Church was in existence before the books composing the New Testament were written; because these books were written by apostles and evangelists who were members of the Church; because to members of the early Church we are indebted for our historical evidence of the canonicity of these books; and because the Church has preserved the New Testament from age to age.

On the other hand, there is a sense in which we are indebted to the New Testament for the Church. It was by means of the facts and truths embodied in the New Testament that the Church was brought into existence, and it is by means of the same facts and truths that its existence has been continued until this day. Had the New Testament writings been lost, the Church would long since have lost its identity. Everything good and true within the Church today has been derived from the New Testament, and this has been the case ever since the hearers of the original preachers passed away.

But in all the above there is nothing conceded to those who, in the Roman Catholic sense of the terms, are constantly reiterating the declaration that we are indebted to the Church for our New Testament. They mean that Protestants are indebted

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, May 15, 1873.

to the Roman Catholic Church for the New Testament, that this Church, by her councils, settled the canon of the New Testament by deciding between the genuine and the spurious books which claimed a place in the sacred list. The reader will recollect that this Romish pretence was put forward in the *Christian Quarterly* by the writer whose article on Ecclesiastical Polity was recently reviewed in this paper. He went so far as to affirm that "even as late as A.D. 325, the Council of Nice was compelled to settle the canon, and decide between the genuine writings of the apostles, and the flood of spurious Acts, Gospels, and Epistles, which were everywhere circulating, and in many places accepted as parts of the Holy Scriptures." The writer betrays in this affirmation the same want of accuracy which marks his entire article. The fragmentary history of the Council of Nice which has come down to us, contains no account of any action at all on the subject. The question was not even brought before this Council. The Greek Council of Laodicea was the first Council of bishops which took any action at all on the canon, and it convened A.D. 363. This Council published among its decrees a catalogue of the canonical books as they are now received, with the exception of Revelation.

But it was not the authority of this or of subsequent councils that settled the canon for early Christians, or that enables modern scholars to distinguish the spurious from the genuine books of the New Testament. The canon had already been settled in the minds of the great mass of Christians, and catalogues of the genuine books had been published before the meeting of the Council of Laodicea, so that all this council did in the matter was to recognize the canon which was already received by the churches at large. The first of these catalogues was Origen's, published about A.D. 225; the second, that of Eusebius, A.D. 315; the third, that of Athanasius, A.D. 326; and the fourth, that of Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 348. These catalogues, running back more than a hundred years beyond the action of the councils on the subject, show how utterly fabulous is the conception that to these councils we are indebted for the settlement of the canon.

The truth is that the student of the present generation has the same means of determining this question that were in pos-

session of the bishops assembled in the council of Laodicea. The latter lived too late to know anything at all of the subject except through the testimony of those who lived within and near to the apostolic age. By the writings of those earlier disciples, called the Apostolic Fathers, the question was settled then, and by the same writings it is settled now. Indeed, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius and Cyril, made out their catalogues on the authority of those who lived before themselves, and the scholar of the present age can quote the very words of men who lived within the age of inspiration for the canonicity of twenty out of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. See an epitome of this evidence in Milligan's *Reason and Revelation*.

From this very brief statement of facts the reader can see the pretense of Romanists, and of shallow imitators of Romish writers, that Protestants are dependent on the testimony and authority of Roman Catholic Councils for the canon of the New Testament, is utterly baseless and shameless. It is so far from being true, that, instead of even listening to such evidence, the Protestant feels constrained to go back beyond the earliest of all the Ecumenical Councils, in order to find evidence on the subject that is worthy of the name.

We would be in a sorry predicament if we had to depend for our knowledge of this subject on a church which, by her councils of later date, has dared to pronounce canonical the very defective Latin translation of the Scripture, and to add to the canon of the Old Testament the Apocrypha, which even the Jews themselves never regarded as inspired. Let us be done with this driveling nonsense about our indebtedness to Rome. The debt which we owe to the old Mother of Harlots is one of a very different kind, and our Lord will pay it for us in his own good time.

Unwritten Creeds

The position that the Bible and the Bible alone should be our creed is so obviously correct, that men everywhere realize the advantage which it gives us, and they have made the most strenuous exertions to rob us of it. The most popular cry at present against the position is, that though we have no written creed, we have an unwritten one, that is just as binding and as rigidly enforced as any written creed. Even some of our own brethren, when they begin to wander into forbidden paths, and find the force of public sentiment against them, make the discovery that we have an unwritten creed, and that we enforce it very tyrannically.

If this charge is true, we ought to confess it honestly, and repent of our past duplicity. But is it true? If it is, someone who knows it to be so ought to be able to point out the articles of this creed. We confess ourselves unable to point out a single one. Is the belief in immersion one of them? What we believe in regard to this is not unwritten; it is written in the plainest words in the New Testament. What could be plainer than this: "Buried with Christ in baptism, wherein we are also risen with him by faith in the operation of God which raised him from the dead"? Is the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins one of them? It is also written in so many words in the Scriptures, and if we had a written human creed, we could not write this

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, April 30, 1874.

article more plainly. So of repentance; so of the confession; so of the Lord's supper; so of our church officers, elders and deacons; and so of every single item of faith, ordinance and church organization which we teach.

There are some negations which we are in the habit of announcing which are not written in our creed; such as the denial of infant baptism, of sprinkling, or the mourner's bench, of pardon before immersion, of ceremonials, of church officers and church courts not named in the Scriptures, etc. But these cannot be called articles of an unwritten creed; for they are nothing more than denials that these things are authorized by our written creed, the Word of God. If a Presbyterian denies that diocesan episcopacy is authorized by the creed of his church, no one would speak so absurdly as to say that this denial is an article in an unwritten creed which he has in addition to his written creed; why, then, be so hard as to charge us with having an unwritten creed because we deny that certain things believed in the churches are taught in, or authorized by the Bible?

When any man says we have an unwritten creed, I deny it, and challenge him to present a single article which belongs to such a creed. Everything which we require men to believe in order to fellowship with us is written, and written in the Word of God; and every thing which we deny is denied because it is not written therein. Our creed, then, is not only a written one, but we bind ourselves so closely to it that we refuse to believe anything of divine authority that is not in it. This cannot be said by the inhereents of any other one creed; for besides all that is in their own creed they believe much that is contained in ours and not in theirs.

Instrumental Music in Churches

In the earlier years of the present Reformation, there was entire unanimity in the rejection of instrumental music from our public worship. It was declared unscriptural, inharmonious with the Christian institution, and a source of corruption. In the course of time, individuals here and there called in question the correctness of this decision, and an attempt was occasionally made to introduce instruments in some churches. It was at first a sufficient objection to such attempts, that a large portion of the congregation were offended by them, and that the Scriptures forbid giving offense to the brethren. But more recently, congregations have been found who are almost, if not altogether unanimous in favor of instruments, and upon the principle of church independence, they have assumed the right to make use of them without regard to the wishes of other congregations. If the practice is in itself innocent, then these congregations act upon a correct principle, and others have no right to interfere or complain. Moreover, in that case, the taste and judgment of the majority in every congregation ought to rule, and the minority should cheerfully acquiesce. This state of things changes somewhat the practical character of the issue, and places it before us as an original question. As such, we must discuss it upon its merits; we must call in, for the time, our former decision, renew the original investigation; lay aside all feeling pro and con, and start anew the inquiry, Ought we to make use of musical instruments in public worship?

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 7, Bethany, W. Va., 1864, pp. 510-514.

By what standard shall we judge of this question? If there is any Scripture authority on the subject, then of course we must hear that first, if not, then expediency must supply the test. If the Scriptures leave us at liberty, we must decide whether to exercise the liberty of using the instruments or the liberty of disusing them, according as experience and sound judgment may dictate. But if the Scriptures do not leave us at liberty, then we have no right to appeal to expediency, except for the purpose of vindicating the decision of the Scriptures.

If these observations are correct, our first, and it may be, our final appeal is to the Word of God. To this we confine the present article.

It is sometimes assumed by the advocates of instrumental music, that the Scriptures do furnish authority in its favor. They find this authority in the fact that instruments were used in the temple worship of the Jews, and that they are also represented as being used by the angels in heaven. In view of these two facts, two questions are propounded: first, Can that be wrong in the Christian congregation, which was acceptable to God in the Jewish congregation? I answer, it may be. The offering of victims, the sprinkling of blood, the burning of incense, and the perpetual light of burning lamps were acceptable to God in Jewish worship; but they are not in Christian worship; and so may instrumental music not be. But in view of the second fact, it is asked, can that be wrong among saints on earth, which is right among saints and angels in heaven? I answer again, it may be. Angels and saints in glory may be granted privileges which ought not to be granted to men in the flesh; for that may be harmless there which would be dangerous here, as children must be denied privileges which older persons may enjoy with impunity. If, then, the inhabitants of heaven do literally use harps of gold, which may well be doubted, it may still be unsafe and improper that harps or any other musical instruments should be used in Christian congregations.

How, then are we to decide whether a certain element in Jewish worship, or in the worship of heaven, is acceptable in the Christian church? Undoubtedly we are to decide it by the teaching of the New Testament, which is the only rule of

practice for Christians. Whatever is authorized by this teaching is right, and whatever it condemns is wrong in us, whether it belong to the service of the Jews or the service of angels.

But it is argued that the New Testament is silent upon the subject of instrumental music, and we are therefore left to judge of what would be acceptable to God, by what he did accept in Jewish worship. Now it must be admitted that the New Testament is silent upon this subject, and that this argument is at least plausible. But is it conclusive? Before we affirm that it is, we should first look ahead, and see whether the affirmation will not involve some unwelcome consequences.

There is nothing said in the New Testament about burning incense in connection with Christian worship; it was authorized in Jewish worship, and it is represented in John's vision, as accompanying the worship of the angels. Shall we thence argue, that in the silence of the New Testament, these facts should be taken as an indication of the divine will, and like the Catholics, shall we burn incense in our public worship? Shall we, for the same reason, keep lamps or candles burning in our churches, and array our preachers in gorgeous robes? For all these the argument is valid, if it is valid for instrumental music. If, therefore, we adopt the latter, we dare not pronounce any man or any church unscriptural in practice, that adopts the other three. In whatever light this conclusion might appear to a Catholic or an Episcopalian, it must certainly convince every disciple that the argument from which it springs is unsound. When we come to discover the exact fallacy which it involves, we may get hold of a thread of thought which will completely reverse the conclusion.

This argument is based upon the assumption that whatever was practiced in the Jewish worship may be in Christian worship, provided the New Testament does not condemn it. This assumption forms the major premise of the argument, and we see, from the examples just adduced, that it is inadmissible.

The true method of arguing in reference to Jewish acts of worship must place the subject in an entirely different light. We may lay it down as an indisputable proposition; at least,

one not to be disputed among us, that we cannot know what acts of worship are acceptable to God, except by express statements of revelation. Furthermore, seeing that in different dispensations there are some differences in the acts of acceptable worship, we cannot know what is acceptable under a particular dispensation, except by express statements of revelation with reference thereto. We cannot, therefore, by any possibility, know that a certain element of worship is acceptable to God in the Christian dispensation, when the Scriptures which speak of that dispensation are silent in reference to it. To introduce any such element is unscriptural and presumptuous. It is will worship, if any such thing as will worship can exist. On this ground we condemn the burning of incense, the lighting of candles, the wearing of priestly robes, and the reading of printed prayers. On the same ground we condemn instrumental music.

Let it be observed that we here confine ourselves to acts of worship. All that has been said by advocates of music instruments about the silence of the Scriptures in reference to Colleges, Missionary Societies, etc., is wide of the mark. We might be excusable for adopting means not mentioned in the Scriptures, for spreading a knowledge of the gospel, and still inexcusable for introducing in our worship of God, an element which he has not authorized.

Some writers, more sharp than logical, have endeavored to reduce this argument to absurdity by insisting that if we must avoid the use of instruments because they are unauthorized, we must also lay aside the note book, the tuning fork, and even the hymn book. But the hymns and spiritual songs authorized by the New Testament were human compositions, and the right to sing implies the propriety of everything necessary to singing. The notes of the scale, and some standard of sound, being necessary to the art of singing, are therefore innocent and Scriptural. But the same cannot be said of an instrument designed to control the singing, and to constitute the chief element in the joyful sound which fills the house of worship. It cannot, therefore, be justified on this ground.

If not, any man can mention an act or an element of worship known to be acceptable to God, but not authorized by the New Testament, he will prove this argument against in-

strumental music in the church to be invalid. I know not how it can be done in any other way.

But I have another argument based upon this same silence of the New Testament, to which I invite especial attention. Whether silence in reference to a practice implies approbation or disapprobation, sometimes depends upon the circumstances of the case. In the present case we will see that it implies most emphatic disapprobation.

The Christian worship was instituted by inspired men who had every one been reared under the Jewish economy, and who in more than one instance exhibited a strong disposition to perpetuate its usage in the Christian church. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit they did perpetuate some of those usages; but discontinued others. Seeing, now, that all the acts of Jewish worship had been appointed by divine authority, the only conceivable reason why any of them were discontinued must have been that they were unsuited to the Christian worship. The very fact, therefore, that any part of the Jewish worship was discontinued by those who organized the Christian church, is a direct condemnation of it by the Spirit of God, as unsuited to the new institution. But the use of instrumental music is an element of Jewish worship which was thus discontinued, and, therefore, it is condemned by the infallible authority of the Spirit.

I wish this argument to be examined carefully and candidly. It is briefly stated, but I trust it will be understood. If it is valid, nothing more need be said against instrumental music among lovers of the truth; and certainly nothing more should be said in their favor unless it can be set aside. On it and its predecessor I now rest the case, so far as Scripture authority is concerned, and I would be glad to hear from any brother who thinks he can reply successfully to either. The brethren who have adopted or advocated instrumental music in the church owe it to themselves, to their brethren who differ from them, and to the good name of our common sense, to meet the issue in candid, fraternal discussion. Let us, then, have the question fully discussed and finally settled.

The Eldership: Titles and Duties of the Office

The term eldership means *the office of an elder*. This assertion will be proved in proving that an elder is an officer. The termination *ship* appended to the title of an officer, as *secretaryship*, *auditorship*, *governorship*, is indicative of office.

But there are some, who deny that the term elder is ever used in the New Testament in an official sense. They hold that it always means *older person*, and that the eldership of a church consists of the older men of the church. We are now to test the correctness of this assumption, and to determine whether *elder* is every used as an official title.

It is well known that the term elder is adjective in the comparative degree, and that its primary meaning is *older*. When used as a substantive, it means an *older person*. The same is true of its Greek representative, *presbuteros*. It is also well known that many words have, in addition to their primary meaning, a technical or official signification. For example, the familiar adjective *general* is sometimes used as the title of a military officer. *Major*, *greater*, is the title of another; and *corporal* which means pertaining to the body is the title of still another. So the terms *secretary*, *auditor*, *judge*, *mate*, *professor*, and many others, have each an official as well as a primary signification. So it may be with the term *elder*. Whether it is so or not is to be determined, as the same question is determined in reference to these other words, by usage. We will now

From *A Treatise on the Eldership* (a series of articles originally published in *The Apostolic Times*. Reprinted by DeHoff Pub., Murfreesboro, Tenn., 1956, pp. 10-29.

examine its New Testament usage sufficiently to settle this question.

The following statement is made concerning Paul and Barnabas while engaged in their first missionary tour: "When they had *ordained them elders* in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed" (Acts 14:23). The term here rendered *ordained* is *cheirotoneo*. It is compounded of *cheir*, the *hand*, and *teino*, to *stretch forth*, and its primary meaning is *to stretch forth the hand*. But from the fact that bodies of men frequently expressed a choice by an elevation of the hand, it acquired the meaning of *to choose* or *to appoint* by an extension of the hand; and finally it came to mean to appoint without reference to the method of appointing. Such is the testimony of scholars, and it is confirmed by the usage of the term. It occurs in only one other place in the New Testament, where it is said of an unnamed brother whom Paul sent to Corinth with Titus, that he "*was chosen* by the churches" (II Cor. 7:19). How the churches chose him, whether by a show of hands or in some other way, is not determined by this term, nor by the context. Another instance of its use is found in Josephus. He represents Alexander Bala, the Syrian king who claimed jurisdiction over Judea, as writing to Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabaeus, these words: "We therefore *do ordain* thee this day high priest of the Jews." Here there was not stretching out the hand, but an appointment to office by a single individual, and through the instrumentality of a letter. Clearer proof of the definition we have given could not be demanded.

Substituting this definition for the term *ordained* in the passage we are considering, we read that Paul and Barnabas "*appointed*" for them elders in every church. These elders, then, were made such by appointment; but Paul and Barnabas certainly did not make *older men by appointment*; neither would the passage make complete sense if it read, "They appointed for them older men in every church." To complete the sense, it would be necessary to add the office or position to which the older men were appointed. The considerations show that the term is here used not in its primary sense, but in a sense which designates position obtained by appointment. But an appointment puts men into office, and *elder* is therefore the

official title conferred by this appointment. The process of appointment will be considered in another part of this treatise.

The same conclusion follows from Paul's statement to Titus: "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and *ordain elders* in every city" (Tit. 1:5). The term here rendered *ordain* is *kathisteemi*, the Greek word most commonly used in both the New Testament and the Greek version of the Old Testament, for appointing to office. It is used to express the appointment of Joseph as governor over Egypt, and of the other officers under him (Gen. 12:33-34; Acts 7:10); for the appointment of David as ruler over Israel (II Sam. 6:21); for the appointment of rulers over household servants (Matt. 24:45); of a judge in civil jurisprudence (Lev. 12:14; Acts 7:27); and of Jewish high priests (Heb. 5:1; 8:3).

Now, the fact that this term so frequently expressed the idea of appointment to office does not necessarily prove that it has this meaning in any given passage. Whether it does or not, is to be determined by the context and we should always try its primary meaning first. Its primary meaning is *to set or place* locally. It is so used twice in the New Testament (Acts 17:15; Jas. 3:6). But Paul could not mean that Titus was to set elders or place elders in every church. There would be no good sense in such a rendering, and therefore, the secondary sense of the term must be adopted. With the universal consent of scholars and critics, we render it *appoint*. Titus, then was to *appoint* elders in every city, and the term elders designates the office to which they were appointed.

We shall not regard it as an established fact that the term elder is sometimes used in the New Testament as an official title. In this fact we find further proof of our first proposition, that there is such an office in the church as the eldership. We shall find, as we proceed, still further confirmation of both these conclusions. In the meantime, we must prescribe a rule by which to distinguish between those instances in which the term elder is used in its primary sense and those in which it has its official sense. The law of the context, the first great law for ascertaining the meaning of ambiguous terms, must be our guide. When the context indicates that a comparison as to age is intended by the writer, we must give the term its primary sense of *elder*; but when the context shows that the persons

spoken of sustain an official relation to the church, it must be understood in its official sense. In nearly all instances the distinction is drawn; in a few, the meaning is somewhat uncertain. We shall see and know more of these instances as we proceed further with the discussion.

The second title of this office which we shall consider is expressed by the Greek word *episcopoe*, rendered in the English version once *bishoprick* and once *office of a bishop*. It is derived from the verb *episcopeo*, whose primary meaning is *to look upon*; but in usage it conveys the idea of looking upon with a view to inspection or control. The noun, *episcopoe*, therefore, means *inspection* or *oversight*; and from the fact that visiting is often done for the purpose of inspection, it is sometimes rendered *visitation*. The *visitations* of God were sometimes for good and sometimes for evil to the party visited, and this term is used in both cases. See Luke 19:44 and Isaiah 10:3, *Septuagint*.

We have also, from the same root, the masculine noun *episcopos*, which means the man who performs the act designated by *episcopeo*, and is best represented in English by *overseer*. The term *bishop*, by which it is most usually rendered in the common version, is objectionable on two accounts: *first*, it does not correspond in meaning to the original; *second*, it conveys a meaning to the mass of readers not attached to the original word. *Overseer* corresponds to the original, in etymology, and also in current meaning, and it is the only English word which does so. It should, therefore, be adopted into the English version, and into the speech of those who would call Bible things by Bible names.

Now, it is not claimed for either of these substantives that in its primary sense it refers to an office in the church; for primarily, neither has any allusion to the church. But it is claimed that like the term *elder*, they acquired an appropriated sense, one of them becoming the title of a church officer, and the other the name of his office. The proof of this we will now present; and we beg the reader to remember, lest he grow weary of these apparently useless inquiries, that we are now discoursing upon this subject as though nothing were known of it, and we must therefore take nothing as granted. We

happen also to know that there is practical need for this part of our inquiry.

The Titles Explained

1. The term *episcopos*, *overseer*, is used as the equivalent of *elder* in its official sense. This is clear from the use of the two terms in the 20th chapter of Acts. Luke says that from Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus and called the *elders* of the church. Here, according to a rule already established, *the elders* of the church must mean, not the older men, but those called elders officially. But Paul says to these elders, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you *overseers*." The elders, then, and the *overseers* in the church at Ephesus were the same persons, and *overseers* is but another title by which they are known. Moreover, they had been made overseers by the Holy Spirit, which implies that by some process dictated by the Holy Spirit, they had been formally placed in that position. This corresponds to the appointment by which we have seen that persons entered the eldership, and is sufficient to establish the presumption that they were made overseers by the same appointment which made them elders. We have further proof of this use of the term in the epistle to Titus. Paul says, "I left thee in Crete that thou shouldst ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless . . ." and then adds, "For an overseer must be blameless." Now, the fact that an overseer should be blameless, could be no reason why a blameless person must be ordained elder, unless an elder is the same as an overseer. It is the same as if I should say to a literary society of students, Appoint a President of your society, if any be found acquainted with parliamentary rules; for the chairman of such a society should be acquainted with these rules. Now, in this example, if a person knew nothing more of the word chairman than its etymology would indicate, *the mart of the chair*, he could not fail to see that I used the term as another title for the President of the society. It is equally clear in the case before us, that Paul uses the term overseer as another title for him who is called elder.

2. The term *episcopoe* is used to designate the position occupied by the *episcopos*, or overseers. This is seen in I

Timothy 3:1-2. Paul says, "If a man desires *episcopee* he desires a good work. An *episcopos*, then, must be blameless, . . ." Here it is clear that he who desires *episcopee*, desires to be *episcopos*. If *episcopos* is overseer, then *episcopee* must be the position of an overseer; and what shall we call this position in English? Mr. Green translates it "*a post of oversight*," not a bad expression of the meaning. He renders it in the same way in Acts 1:20. "*His post of oversight* let another take." I prefer the single word *overseership*, because it is shorter, and corresponds more closely to the correlative term *overseer*. Whatever be the expression, however, the idea remains the same, and the term designates the office held by an overseer.

It is here objected by some, that we should not call the overseership an *office*, because Paul in this passage expressly calls it *a work*: "If any man desires the overseership, he desires a good work." Undoubtedly, it is a work; and so is every office in either church or State, unless it be a mere senecure. The fact that it is a work makes it none the less an office. If the President of the United States were to say, "He who desires a foreign mission desires a heavy work," it would not be inferred from the term work that a foreign mission is not an office.

The conclusion thus naturally and necessarily springing from these passages of Scripture will be confirmed as we proceed to develop the functions of the office. We will find that the elders or overseers of the church are charged with such duties, and entrusted with such authority as makes them officers of the church in the fullest sense of the term.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, we must notice another question which has caused confusion in some minds. It has been assumed that the elders constitute a class out of which the overseers are chosen; the elders being the older men of the church, and the overseers the officers. We have already answered this question by showing that the term elders is used in an official sense to designate the same persons as the overseers. The elders of the church at Ephesus were all embraced in the term overseers; for, as we have seen, *the* elders, not merely a part of them, had been made overseers.

The third and last official title which we shall notice is *pastor* or *shepherd*. This term, in the substantive form, is used

but once in the New Testament with reference to church officials. It is in the well known passage, Ephesians 4:11, where *pastors* are enumerated among the gifts bestowed upon the Church by Christ. The evidence that this term designates the *overseers* or *elders*, is conclusive, and may be briefly stated. The Greek term for shepherd is *poimeen*, and the verb *poimaino* means *to do the work of a shepherd*. Now, he to whom this verb applies is a shepherd, just as he who sows is a sower, he who reaps is a reaper, he who speaks is a speaker, he who sings is a singer, etc. But Paul exhorts the overseers in Ephesus "*to be shepherds* to the church" (Acts 20:28), and Peter exhorts the elders of the churches to which he writes, "*Be shepherds* to the flock of God which is among you," and promise that when the "*chief shepherd*" shall appear, they shall receive a crown of glory. They, then, were shepherds and Christ, the chief shepherd.

The term *pastor*, the Latin for shepherd, has come into common use from the influence of the Latin version of the Scriptures. There is one all-sufficient reason for preferring our own Anglo-Saxon term *shepherd*. It is found in the fact that *pastor* has become perverted by sectarian usage, and designates in popular phraseology, an entirely different office from the one to whom it is applied in the Scriptures. It has become a synonym for a settled preacher, and is often used for the purpose of distinguishing the preacher from those who are Scripturally called the *pastors* of the church. It will perhaps be impossible to recover the term from this abuse, and, therefore, it is better to throw it away.

Another good reason for preferring *shepherd* is, that its primary meaning is familiar to the most illiterate reader, and the metaphor by which the overseer is thus styled is perfectly intelligible to everyone; whereas, the term *pastor* is known to the masses only in its appropriated sense.

Duties of the Office

The title of an office is often taken from some characteristic duty belonging to it. Thus the title President is taken from the act of presiding; Secretary from the act of writing; Auditor (*hearer*) from the act of hearing financial reports. In such cases, the information derived from the title is generally

meager. In some instances, however, officers newly created adopt the titles of previously existing offices which are similar to them; and in such instances the titles carry with them all of their previous significance, except so far as this is modified by the nature of the new office. Thus the term President, which first meant one who presides over an assembly and enforces order in its proceedings, when transferred to the chief officer of a college, and to the chief magistrate of the United States, carried with it the chief part of its previously acquired meaning. Now, it so happens that all the titles by which the Elder of a church is known were adopted from previously existing offices, and brought with them into their new application much of their former significance. That significance will enable us, therefore, to obtain a general idea of the duties of the office, and to better appreciate the more specific statements of the Apostles which will afterwards be considered.

The title *Elder*, which is most frequently used by the Apostles, and which is still the most popular of these titles, obtained an official signification among the Jews long before its adoption into the Christian Church. Originally it designated the older men, or heads of families in Israel, who exercised a patriarchal government over their posterity (See Ex. 4:29; 19:7.) In the days of Christ it had become the title of the rulers of the Jewish synagogues, and of one of the classes composing the Sanhedrim. Reliable information in reference to the functions of the office among the Jews is quite meager; but it is sufficient to justify the assertion that those who enjoyed the title exercised authority in some capacity. When it was adopted, therefore, into the Christian Church, it brought with it at least this general idea, that those to whom it was applied were rulers in the church. The exact nature and limits of their authority it could not of course designate.

The term *episcopos* brought with it a more clearly defined significance, and furnishes more definite information in reference to the duties of the office. Among the Athenians it was the title of "magistrates sent out to tributary cities, to organize and govern them" (see Robinson's N.T. Lexicon, and references there given). Among the Jews it had very much that variety of application which the term overseer now has in English. It is used in the Septuagint for the officers appointed

by Josiah to oversee the workmen engaged in repairing the temple (II Chron. 34:12, 17); for the overseers of workmen employed in rebuilding Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. 11:5, 14); for the overseers of the Levites on duty in Jerusalem (Neh. 11:22); for the overseers of the singers in the temple worship (Neh. 12:42); and for subordinate civil rulers (*Jos. Ant.* 10. 4. 2). In all these instances it designates persons who have oversight of the persons for the purpose of directing their labors and securing a faithful performance of the tasks assigned them.

Such a word when applied to a class of officers in the Christian Church, necessarily carried with it the significance already attached to it. It indicated, both to Jew and Greek, that the persons so styled were appointed to superintend the affairs of the church, to direct the activities of the members, to see that everything was done that should be done, and that it was done by the right person, at the right time, and in the right way. Anything less than this would be insufficient to justify the title *overseer* as it was currently employed in that age. The details of the process by which all this was accomplished will appear as we advance.

The title *Shepherd* is still more significant than either of the other two. The Jewish shepherd was at once the ruler, the guide, the protector, and the companion of his flock. Often, like the shepherds to whom the angel announced the glad tidings of great joy, he slept upon the ground beside his sheep at night. Sometimes, when prowling wolves came near to rend and scatter the flock, his courage was put to the test (John 10:12), and even the lion and the bear in early ages rose up against the brave defender of the sheep (I Sam. 17:34-36). He did not *drive* them to water and to pasturage; but he called his own sheep by name, so familiar was he with every one of them, and he *led* them out, and went *before* them, and the sheep *followed* him, for they knew his voice (John 10:3, 4).

A relation so authoritative and at the same time so tender as this could not fail to find a place in the poetry of Hebrew prophets, and the parables of the Son of God. David's poetic eye detects the likeness between the shepherd's care of his flock and the care of God for Israel, and most beautifully does he give expression to it in lines familiar to every household, and admired in every land:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want,
 He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
 He leadeth me beside the still waters,
 He restoreth my soul:
 He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his names' sake.
 Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death,
 I will fear no evil:
 For thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

Psalm 23.

The same beautiful image is employed by Isaiah, when with prophetic eye he sees the great Persian king gathering together the scattered sheep of Israel in distant Babylon, and sending them back from their long captivity. He exclaims in the name of the Lord, "Cyrus is my *shepherd*, and shall perform all my pleasures; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundations shall be laid" (44:28). But he sings a still sweeter note in the same strain, when he foresees the life and labors of the Son of God, and exclaims, "He shall feed his flock like a *shepherd*; he shall gather the lambs with his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." (40:11). The Savior himself re-echoes the sentiment, and says, "I am the good shepherd," "I know my sheep, and am known by mine." "I lay down my life for the sheep" (John 10:14, 15). Even the less poetic Paul is touched by the beautiful metaphor, and makes a prayer to "the God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of sheep" (Heb. 13:20); while Peter says to his brethren, "Ye *were* as sheep going astray; but now are returned to the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls" (I Pet. 2:25).

A word thus highly exalted by the pens of prophets, and even by the lips of Jesus, almost appears too sacred to represent the relation and responsibilities of an uninspired laborer in the cause of God. But even before the church came into existence it had been consecrated to this usage, and was a favorite term with the later prophets by which to designate the religious leaders of Israel. Jeremiah pronounces a woe upon the shepherds of his day who destroyed and scattered Israel, and predicts the time when God would bring the sheep again to their folds, and set up shepherds over them who would be real shepherds to them (Jer. 23:1-4). The connection shows that the

prediction has reference to the Christian age. Ezekiel speaks in the same strain, and in almost the identical thoughts of Jeremiah, except that in contrast with the unfaithful shepherds of his age, he says, "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, he shall be their shepherd" (Ezek. 24:1-23).

With such a history, the word shepherd came into the terminology of the church with a most clearly defined secondary meaning. When applied as a title in the church it necessarily represented its subject as the ruler, the guide, the protector, and the companion of the members of the church. When Paul and Peter, therefore, exhorted the elders to be shepherds to the flock of God, all these important and tender relations were indicated by the word.

We have already taken notice of that general conception of the duties assigned the eldership, which is derived from the title applied to the office. In the confirmation of the conclusions drawn from this and overseer are enjoined upon the elder by express command.

In two distinct passages already quoted (Acts 20:28; I Pet. 5:2), the elders are exhorted to be *shepherds* to the church. This exhortation, or rather this apostolic command, has failed to make its due impression on the English reader, because of the very inadequate translation of *poimaino* in the common version. It occurs eleven times, and is seven times rendered *feed*, and four times *rule*. When connected with church work it is uniformly rendered *feed*. No doubt the translators intended by this rendering to make their version intelligible to their uneducated readers in England and Scotland, where very little is known of a shepherd's work except *feeding* the sheep through the long winters. But this attempt at adaptation has led to serious misapprehension; for even to this day, and in America as well as in Great Britain, the term *feed* in these passages has been understood by the masses as a metaphor for public teaching, and the whole work here enjoined is supposed to be accomplished when a suitable address is delivered to the saints on the Lord's day. Many an elder has imagined that the chief part of his work is accomplished when he has called together the flock once a week, or it may be once a month, and gives them their regular supply of food, even when the food is nothing

better than empty husks. And many an evangelist, miscalling himself a pastor, has labored under the same mistake. Let it be noted, then, and never be forgotten, that the term employed in these passages expressed *the entire work of a shepherd*, of which *feeding* was very seldom even a part in the country where this use of the term originated. The shepherds of Judea, and those of Asia Minor, *pastured* their sheep throughout the entire year. Their duty was to guide them from place to place to protect them from wild beast, and to keep them from straying; but not to *feed* them.

The Apostle Paul leaves us in no doubt as to his own use of the term in question; for after the general command, "Be shepherds to the church," he proceeds to distribute the idea by adding these words: "For I know this, that after my departure shall ravenous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore, *watch*; and remember that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears" (Acts 20:28-31). Here, continuing the metaphor of the flock, he forewarns the shepherds against ravenous wolves, who can be no other than teachers of error who would come into Ephesus from abroad, such, for example, as those who had already infested the Galatian churches (Gal. 1:6, 7; 5:12) and he commands them to *watch*. He also predicts that men of their own number, like unruly rams of the flock, would rise up, speaking *perverse* things, and seeking to lead away disciples after them. The shepherds were to watch against these also, and as they saw symptoms of such movements within, they were to "*warn* every one, night and day," as Paul had done.

Here, then, are two specifications under the generic idea of acting the shepherd, and they are strictly analogous to the work of the literal shepherd. It is made the duty of the eldership, *first*, to protect the congregation against false teachers from abroad; *second*, to guard carefully against the influence of schismatics with the congregation; *third*, to *keep watch* both within and without, like a shepherd night and day watching his flock, so as to be ready to act on the first appearance of danger from either direction.

The first of these duties is again emphasized in the epistle to Titus, where Paul requires that elders shall be able, by sound teaching, both to exhort and convict the gainsayers, and adds: "For there are many vain and unruly talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped" (Tit. 1:9-11). The duty of watchfulness is also mentioned again, and in a manner which shows most impressively its supreme importance. Paul says, "Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they *watch for your souls*, as they that must give account" (Heb. 13:17). From these words it appears that the object of the watching enjoined, is not merely to keep out false teaching and to suppress incipient schism, but to do these in order to save souls from being lost. That priceless treasure for which Jesus laid down his life is at stake, and the elders of each church, like shepherds of each flock, must give account to the owner of the flock for every soul that is lost. The task of Jacob, concerning which he said to Laban, "That which was torn of beast I brought not to thee, I bore the loss of it; of my hand didst thou require it, whether stolen by day or stolen by night," is a true symbol of the task assigned the shepherds of the Church of God. Well might they all exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

The duty of "taking oversight" is enjoined upon the elders in express terms, and the expression is used as the equivalent of acting the shepherd. Peter says, "*Be shepherds to the flock, taking the oversight thereof*" (I Pet. 5:2). The essential thought in overseership, that of *ruling*, is frequently enjoined. Paul says to Timothy, "Let the elders that *rule well* be counted worthy of double honor" (I Tim. 5:17). The Greek word here rendered *rule* is *proisteemi*, the etymological meaning of which is *to stand or place one object before another*. But the fact that rulers stand before their subjects, with all the eyes of the latter looking to them for direction, led to the established usage of this term in the sense of ruling. It is so defined in the lexicons, and so used in both classic and Hellenistic Greek. It expresses the rule of a father over his family (I Tim. 3:4-5, 12); of a deputy over a district (I Mac. 5:15); of a king over his subjects (Jos. Ant. 8:1, 2, 3); and of the elders over the church (I Tim. 5:17; I Thess. 5:12; Rom. 12:5-8).

By use of still another Greek word, Paul expresses in the epistle to the Hebrews the same general idea of ruling. He says (13:7), "Remember *them who have the rule over you*, who have spoken to you the word of God." Again (v. 17), "*Obey them that have the rule over you*, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, . . ." and again (vs. 24), "Salute *them who have the rule over you*." The term here employed *heegeomai*, means primarily, *to lead*. When applied to the mind it means to think or suppose, because in this mental act the mind is *led* to a conclusion. See Acts 26:2; Phil. 2:3-6; *et al.* But the *present participle* of this verb came to be used in the sense of *ruler*, because a ruler is one who *leads*, sometimes, indeed, it means *a leader* in the sense of *a chief man*, as when Silas and Judas are called "*chief men among the brethren*" (Acts 15:22). When the idea of ruling is expressed by it, the fact is indicated in the context: e.g., Pharaoh made Joseph "*ruler (heegoumenon) over Egypt*" (Acts 6:10), where the expression "*over Egypt*" indicates the relation of authority. So, in the second of the three examples under discussion, the terms *obey* and *submit yourselves* show that the relation of authority is expressed, and that the rendering of the participle should be *rulers*, or "*them who have ruled*."

Another duty of the eldership, distinct from the preceding, is that of *teaching*. By a mistake already mentioned, this duty has been supposed by many to be the chief work indicated by the term pastor or shepherd; but in the only place where the latter term occurs in the common version in its appropriated sense pastors are distinguished from teachers. "He gave some, apostles and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some *pastors* and *teachers*." The distinction, here evidently made between pastors and teachers, does not imply that they are always different persons; for as one person might be both a prophet and an evangelist, so, for the same reason, he might be both a pastor and a teacher. But the distinction made shows that one might be a teacher and not a pastor. From other passages, however, we know that all pastors or shepherds, in addition to what is implied in this title, are also *teachers*. In the statement of their qualifications, Paul says that they must be "apt to teach" (I Tim. 3:2); and that they should be "able,

by sound teaching, both to exhort and to convict the gainsayers" (Tit. 1:9). That they should be able to teach, necessarily implies the duty of teaching.

The Eldership: Qualifications for the Office

The qualifications for the office of an Elder are all prescribed by the Apostle Paul in the third chapter of I Timothy and the first chapter of Titus. They are distributable into six natural divisions, and it will simplify our investigation to examine these divisions separately. They are distinguished as they relate respectively to experience, reputation, domestic relations, character, habits, and ability to teach and rule. We will consider them in this order.

1. *Experience.* We mean by this, experience in the life of a Christian. Paul says that an Elder should not be a new convert, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil (I Tim. 3:6). The reason here given shows that the office was one of high honor and responsibility; otherwise, the occupant of it would incur no danger of being lifted up with pride. The condemnation of the devil is the condemnation into which the devil fell, which, according to Paul's understanding of it, resulted from pride. A new convert would be more likely to fall into this sin than an experienced Christian, because he would more recently have escaped the habitual service of Satan, and would have less power to resist temptation. In assigning this qualification, the apostle shows how important it is that *pride of office* shall not characterize the Eldership. It

From *A Treatise on the Eldership*, pp. 53-66.

is the same important lesson that Jesus taught the disciples when he said, "He that would be greatest among you, let him be servant of all."

Within what period after his immersion a man ceases to be a new convert, is not here indicated. It is left to the decision of those interested in the selection and ordination of Elders. It is not at all difficult for men of common sense to decide what members of a given church are new converts, although it would be difficult to express the idea more definitely than it is done by the apostle.

2. *Reputation.* The good which a church is capable of accomplishing in a community depends very much upon its reputation, and the reputation of the church depends much upon that of its representative men. Most wisely, therefore, it is required that an Elder shall have a "good report of them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil" (I Tim. 3:7). If he fall into reproach, not only is the church reproached with him, but he must soon lose his influence over the membership of the church, and it is difficult for the devil to construct a snare more likely to catch his victim than when he brings an Elder into reproach within the church. Both the Elder himself and many members of his flock are exposed to almost certain ruin in that event. Many brethren can be found who have been caught in this snare, and who are now either standing aloof from the church, or coldly and sourly looking on and criticizing those who do the work which they once failed to do.

This qualification has a necessary limitation. When they that are without are men who despise what is good, and hold in bad repute the man who acts according to the will of Christ, we cannot understand the apostle to mean that the Elder shall have a good report from them; nor, indeed, does he refer to men of that character, whether many or few in the community. He refers to men whose opinion is worth considering, and who know the habits of the Elder. He must have a good report from them in regard to his moral and religious character.

It is seldom, according to our observation, that a church has been so thoughtless as to select a man for the Elder's office who was very deficient in this qualification, but it often

happens that in the course of his career, an Elder falls into bad repute, sometimes unjustly, but oftener, justly. Many churches are now languishing under the incubus of an Eldership composed partly of such material, and they can never flourish till relieved by the death or resignation of the unfortunate party. It is too hazardous, in such cases, to wait for death to bring the desired relief, and voluntary resignations are least likely to occur with just that class of men. It is the duty, therefore, of all churches thus afflicted, to call upon the party to resign the office. It is the duty of a most delicate nature, requiring all the wisdom and prudence of which the leading men of the church are capable, but it must, at all hazards, be done. A conference of a large number of the more intelligent and disinterested members, conducted in the most private manner possible, and its decision communicated in the most considerate manner, will always effect the object with a man whose feelings are at all delicate. If, in any case, this should fail, more open and public means should be resorted to; for an Elder must have a good report from them that are without, and upon the church rests the responsibility of seeing that no man is retained in the office who does not possess this qualification.

3. *Domestic relations.* To Timothy and Titus both, the apostle prescribes that the overseer shall be the husband of one wife. There has been a vast amount of disputation as to whether this requires him to be a married man. It is alleged, in opposition to this idea, that when churches were planted among a people practicing polygamy, men would frequently be immersed who had a plurality of wives, and that the apostle intends only to prohibit such from being made overseers. Undoubtedly, the use of the numeral one in the text has this force, and it would be unlawful to place a polygamist or bigamist in the office. But while the expression has this force, we think that candor requires the admission that it also has the effect of requiring a man to be a married man. That he should be the husband of one wife, forbids having less than one as clearly as it forbids having more than one. If it be said that a man owns but one farm, it is just as clearly implied that he owns one as that he owns no more than one. Moreover, the context confirms the conclusion; for the apostle proceeds in both epistles

to state how the overseer must govern his household, and especially his children; which statements imply that he is to be a man of family.

It has been urged as an objection to this conclusion that it would disqualify Paul himself, and Barnabas and Timothy for the office of Elder although they held offices or positions of much greater responsibility. But this objection can have no force, unless it be made to appear that these brethren were qualified for the Elder's office, or that the qualifications of an Apostle or an Evangelist include those of an Elder. Neither of the two, however, can be made to appear, and therefore the objection has no force whatever. Indeed, it seems most fitting that men whose chief work led them from city to city and nation to nation, through all kinds of danger and hardship, should be freed from the care of a family, and equally fitting that the shepherd, whose work was always at home and in the midst of the families of his flock, should be a man of a family. A married man certainly possesses advantages for such work that are impossible to an unmarried man, and the experience of the world must confirm the wisdom of the requirement that the overseer shall be the husband of one wife. It may be well to add that one living wife is clearly meant, and that there is no allusion to the number of deceased wives a man may have had. If my wife is dead, I am not now her husband.

It is also required that the candidate for the Eldership shall "rule well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;" or, as it is expressed in Titus, "having faithful children not accused of riot, or unruly." The reason given for this requirement is this: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" The figure of interrogation is here employed in order to assert, most emphatically, that if a man does not know how to rule his own house, he cannot take care of the Church of God—he is incompetent to fill the office of overseer. It is altogether vain for uninspired men to demur against a decision so emphatically rendered by an apostle; we therefore accept it without qualification.

4. *Character.* The traits of character prescribed for an Elder are numerous, and when considered as a whole they

present a very rare combination. The first of these in logical order, and the first mentioned in both of the epistles which treat of the subject, is *blamelessness*. When it is said that an overseer must be *blameless*, we must of necessity understand the term in a comparative, not in an absolute sense. This necessity arises from the fact acknowledged and insisted upon by the apostles, that no man is entirely blameless when his character stands a fair comparison with the characters of other good men. The apostle seems to have his eye upon the counterpart of the good reputation which we have already mentioned. If a man possessing a good repute among them who are without, is known to have a character corresponding to this, he is blameless in the only sense in which men in the flesh can be blameless. We may remark further, that this qualification, from the very fact of its being comparative, must admit of different degrees, and that some qualified Elders may be more blameless than others. The degree which is requisite to eligibility in any given case, must be determined by those who are immediately concerned in the selection and ordination of the Elder.

To be blameless is merely to be free from faults. Not content with this general prohibition, the apostle proceeds to specify some faults which it is especially important for the overseer to avoid. He must not be *covetous*. We have already spoken of the importance of this prohibition, while treating of the example which the Elders should set before their brethren. A covetous Eldership will make a covetous church, and a covetous church is a dead church.

As the Elder must not be covetous, so, according to the reading of our common version, he must not be "greedy of filthy lucre." The Greek adjective, of which this expression is the rendering, is *aischrokerdos*, compounded of *aischros*, *base*, and *kerdos*, *gain*. There is a slight difference of opinion as to its meaning. Some critics render it "*greedy of gain*," and some, "*making money by base means*." The latter understand the apostle as prohibiting any disreputable business; and the former, as prohibiting the greed for gain which would lead to such a business. By either rendering, a disreputable occupation is prohibited—such, for example, as dealing in intoxicating liquors, jockey trading, rearing sporting stock, renting

property for improper uses, and such like, in none of which can a man engage unless his greed for gain overrides his regard for the welfare of the community. Any other course of life by which a man betrays an excessive greed for gain is undoubtedly prohibited.

The apostle also specifies among prohibited faults, *self-will*. The Elder must not be *self-willed*. No man is fit to hold office jointly with other men, who is not content to often yield his own will to that of his compeers. Neither is any man capable of exercising moral sway over a community, who possesses an iron will that never bends to the wishes of others. We speak now of matters which are lawfully subject to the will of man, not of those in which God's will has been declared. Within the limits of the latter there is no room for the human will to play—it has only to submit.

In the third place, the overseer is to avoid everything which would disturb the peace of the church. He is not to be a "*striker*," nor a "*brawler*," nor even "*soon angry*," but in opposition to all these, he is to be "*temperate*" and "*patient*." He will have frequent occasions for the trial of his patience, if he makes vigorous efforts to discharge his duties; and unless he be well supplied with it, though he may not fall to brawling and striking, he will become ill-tempered and discouraged. Nothing is more wisely said, than that he must be patient.

Besides the negative qualifications, or traits of character which an overseer must not possess, the apostle names a number of *positive* elements of character. He must be "*just*," for he is a judicial functionary of the church; he must be "*sober*," that is sober minded, for *levity*, which sobriety forbids, argues a want of piety; he must be a "*lover of hospitality*," for otherwise he is devoid of that sympathy which is necessary in order to secure the affection of others; he must be "*a lover of good men*," for all good men love one another; he must be "*holy*," for he is set apart to a holy office, and his official acts concern the most holy relations which bind men to one another and to their God.

5. *Habits*. A man's habits grow out of his character, but they also react upon his character, tending constantly to make it either better or worse. A habit of vigilance, or watchfulness,

is enjoined upon the Elder, because without it many things most deleterious to the congregation would escape his notice. A want of this habit is a very common fault. While the overseer should be far better informed as to the condition of the members of the church than any other person in it or outside it, it is often the case that through mere want of watchfulness he is the last to learn what is going on. A habit of watchfulness in matters of business is apt to follow a man into the office of overseer; hence the importance of requiring it as a condition of eligibility.

It is not more important for the overseer to be watchful, than that he should avoid the only other habits mentioned by the apostle, and not implied in the qualifications already discussed. He must not be "given to much wine." It is not merely drunkenness that is here prohibited; if it was, we would doubtless have the word which is appropriated to the expression of that idea. Neither is the idea of *much* in the original. The term is *paroinon, by wine*, and means simply, *given to wine*. It doubtless contemplates a man who is given to a freer use of wine than was customary among strictly sober people even though he might never become intoxicated.

We have now glanced rapidly at the rare combination of moral traits and habits which must characterize the overseer, and will next discuss the intellectual qualifications which are necessary to his usefulness as a teacher.

Intellectual Qualifications

While the moral and religious traits of character requisite for the office of Elder are numerous, and some of them are demanded by the apostle with great emphasis, only one qualification of an intellectual character is mentioned, and this is expressed in general terms. This fact is significant, and admonishes us not to mis-adjust the divine balance, by making the most of what is made the least of in the Scriptures.

This one intellectual qualification is represented in the Epistle to Timothy by the expression "*apt to teach*." The Greek for this expression is *didaktikos*, which I prefer to render "*capable of teaching*." The Elder, then, must be capable of teaching; but this expression represents a variable quantity.

One might be capable of teaching some persons, and utterly incapable of teaching others. It becomes a matter of necessity, then, that before we can form a judgment as to a man's possession of this qualification in the requisite degree, we must know who it is that he is to teach. A person capable of teaching children might be incapable of teaching adults, as one capable of teaching an academy might be incapable of teaching the classes in a college. So an Elder might be capable of teaching a congregation in one community, and not in another nearby. What is the standard, then, by which each individual candidate for the Eldership is to be judged in this respect? Undoubtedly, it is to be found in the attainments of the congregation which he is to teach. He is to be *their* teacher, and theirs alone; consequently, if he is capable of teaching them, he has the capability required by the Scriptures. From this it appears that properly qualified Elders may possess capability of teaching in as great variety of degrees as characterizes the intellectual and religious attainments of the various congregations. Furthermore, it must be evident that each individual congregation is the best judge of the capability of an Elder to be its teacher. So long as they receive instruction from the Elder, and are satisfied to teach that congregation, however much he may fall below some other Elder in some other congregation.

But this capability of teaching has a special direction given to it in the epistle to Titus. It is there said that the Elder must "hold fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound teaching both to exhort and to convict the gainsayers." Here, both the source of his information, and one of the specific objects of his teaching are mentioned. The specific object is to exhort and convict the gainsayers—exhort them till exhortation fails, and then convict them before the congregation as corrupt opposers of the truth. Of course, this is only one of the many objects of teaching, and is mentioned in this place because the young congregations in Crete were at that time infested by "vain talkers and deceivers." The source of information by which the Elders were to silence these men was not the philosophy in which the latter boasted, but the faithful word which had already been taught. The Elders are required to hold fast this "faithful word," and, as a conse-

quence, condemn everything unauthorized by it. A "thus saith the Lord" was to be the touch-stone of every doctrine and every practice which Jew or Gentile might introduce, and thus, by "*sound teaching*," the Elders were to stop the mouths of all in their respective congregations who taught things which they ought not.

It is an old question, as old, at least, as Presbyterianism, whether capability to teach must characterize every eligible candidate for the Eldership. The Presbyterian theory requires one teaching Elder and a plurality of ruling Elders in each congregation, and they claim that they find authority for this distinction in the well-known words of Paul: "The Elders who rule well count worthy of double honor, specially they who labor in word and teaching." After all that has been said and written on this passage, we think that candor most certainly requires the admission that there were some Elders who did not labor in word and teaching. Every attempt which we have ever seen to set aside this obvious inference from the words, is a mere subterfuge like those so often adopted to obscure the plain statements of the Scriptures in reference to baptism. Let us deal fairly with our own minds, and the Scriptures will more readily yield to us their meaning.

But while we are thus compelled, by the obvious meaning of plain words, to admit that there were Elders in the primitive churches who did not labor in word and teaching—that is, who did not preach and teach publicly, we are by no means compelled to admit that it was because they were *incapable* of teaching. Capability of teaching being a prescribed qualification for the Eldership, we may not suppose that it was disregarded in the selection of Elders, unless it be in uninstructed congregations. But Paul does not mention the "Elders that rule well" in a manner to indicate that their appointment was irregular. There is another way to account for the distinction made without supposing a violation of the law; and that is, that although all of the Elders were capable of teaching, some were more capable than others, and the burden of this part of the work was for this reason assigned to them by mutual consent. Where a number of men are associated together in an office of multifarious duties, it is almost invariably the case that some are better adapted for one duty, and others for

another; and in order to the greatest efficiency of the body they must of necessity adopt a corresponding division of labor. It is natural, therefore, if not unavoidable, that in the practical working of a board of Elders, some of them should do little else than rule, and others little else than teach and preach. Jointly, they are responsible for the teaching and ruling; among themselves they must divide the labor in such a way as will accomplish the best results. The best rule that they can jointly exercise, and the best instruction that they can jointly impart, is what the Lord requires at their hands.

Some of the Christian congregations of the present day are at work on the plan here indicated. They have a board of Elders, all of whom are capable of teaching, and one of whom is a preacher. The latter proclaims the gospel to the world in the public assembly, and takes the leading part in the instruction of the congregation. He gives his whole time to the work, and lives of the gospel which he preaches. The others take a secondary part in the teaching, and share in full the responsibility of ruling. They give but a portion of their time to the work, and give it, like the Elders of the church at Ephesus, gratuitously (Acts 20:34, 35). This is Scriptural and wise.

In a still larger number of congregations, an Evangelist is called to the aid of the Eldership. He preaches and takes the leading part in teaching, while the Elders take the secondary part in teaching, and supreme control in ruling, making use, however, of whatever wisdom and experience the evangelist may possess, to aid them. This we also pronounce Scriptural; for in this capacity Timothy labored among the Elders at Ephesus, and Epaphroditus among those at Philippi (Acts 20:17; comp. I Tim. 1:3; Phil. 1:1; comp. Phil. 2:35-30).

But, besides these, we must acknowledge that there are many congregations among us with Elders in office who do not teach, and who are incapable of teaching. All such should immediately do one of two things—either resign the office, or put into exercise their latent powers, and prove themselves capable of teaching and therefore qualified for the office. However, all the congregations should be taught, by the Evangelists who shall inform them to select for the office only men who are capable of teaching, and all Evangelists should be careful to

ordain only such to the office. In this way present evils may gradually be corrected, and a repetition of them in the future, avoided.

Preaching — What Is It?

A great many preachers have an entire misconception of their calling, and many more have no very definite conception as to what preaching really is. A writer in the *New York Observer* recently expressed his conception of it in the following words:

But, there is no sphere of life, no facts, no principles, no rights of men, which are not proper subjects of pulpit notice, and the scope of the preacher is absolutely unbounded, his sphere is as wide as earth and heaven. The kingdoms of this world and the Kingdom of the Redeemer are his to treat and to expound: the realm of mind, and the achievements of history and science, all are his.

This is an extreme view, but it is the one toward which the current of public opinion has been rapidly drifting for the last ten or fifteen years. It is well to pause and consider whether this tendency is in the right direction.

Paul's conception of preaching was quite different. When preaching to sinners he determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified (I Cor. 2:2). Notice, he determined not merely to preach nothing else, but to know nothing else; that is, so far as men discovered what he knew by hearing his discourses he would appear to know nothing else. What he knew of science, of profane history, of everything not directly tributary to his one theme, this he allowed no place in his sermons.

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, Dec. 3, 1874.

There could scarcely be a greater contrast than exists between his conception of preaching, and that expressed in the extract given above.

To young, or comparatively inexperienced disciples, Paul gave milk—the pure milk of the word. He confined himself to imparting elementary instruction in the duties and privileges of the Christian life. To the "perfect," the disciples possessed of matured knowledge and experience, he spoke "wisdom," yet not the wisdom of this world, not the wisdom of human philosophy or science. In no part of his ministration, whether preaching to sinners or teaching the saints, did he have use for science or philosophy. "But," says he, "we speak the wisdom of God" — the knowledge which God alone had imparted (I Cor. 2:6, 7).

According to the divine ideal, then, preaching is limited in its subject matter to the subjects on which God has seen fit to speak. It is also limited in regard to the manner in which these subjects are to be treated.

Many persons imagine that a sermon may be complete if it merely elucidates its subject; if it merely imparts instruction. But there is not a sermon nor an epistle in the New Testament which contents itself with this. Instruction is never aimed at as an end, but is always a change for the better in the life of the hearer. It is the reformation of the sinner and the more complete sanctification of the righteous. A sermon which has not this aim, is misdirected—it is a blank cartridge fired off into the air.

What is a sermon, then, but a discourse whose subject matter is derived from the Word of God, and whose purpose is to effect some specific change for the better in those who hear it.

If you would decide whether your so-called sermons are real sermons, or mere lectures, or mere harangues, apply to them the test here indicated. Ask yourself, what specific change of life for the better do I intend to effect in my hearers by this discourse? If none, then reconstruct the discourse with a view to some such effect; and if you cannot thus reconstruct it, throw it away. Never go into the pulpit with a speech in your head which is not a real sermon.

Ministerial Education

There is an urgent and increasing demand among our congregations for an educated ministry, and a proportionate longing, among our young men who contemplate preaching, for a ministerial education. The frequent selection of this subject as a theme for studied discourses at our large conventions, and the increasing number of college students who intend to be preachers, are indications of the extent of this feeling. Indeed, our colleges themselves are but a result of the same feeling, for not one of them could have obtained the funds necessary to its existence but for the plea that it would help to supply the churches with educated preachers.

That one who is to preach the gospel, and teach the disciples the whole will of God, should be educated for his work is a maxim of common sense. In every other department of human labor, whether physical or intellectual, a man is expected to undergo some preparatory course of instruction; then why not in this? If to teach the arts and sciences which pertain to earth alone a man must be appropriately educated, how much more to teach that master-science which pertains both to earth and heaven!

We do not propose, however, to argue a proposition which is not doubted. We have had some discussion upon the subject, but the question at issue, when properly eliminated, is not whether our young preachers should be educated, but what

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses E. Lard, editor, Vol. 2, Lexington, Kentucky, 1865, pp. 239-250.

kind of education they should have. Perhaps, if we had a distinct conception of what constitutes a proper ministerial education, there would no longer be any dispute upon the subject. We have been dealing too much in vague generalities, for a proper understanding either of our subject or of one another. We have had no formal attempts at defining the exact character of the education demanded, or the most efficient means of securing it. Neither has the subject of an adequate supply of preachers to meet the increasing demands of our cause received due consideration. It is time that our ideas were more sharply defined, and that our educational schemes were rendered more efficient. We propose to accomplish something in this direction, by the remarks which we now submit.

In the course of the discussion which this subject has elicited, our attention has been called to a singular contrast between the labors of those styled respectively the educated and the uneducated preachers. The latter class have undoubtedly been the pioneers of the Reformation, and many of them are still among the most powerful and successful preachers we have. Neither is their influence confined to the rural districts and the more susceptible classes of the community. In the towns and cities their labors are in demand, and the most solid men and women of every community are among their converts. Our successful evangelists are nearly all men of this class, while our educated preachers are often found very quietly passing away their lives in the dull routing of weekly sermons to very weakly congregations. This contrast has led persons of little discrimination to speak disparagingly of educated men. Such persons are misled by a misapplication of terms. It is not education which renders preachers inefficient; but the *want* of education. What education they have is not of the right kind, or it lacks some of the elements of a proper ministerial education. Now, it is incontrovertible that he who makes the best lawyer, other things being equal, has the best education for the practice of law; and the most successful physician is the one who has in reality the best medical education. That which produces the best results is best. So of ministerial education. The man who can and does accomplish the greatest religious results by his ministerial labors, has, whatever he has learned or not learned, the very best education for a preacher. Such is the

true, the practical, and rational standard by which to judge of this subject.

What do we want preachers for, but to convert sinners and edify the saints? What do we want them educated for, but to enable them to do this more successfully? What, then, is the best education for a preacher, but that which makes him most successful in his work? To determine, therefore, what education our young preachers should have, we have but to ascertain the essential qualifications for success in a preacher's life. Whatever these are we must aspire to attain, and in the aggregate they must constitute our standard of excellence.

We now proceed to point out some of the more essential elements of the education which has been demonstrated by experience and by common sense as that best adapted to the preacher's wants. First of all, we place *a knowledge of the Word of God*. Without this, the preacher is the most dangerous character in the community, and the greater his eloquence and learning the greater the danger. The Bible contains the only true light in reference to man's spiritual and eternal relations; and in the absence of this the false lights of human philosophy but lead into deeper darkness, the hapless victim being the more hopelessly lost as he flatters himself that he has found the only way of life.

While it is beyond question that this is the most essential element in a preacher's education, yet it may be safely assumed that the most crying sin of the preachers of this generation is ignorance of that very Book which they *profess* to make their life-long study. The experience and observation of all persons who have had the ability and opportunity to test this assumption, will bear witness to it. But if we examine, in this respect, those preachers who have been most eminently useful; who have most successfully fought against infidelity, sectarianism, and iniquity, we find them pre-eminently familiar with the Word of God. In this respect, those who are commonly styled uneducated preachers are frequently the most thoroughly educated. They are sometimes men of but a single Book, having seldom looked within the lids of any other book than the Bible; but they are men of power, and whole communities acknowledge their influence. They possess the most essential and effective element of a thorough ministerial education.

They began their labors, however, with but a small stock of this element, and their subsequent acquisitions were secured by a slow process amid many disadvantages. Proper educational facilities would have imparted to them at the beginning, within the course of a few months, information which was acquired only through many years of study. Every such preacher, by the remembrance of his own hard experience, can appreciate the value to a young man of a proper preparatory education.

Such knowledge of the Word of God as we speak of embraces a familiar acquaintance with its history, its biography, its poetry, its prophecies, and its didactics. It involves an acquaintance with all the leading subjects treated of in the whole Bible, with the passages in which they are treated. It also includes specific knowledge of all the perversions of Scripture common in the sectarian world, together with the correct method of exposing them; and all the points of infidel assault, together with the means of defense. Such an education would fit a young man to enter the world as it is, ready to confront every foe, whether of revelation itself or of primitive Christianity, and to impart to the people at all times the Scripture instruction which the times demand. This department of education alone would suffice for a most efficient ministry, and all other possible education would be inefficient without it.

Next to knowledge of the Scriptures, it is most important that the young preacher should have proper moral training for his work. The foundation for this training must pre-exist in an ardent desire to become a preacher, not for the ease and respectability which may be attained by it, but for the good of men and the glory of God. A young man who begins to prepare for the ministry with only half a heart, is not likely to become more than half a preacher. He must undertake it from that deep sense of duty and that longing for the salvation of men which the Baptists have dignified into a special divine call. With this foundation laid, he still needs the results of the experience and reflection of wise predecessors, to prepare him for the details of his work. He should be instructed in reference to the best course of study to pursue while engaged in his labors, so as to cultivate most successfully his own peculiar talent. He should be impressed with the necessity of constant

industry, and be advised as to the best disposition of all his time. He should learn how to deport himself toward the word, toward the church and its officers, and toward his brethren in the ministry. He should be taught that his field of labor is not confined to the pulpit, but extends from house to house throughout the community, and reaches down to all the little children; and knowing this, he should be fully advised as to the most successful method of cultivating the entire field. In short, he should have all the practical advice and instruction which the experience of wise and useful men has indicated as necessary to early and complete success.

This second element of education is almost uniformly acquired by preachers of eminent usefulness, though often, like their knowledge of the Scriptures, by years of hard experience, and many mortifying mistakes. These two elements combined have formed the entire education of the great majority of our useful men; and this is a demonstration that no other education is positively necessary to eminent usefulness. In devising an education scheme, therefore, we should demand no less than this, and we should not peremptorily insist upon any more.

The last and least important department of ministerial education is an elementary course in literature and science, such as our colleges usually furnish. If our object were to make authors, or critics, or professors, this department would be indispensable; but for the man who is to go out among the people, and make known nothing but the gospel of Jesus Christ, we have already seen that it is not so. In conjunction, however, with sound Scripture knowledge, and proper moral training, it must be a means of greatly increasing the preacher's usefulness. A knowledge of the Greek language alone enables the student of Scripture to make much more rapid and satisfactory progress, while the mental culture and discipline resulting from the pursuit of the entire college curriculum, enables him both to acquire and to communicate with greater facility. These are its chief advantages; and while they are by no means inconsiderable, they derive all their value to the preacher from the aid they furnish him in prosecuting other studies and in treating other subjects.

The reader will here observe that we do not attribute to a classical education that high rank which has been accorded to

it by many writers. When men have spoken of ministerial education, they have too often referred exclusively to a knowledge of the languages and sciences. The term has been so understood by others; and when the importance of an educated ministry has been called in question, it is this kind of education which is referred to. We are confident that, without demanding any further argument, a discerning public will justify us in retiring it to a subordinate position, and bringing into the foreground that which is manifestly more important. And we think, too, that this arrangement will enable speakers and writers upon the subject to be better understood, and to advance the cause of ministerial education more successfully.

Having now designated the three elements or departments of a good ministerial education, we next proceed to inquire to what extent it can be supplied by our present facilities. These facilities consist, aside from the private studies of young preachers, exclusively in our colleges and educational societies. These are the entire dependence for education, and they are rapidly becoming our main dependence for the supply of preachers. This latter tendency is by no means free from danger. To the full extent that the people learn to depend upon college graduates for young preachers, will young men who enjoy no facilities for a classical education be discouraged from attempting to preach, and thus we will lose that very class of men who have hitherto been the pioneers of the cause, and the pillars to support the truth in very many communities. The men who learn to preach while working on their farms or in their shops, by reading their Bibles at night and preaching on Lord's day, should have every possible encouragement; for they will fill a place which men of more learning can seldom fill so well, and which, indeed, will be vacant unless filled by them.

Besides the danger of this tendency, our colleges, as a source of supply, have been, and must continue to be, inadequate. Not more than eight or ten young preachers are annually graduated from all of them combined. Nor need we expect, within any brief period, a very great increase of the number. The Baptists have been testing this matter longer than we have, and with much greater facilities, and the result, as declared by Dr. Wayland, is by no means encouraging. He estimates the annual demand for Baptist preachers at six

hundred. He says they have twenty-two colleges, and ten theological seminaries, yet the number of graduates per annum who pass through both courses of study, is only some twenty-five or thirty. The entire number of candidates for the ministry who come from all these institutions, including those who have pursued only a partial course, he estimates at from ninety to one hundred; or about one-sixth of the annual demand.

These facts are readily accounted for by considering the expensiveness of a college course, and the length of time required to pass through it. Most of the young men who desire to preach are poor. Many of them are already so far advanced in life that they can ill afford to spend four years at college before entering upon their life work. To met the first of these difficulties, a few benevolent brethren have contributed liberally, some education societies have been organized, and some of our missionary societies are extending their operations into the educational field. But the results, under the present system of education, will disappoint public expectation. Let the operations of the Kentucky Educational Society testify. They have a capital of about \$50,000 invested in stocks. Some of their stocks yield but little, yet on the whole it is probably as productive as the most of such endowments. They have been operating since 1856, eight years, during which they have had under their patronage an average of about twelve students continually. Supposing their course of study to occupy four years, and all of these students to persevere through it and become preachers, we would have from this handsome endowment just three preachers per annum! This is fully up to the number now in the field who have been aided by this Society, including some who did not graduate. Other associations of brethren, whether operating by the proceeds of an endowment fund, or by annual contributions, need not expect to meet with success very greatly beyond this. Making these results the basis of our calculation, and supposing that one hundred preachers per annum will be required to make up our present deficiency and meet the constantly increasing demand, we would require, in order to furnish them in this way, an endowment of more than a million and a half dollars. This is sufficient proof that the scheme is impractical.

The inadequacy of this source of supply is further evident from another consideration. But a very small number of the young men of the country, even of those who have abundance of means, choose to acquire a collegiate education; and a number of graduates is quite disproportionate to the number of matriculates. With an average of about one hundred students in attendance, Bethany College has seldom graduated more than eight or ten. The disproportion is still greater in our other institutions, where the matriculates are generally younger. If we add to these those who master the principal part of the course before they abandon it, the number is still quite insignificant.

But besides the inadequate supply from our colleges, the education which they have hitherto furnished our young preachers is seriously defective; and we must take the liberty to speak of it very candidly. Where difficulties and defects exist, it is far more manly to speak of them plainly, and make an honest effort to remove them, than to ignore them and still struggle under the burden.

In reference to the literary and scientific attainments of our young graduates, we have no special complaints to file. These are as good as the short time devoted to the course, and the inadequate preparatory instruction so common among college matriculates, will admit. The colleges of the Reformation compare favorably in this particular with any others in the West. But, as we have seen above, classical and scientific attainments constitute the least important element of ministerial education.

It is in respect to the first and most essential element of their education, a knowledge of the Word of God, that the preachers furnished by our colleges are most deficient. Our young graduates are better prepared to lecture on some scientific or literary topic, than to preach a sermon. They are more familiar with the odes of Horace than with the Psalms of David; with the adventures of Aeneas than with those of Paul; with heathen mythology than with Christian antiquities; with the solar system than with the kingdom of God. They can explain any problem in Euclid better than they can the apostolic commission; and are far more familiar with the fables of Aesop than with the cases of conversion. On this account,

their sermons often have in them more science and literature than gospel. They lecture or declaim rather than preach, and plain men often conclude that going to college has been their ruin. This would all be just as one should expect, if the college course were merely a preparatory discipline, to be followed by some special education for the ministry; but when it is regarded as *the* ministerial education to which young men have devoted years of study with the expectation of being prepared to preach at its conclusion, its deficiency is sufficiently apparent.

There are undoubtedly some exceptions to this general rule, as in the case of young men who had preached sufficiently before going to college, to know what they want, and what they do not want; but the writer acknowledges that his own case is not exceptional, and he can testify the same in reference to many who have become prominent and successful preachers. We were familiar with the Pentateuch; but knew little of the gospels, still less of Acts, and almost nothing of the epistles. As for Biblical criticism, it was to us *a terra incognita*. All that we have learned about the practical detail of a preacher's life and course of study, we have had to acquire by our own unaided exertions since we left college. We have spent years, too, in random and sometimes fruitless efforts before we learned how best to employ our time, years which might have been saved to us by a little judicious instruction while we were in school. If some portion of our college course had been *omitted, and its place filled with direct preparation for preaching*, so that we could have started aright in the work, we would now be years in advance of what we have attained.

This may appear strange to brethren who have heard so much about the Bible being the leading text-book in our colleges, but have had no opportunity to know just how the Bible is taught. These results are really all that we are justified in expecting under the circumstances. The young preacher matriculates for a four-year course, without the amount of preparation presupposed, and in order to get through successfully he finds himself under a constant press to prepare his daily recitations. He listens to a daily Bible lecture; but no preparatory study is required, and no time allotted for it. Even while hearing the lecture, his attention is often distracted by

Greek conjugations and mathematical problems which are forced upon him by the severe examination to which he is subjected in the other departments. Whatever may be his desire, therefore, to acquire Scripture knowledge, he finds the necessity for graduating within a given time an insurmountable obstacle in the way.

Our present system is also defective in reference to the second element of ministerial education—proper moral training for the work. The young preacher at college finds himself one of a small and peculiar class of students, who are not sufficiently influential to form the prevailing sentiment of the school, and he must either fall into the popular current, or maintain with his fellows a clannish isolation. The prevailing sentiment is purely worldly. The universal ambition is for distinction in the world, and the code of honor regulates social intercourse. Vice of almost every kind, and in the most secret and seductive forms, finds its way into the college circle, resulting sometimes in the corruption of young preachers. Even when these influences fall short of their worst effects, they often result in the morbid taste, the pedantic display, and worldly habits, which impair the usefulness of so many young men.

But the worst effects of college life are by no means so rare as one might suppose. Many a young man who has started upon his course of study firmly determined to become a preacher, is turned away to some other pursuit; while some are ruined for life. This result is not peculiar to our own colleges, but is common among all others. Dr. Wayland, for many years President of Brown University, and enjoying ample means of information upon the subject, bears the following testimony: "Of the temptations which beset a young man while pursuing a course of education, few persons are aware; and it requires deeper piety and a more matured character to resist them than is commonly supposed. The beneficiaries of education societies possess, in general, the same moral and religious standing as other young men in college who profess personal piety. Now suppose twenty young men, professors of religion, to enter college, and pursue their course to the close. It will be well if five of these twenty maintain a consistent religious character, attending meetings for prayer with constancy, on every occasion

standing up fearlessly for what they know to be right, and bearing testimony everywhere in favor of religion. Of the remainder, a part would rank among the timidly conscientious, willing to be on the side of right where there is nothing to lose. Some would become Christians only in name, known to profess Christ only by their presence at the communion table; some would be equally active for Christ and for the world, and a few would be known as the worst enemies of religion, taking part with the irreligious and profane, and furnishing, by their participation in it, an excuse to others for every form of ill-doing. I do not think that in this estimate I exaggerate the facts. . . . I write these things in pain. I am, however, dealing with facts, and facts which should be in the possession of every one who is called to form a judgment in this matter."

But we have dwelt long enough upon the defects of our present educational system; longer, perhaps, than will prove agreeable to some of our brethren who are deeply interested in colleges. I could have wished to be spared the necessity of making some of these developments; but the facts are well known among many brethren, and our college presidents, professors, and agents ought to know that they are causing a loss of confidence in colleges, and checking the liberality of brethren toward them. Let the facts be candidly exhibited, and then let us tax our ingenuity for the improvement of our system.

To devise a scheme for the removal of all the defects in our educational system, and for a sufficient increase in the supply of preachers, is not likely to be the work of a single mind, or the result of a single attempt. But a beginning must be made, and to this end we submit the result of our own reflections.

1. For the injurious moral effects of college life there is one remedy, which, if not perfect, must, if properly applied, prove highly successful. It is to be found in the religious activity of the faculty. I mean, not merely a religious example, but a constant activity in bringing to bear upon every individual student a constant religious influence. The lectures and recitations in every department should be made subservient to Christianity, and the college classes should be regarded as a missionary field for the most arduous evangelical labor. Those students who are already religious should be made active co-

operants in the work, so that, instead of yielding to evil influences, they might be constantly increasing in moral courage and religious power. In this way our institutions could be made recruiting establishments, to swell the number of candidates for the ministry, instead of dangerous resorts for the youth of the country.

This would require at the hands of our college professors a religious zeal which most of them have little dreamed of, and of which some of them are doubtless incapable; but it is certainly no more than may justly be demanded of those to whom the destiny of our young men is so largely committed. The brethren have built and endowed these colleges primarily for the sake of their religious influence; and if they are not to enjoy this, they will send their sons to other institutions, or educate them in more private schools at home. But they must not be disappointed. Let our professors wake up to this solemn and long neglected duty; and let our trustees see to it that no irreligious man, that no man not an earnest religious worker shall occupy a chair in any of our colleges. Fidelity to the trust committed to them demands this, and the public will not remain satisfied without it.

2. It must be conceded to our colleges, that a much greater amount of Scripture instruction could hardly be expected of them under the present arrangement of the course necessary to graduation. Every professor has his full amount of work, and every student is sufficiently taxed by the regular course. But it is worthy of very grave consideration, whether a certain amount of Scripture study might not be profitably substituted for some part of the course now necessary to the degree of A.B. Why should the history and literature of the Book of books be considered less worthy of a place in the college course than conic sections or political economy? Why should ignorance of constitutional law or mental philosophy be considered a more serious defect in an education than ignorance of the constitution and laws of the kingdom of heaven? And why should young men be expected to study uninspired works on moral science, natural theology, and evidences of Christianity, to the neglect of the only inspired and infallible authority on these subjects? If no satisfactory answer can be given to these questions, then let our college curriculum be modified so that an

elementary knowledge of the Word of God shall be equally necessary to graduation with an elementary knowledge of any other branch of study. This is not only demanded by enlightened reason, but if accomplished would tend greatly both to relieve college life of its corrupting influences, and to increase the number of educated young men who would be inspired with a desire to preach the gospel. When men obtain knowledge that interests them, they feel an instinctive desire to impart it to others. When the knowledge acquired is such that the welfare of others depends upon its impartation to them, this instinct is seconded by every benevolent feeling, and becomes a controlling motive. The most direct method, therefore, of kindling in young men a desire to preach, is to impart to them an appreciative knowledge of the Word of God.

3. But all this, though it is the most that we can ask of our colleges, as at present organized, falls far short of the demands of ministerial education. The young preacher should have a course of instruction, in special preparation for his own work, which would not be appropriate for other young men. This can be accomplished only by a separate school, or by a separate department of the same school. Such a department has frequently been spoken of among us, and is now seriously contemplated by all of our prosperous colleges. There is no scheme, the inauguration of which requires more wisdom. Properly conducted, it may prove a source of incalculable good; but it may be inaugurated and conducted in such a manner as to produce consequences the most disastrous. Much will depend upon the character of the instructors employed, and much upon the course of study adopted.

A professor in such a school would wield a fearful power for good or evil. He should therefore be a man of well-balanced head and heart, and his devotion to pure primitive Christianity should be above suspicion. He should be a model for young preachers, in character and habits, and should be himself a preacher of varied experience and success. No man who has not actively encountered the errors and iniquities of the world, and endured the practical trials of a preacher's life, is qualified to prepare young preachers for the conflict before them. Only he who has done the work himself, and done it well, is competent to say how it should be done.

The course of study to be pursued in such a school should be strictly Biblical. Only such books as contribute to a complete and practical knowledge of the Scriptures should be put into the students' hands; and all the lectures delivered before him should be of the same character. The apostle's directions to Timothy and Titus about the matter and manner of their preaching should be regarded as the supreme law in this respect. This point should be guarded with constant vigilance and even jealousy; for a departure from this course of instruction would open the way to endless speculation, strifes, and divisions.

In arranging the course of study for such a school, care must also be taken to avoid increasing the inefficiency of our present system of education in respect to the supply of preachers. If it were so arranged as to require the degree of A.B. previous to entering upon it, it would decrease very greatly the present ratio of supply. It would add at least two years to the four now employed at college, and diminish the number who could be educated upon a given sum of money, at least fifty percent. It would in a still greater ratio diminish the number of young men who would undertake to expend the time and labor necessary to a ministerial education. It would give us a more extensively educated ministry, but at an expense in reference to number which would be ruinous to the cause.

We must never lose sight of the fact established in a former part of this essay, that a knowledge of the English Scriptures alone is a sufficient education to make a most efficient ministry, and that we are dependent upon men of this degree of education for much the greater number of our active proclaimers. Our course of study, therefore, must be adapted to the impartation of this education, and to the supply of this class of preachers. In order to this, it must be so arranged as to enable a young man with nothing more than a common school education to obtain as thorough instruction in the Scriptures as the limited amount of his education would admit.

While providing for this class of young men, the graduates of the regular college course should not be neglected; but they should be introduced to such a course of Biblical study as would call into requisition all the literary and critical resources which they had acquired. They would already have acquired a

good degree of familiarity with the contents of the Scriptures, and would now be prepared to acquire an elementary knowledge of Biblical criticism, and to apply the resources of accurate scholarship to all the practical issues of the living age. The cause of truth will ever demand a goodly number of men thus educated, for the more exhaustive elaboration and defense of Scripture themes; and the entire number that can be supplied will not more than meet the demand.

We have now submitted the reflections which prompted the writing of this essay. We have given but a faint outline of the subject, and have omitted entirely to touch some questions connected with it, which are worthy of grave consideration. But we feel great confidence in the value of the suggestions we have submitted, and trust that they will contribute, in some degree, to the dissemination of correct thought upon the subject.

How To Be Respected

Paul said to Timothy, "Let no man despise thy youth." To despise the youth of a preacher means, I think, to disregard his preaching because he is a young man. And that is no uncommon thing in the experience of preachers at the present day. There is a great demand among the churches for young preachers with many, because it requires less money to support them. But very often the young preacher finds that he is despised on account of his youth. It shows itself chiefly when the young man proposes some changes or improvements in the church which the older men and women have not been accustomed to, and they turn upon him, and say, "Why you are a young man just out of college, and do you presume to teach us?" Or the young preacher finds it necessary in discharging his duty toward God to rebuke some of the abuses that ought to have been rebuked before; then they despise his youth. The young people, when he urges upon them the importance of propriety and sobriety, say, "Why you are no older than we are. If it were some older preacher we would listen to him." And thus, in various ways, the young preacher finds himself despised on account of his youth.

The question naturally arises, inasmuch as young men cannot at once make themselves older, what is a young preacher to do? If he is told to let no man despise his youth, his answer naturally is, How in the world can I avoid it? Well,

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex., The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 75-78.

Paul gives Timothy a recipe for that: "Be thou an example to them that believe." Well, in what way shall I be an example to the believers? In what particulars? Paul points out five of the particulars which he seems to think sufficient to accomplish the purpose. "Be an example in word, in manner of life, in faith, in love, in purity."

How to be an example in word. Does this refer merely to the preached word? Of course that must be included, because that is the most important word that the young preacher, or the old one either, ever speaks. Be an example in that respect, so that whatever you say in the pulpit, no man can despise. Be a good example for others to follow who stand to speak to the congregation. Of course it is to be free from thoughtlessness, frivolity and worldliness, and from everything that would detract from effectiveness in making men better and wiser.

"In manner of life." That refers to conduct. To conduct, not only in public and in the congregation but in society. "Manner of life"! That includes nearly everything that the young preacher does except when he is asleep. If his manner of life is such as to be an example to the believers, one that they ought to imitate, they cannot despise him in that particular.

The next item is faith. "Be an example in faith." Suppose the young preacher indicates by word or action that his faith is shaky—his faith in the Bible, his faith in Christ, his faith in the things that are revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Suppose it is discovered by the congregation that his faith in anything of importance from Genesis to Revelation is very doubtful. Then all thoughtful persons, old and young, will despise his youth. They will say, This young fellow they have set up to lead us and be an example to us, and help us on in the way we should go, while he is wobbling like a lame man on that straight and narrow path himself.

Then, next to faith, the apostle says love. Be an example in love. Of course that refers primarily to the love of God, secondly to the love of the brethren, and the sisters—love of all good persons, and also to the love of sinners whom he is trying in love and earnestness to save from their sins.

There is another kind of love, however, that I think was scarcely included in Paul's intention in writing to Timothy. In

those days you know that what we call "love affairs" among young people were scarcely known. The father and the mother of the two parties managed all those arrangements themselves, without trusting to the immature judgment of the young people. They could not trust a young man to pick out his wife, nor a girl to decide between her suitors. There was too much responsibility in the rearing of children and in the discharge of the duties of married life to be left to the judgment of the young people. But that is included in the word love, and we may safely conclude that the apostle would have a young preacher to be an example to the believers in his love affairs. He must not be a flirt. If he happens to be popular with the other sex, he must not allow his popularity to lead him into flirting. That is dishonest and mean. He cannot be an example before the younger people of the church if they find him to be a man of that kind. He must be an example in these things, in honesty and sincerity, as he loves God, that he may benefit and save the people.

Then he also says, "an example in purity." That word, unlimited, means purity in thought, words, conversation, action; so that the man throughout his whole being is a pure man.

Now the young preacher who makes himself an example to the believers in these five particulars, is an admirable young man. No man is going to despise him on account of his youth. Every man and every woman who considers him sees in him an example for themselves to follow, instead of an inexperienced young man for them to despise and look down upon. I cannot think of any other way to keep people from despising your youth.

Now, brethren, every one of you will be exposed to the danger which Paul apprehended that Timothy might incur, and for which he gave this warning. How are you going to meet it? Will you bristle up when the old folks begin to criticize you, and say, These old people never have been to college, and I know, and I know too that they don't know. What effect will that have? The very opposite. And when the young people begin to criticize him, what will he say? Will he say, I know I am not older than they are, but I know a good deal more than

they do? I am here to "give it to them" and I am going to give it to them! If so, he may keep on giving it to them until at the end of his engagement with that church, they let him go. They despised his youth. But if a man is an example to the believers in these five particulars, such a thing as that can never occur. Such a man is prized very highly by the believers ; and they are thanking God for sending him to them. And they are constantly predicting what a great man he is going to be when he gets older. And that young man, instead of becoming discouraged because he is young, is conscious of the fact that he is getting older every day, and consequently all these troubles about being young pass away. I bespeak for that young man as he grows older an ever increasing love and respect from his people.

Laying aside the matter of your success as a preacher, this is the way to get to heaven. This is the way to live a life that will be praised of men when it is ended, that will have the approval of good men while you are living it, that will have the final approval of God.

Now, brethren, let me impress upon you with all the emphasis I can command, the words, "Let no man despise thy youth, but be an example to them that believe in manner of life, in faith, in love, in purity."

Keep Thyself Pure

In the midst of many important precepts addressed to Timothy, Paul gives conspicuity to one writing it down, as a sentence by itself, though composed of only three words. He pauses in the midst of more important instruction, to say with emphasis, "*Keep thyself pure.*" In these times of unbridled licentiousness, when things that are impure and even obscene press themselves upon our attention on every street in the city, and in every country neighborhood; when they constitute a part of the news of the day which passes from lip to lip; when they obtrude themselves into all the daily or weekly newspapers; when the books and the pamphlets which are read by the millions derive their charm largely from the degree in which they pamper impure desires and imaginings; when wine with its lust-inspiring warmth, the dance with its lascivious touch, and the theater with its nakedness are resorted to by the masses and even by so-called Christians in order to titillate their propensities which should be mortified; when an open crusade is preached against the marriage bond; when scandal invades the very sanctuary of God, and when adultery, seduction and abortion are the order of the day, what man can exaggerate the importance of the precept, "Keep thyself pure." If it were printed on the palm of every man's right hand, and on every woman's brow, it would not be too conspicuous.

From The Apostolic Times, Lexington, Kentucky, August 27, 1874.

Under the Jewish law, whosoever touched a dead body, or entered a room where a dead body lay, or touched the bone of a dead man, or a grave, or touched a person who had a running sore, was unclean, and must go through a cleansing process ere he was permitted to enter the congregation. When a man took the Nazarite vow, he bound himself before God to keep himself clean at all hazards. He must not attend the funeral, nor visit the grave of the dearest friend he had on earth; he must not knowingly touch a person with a running issue, and he must be careful to avoid the probability of doing so unwittingly. And if at any time, or by any means, even by the accident of a man falling dead at his side, he should become unclean, he lost all the time of his vow which had preceded, and he must begin anew to fill out the time. Through all failures and losses and renewals he had to struggle on until finally there should be the full period of his vow between the time of his last cleansing and his final release from the obligation. By this law of uncleanness and by the struggles and failures of those who took the vow, God was educating the Jew to the idea of spiritual purity, and typifying both that purity itself as required under Christ, and the difficulty of maintaining it.

It is no easy task to live a pure life, to be pure in heart, and, a consequence of this, to be pure in thought, in speech, in action. But by the grace of God, using diligently the helps which his word and church afford, it can be done. If, like the Nazarite, we become unclean at times, there is for us as there was for him, a blood of sprinkling which can wash away the stain and allow us, losing and forgetting the things that are behind, to start anew along the mark and toward the prize. The more we battle against impurity in ourselves and in others, the more we hate it, and the more the impurities about us help us, by the force of repulsion, to keep ourselves pure. In this way we may find fulfilled in us the saying of Paul, "Unto the pure all things are pure." There is nothing that can be forced on a man which will not help his purity if he only maintain himself in brave antagonism to all that is impure. The sunshine can pass through atmosphere filled with miasma and all noxious vapors, it can dance on the surface of the cesspool, and float over the mud and filth of the street, and yet be as clean as when it left the skies. Nothing can spot or stain its garments,

no poisonous breath can touch it; nothing can render it unwelcome to the cleanest place on earth. So it is with the man or woman who is pure in heart and life. But the impure are like the atmosphere: it drinks in all the fetid exhalations that rise from the earth; it floats over land and sea absorbing every noxious vapor and every sickening odor, until it must be shaken by the thunder, by the lightning and the tempest, to prevent it from destroying the life of man and beast. So it is with the man or the woman with impure habits. "Unto them that are defiled and unbelieving," says Paul, "nothing is pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." The impure soul must hear the thundering of God's wrath; must be tempest-tossed with the agonies of a deep repentance; must be sprinkled with the cleansing blood of Jesus; and must purify itself in obeying the truth, ere it shall be admitted to the company of the saved on earth, or be able to stand in the presence of the Pure One in heaven. Alas that so many are destined to fail of this, and to have it written as their everlasting epitaph, "Let him that is filthy be filthy still."

Pastors

There is nothing for which the brethren of the present Reformation were at one time more noted than for their advocacy of a pure speech. They rightly insisted that purity of speech and purity of thought are inseparably connected; that they preserve each other; and that a departure from either involves, with practical certainty, a departure from the other. There is no one of the fundamental assumptions of our plea which has contributed more to the accuracy of our Scripture knowledge, yet there is none which we are more likely to abandon. There is nothing in which men are so imitative as in speech. The very first accents of childhood are learned entirely by imitation, and the habit thus acquired of imitating what we hear is not often among the childish things which we lay aside. It is by the force of this habit that cant phrases and meaningless by-words gain currency with such facility, and that so many foreign terms are constantly gaining admittance into our language, to the neglect of those that are native born. Its force is so great that no ordinary man or party can resist the use of established phraseology, however erroneous it may be.

The sectarian parties of this country and Great Britain have the power to establish religious phraseology, so that whatever comes into use among them gains ready currency among the people. They imitate one another, and are imitated by the world. They have in this way molded the religious

From Lard's Quarterly, Vol. 2, Lexington, Kentucky, 1865, pp. 311-317.

thoughts and expressions of the people into hundreds of forms unknown to the Word of God and inconsistent with the truth. In attempting to establish a pure speech, we have hitherto been compelled to stand in opposition to those who make the laws of language, and have therefore waged an unequal contest. If we had control of public opinion in the literary world, ours would be an easy task, and the danger of being diverted from it would be but slight. But as the case now stands we are being constantly seduced into violations of our great law, that Bible things must be called by Bible names. The most unceasing vigilance and the most unrestrained criticism of one another will be necessary to preserve this law in practical operation. We cannot think of allowing it to become a dead law, for its observance is necessary to the final triumph of truth, and it is really a law of God. There is no precept of the New Testament more clearly enjoined than these two: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (I Pet. 4:11). "Hold fast the form of sound words, which you have heard from me, in faithfulness and love which is in Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 1:13).

The term *pastor* furnishes a striking example of the power with which sectarian usage forces itself upon us. In former times it was not known in our phraseology. This was not because the brethren were ignorant of its existence in the English Scriptures; but because the word had acquired, in popular usage, an unscriptural sense. We had no officer in our churches, and we read of none in the New Testament, corresponding precisely to the modern pastor, and therefore we had no use for the word in its popular currency. We were not compelled, indeed, to use the term at all, and therefore we did not even search into its proper or scriptural usage. But now it has gained a currency among us almost as universal as among the Presbyterians and Baptists, and in quite the same sense. We have had various attempts to reconcile this usage with our practices and principles in other respects, all of which tend to its establishment as a fixture among us. In none of the essays having this purpose in view have we seen an attempt to trace out the exact New Testament sense of the term. On the contrary, the writers have completely ignored this first and foremost essential of all the means of preserving a pure speech,

and have gone on to dogmatize after the most approved sectarian method.

We propose, in this essay, to briefly set forth the Scripture meaning and usage of this term, and to define with entire distinctness the relative position of the office it designates. We enter upon the task with confidence, because there is no real difficulty in understanding the subject by the light of the New Testament, and because we believe that all that the brethren need in reference to the matter is a clear exhibition of New Testament teaching.

The term in question occurs only once in the English Scriptures. When Paul is enumerating the "gifts to men" bestowed by our risen Saviour, he introduces pastors among those which were designed "for the instruction of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ." "He gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." In this classification, pastors are distinguished from evangelists, and arranged in the same class with teachers. It would be impossible, however, from this passage alone to fully define the term, or to show in what respect the pastors resemble the teachers so as to be classed with them, and differ from the evangelists so as to be arranged in a different class from them. We know enough of them, however, to state in advance that the duties performed by these various officers to some extent overlapped each other. The apostles were also prophets. The evangelists and the apostles were all alike preachers, and all three of these classes, as well as those called teachers, took part in the work of teaching. But all teachers were not evangelists, nor all evangelists prophets, nor all prophets apostles. There was something peculiar to each office which demanded for it a peculiar name, and which equally demanded that the names should not be confounded. How it was with the term *pastor* we will proceed to inquire more definitely.

Although this term occurs but once in the English version its Greek original occurs in the New Testament eighteen times, and is in every other instance rendered shepherd. In seven of these instances it is used literally for the man who attends a flock of sheep; in nine it is applied figuratively to Jesus, and only in this one is it applied to a class of officers in the church.

Now there is no good reason for a departure in this single instance from a rendering which would otherwise be uniform throughout the New Testament. If the term is correctly rendered shepherd everywhere else it certainly ought to be so rendered here, unless there is something in the context to forbid, which there is not. This, uniformity of rendering requires.

But there is a better reason for retaining the term *shepherd* here than that furnished by the demand for uniformity. When a metaphor is employed in the Greek, fidelity to the original requires that it should be perfectly retained, if possible, in the translation. When Jesus says of Herod: "Go, tell that fox, Behold, I cast out demons today and tomorrow, and the third day I am perfected," if the translator had rendered it: "Go, tell that quadruped," he would have blotted out the beauty of the clause, and robbed the reader of an important idea; although it is true that a fox is a quadruped. We cannot see the force of a metaphorical use of a word, except as we are guided by its literal meaning. We must, then, have uniformity of rendering to the full extent necessary to preserve the Scripture metaphors. Nothing but positive necessity should ever set this rule aside. But when the term *shepherd* is applied to Jesus, or to officers of the church, it is used metaphorically, and the metaphor is lost if you render it by *any* other term.

I may be met here by the objection that the term *pastor* means a shepherd, and therefore the metaphor is preserved by the rendering "pastors and teachers." But while it is true that the term once had this meaning it has long since ceased to be current in this sense, and its religious usage bears, in the popular mind, scarcely a trace of the original meaning. It also designates, as we will soon see, a different office from that to which the original term was applied in the Scriptures.

This is the proper point at which to inquire to whom this term is properly applied; or, in other words, who are the shepherds mentioned by Paul in the passage quoted from Ephesians. We might reach an answer inferentially, by arguing from the office of the literal shepherd; but we have a surer and safer method. Corresponding to the Greek term *poimeen*, shepherd, we have the verb *poimaino*, to act as a shepherd. Now whoever it is that performs the work expressed

by the verb *poimaino* is certainly the officer designated by the noun *poimeen*. In other words, whatever officers are commanded to do the work of shepherds these are the shepherds of the New Testament, just as the man who preaches is the preacher, the one who immerses is the immerser, the one who sows is the sower, and the one who reaps is the reaper. Fortunately for our inquiry, although the noun *poimeen* does not occur in such a connection as to show with certainty who is designated by it, the verb does, and we will have no difficulty in determining whose duty it is to act as a shepherd. The first time it is used imperatively is in the Savior's command to Peter: "Be a shepherd to my sheep" (John 21:16). The apostles were the first persons, therefore, who, after the Savior himself, who is pre-eminently the good shepherd, were called upon to perform this work. But they are not the shepherds of Ephesians 4:11, seeing that the latter are enumerated in a class distinct from that of the apostles. The apostolic commission really covered all the duties of all the officers known in the church. They were evangelists, prophets, rulers, teachers, and even deacons, according to the demands of circumstances. But the powers and duties thus aggregated in them were also distributed to various classes of laborers, each having its own peculiar gift. Among these classes we must look for the permanent shepherds of the flock.

In the only other instances of the imperative use of this term, its duties are enjoined upon the elders of the church. Paul, in addressing the elders of the church at Ephesus, also called bishops or overseers, says to them: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, that you be shepherds to the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). The Apostle Peter also says: "The elders that are among you, I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a sharer in the glory that is to be revealed. Act as shepherds to the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight, not by compulsion, but willingly; not for the sake of sordid gain, but *from* readiness of mind; neither as being lords over God's possessions, but being examples to the flock" (I Pet. 5:1-3). To the elders, or bishops, then, is committed the duty of being shepherds to the flock of God. When,

therefore, the apostle enumerates among other laborers pastors, or shepherds, and teachers, he means to designate the elders of the church. He means to designate them alone; for to no others is the duty of a shepherd assigned, except to the apostles.

We are now better prepared to determine the duties of the shepherd's office. They include, undoubtedly, all the duties assigned to official elders, yet by this title the mind is fixed more prominently upon one part of those duties. The chief business of a shepherd, as known to the Jews, was not to feed his flock; for they lived almost entirely by grazing. Our translators, therefore, made a serious mistake, when, instead of rendering *poimaino*, be shepherds to the flock, they rendered it feed the flock. Taking the custom of shepherds in the cold climate of England and Scotland for their guide, instead of that which prevailed in Judea, they assumed that feeding was their principal labor, and made this principal part stand for the whole in their translation. It would have been far nearer the truth to have rendered it rule the flock. This rendering, indeed, is found necessary in several places in the New Testament, as in Revelation 2:27; 12:5; 19:15; where it is said: "He shall rule them with a rod of iron." Here there is an allusion to the rod with which the shepherds controlled their flocks, and the representation of this rod as a rod of iron compels us to understand the leading term in its severer sense of ruling alone. In only one instance is it properly rendered feed, which is in Jude 12, "feeding themselves without fear," where the occurrence of "themselves" as the object of the participle compels us to so render it.

This fault in our translation has not only obscured the office of the shepherds, but has propagated the idea which led the translators to adopt it, so that feeding the flock by religious teaching is very generally supposed to be the chief duty of the elders' office. The result has been that elders have been appreciated according to their aptness to teach, and have striven to acquit themselves well in this respect to the almost total neglect of the discipline of the congregation. Much complaint has been lodged against our elders as a body, for their want of ability in teaching, while it has all the time been true that you could find among them twenty good teachers where

you could find one good ruler. Let us have the word *shepherd* in its proper place, and let it be remembered that the chief idea in the term is that of ruling, and we shall have a more vigorous effort at proper discipline.

After thus clearing up the rendering and force of the term, we can better see why Paul classified "shepherds and teachers" together. Both terms are employed to designate the elders of the church, the one term referring to their labor as rulers, the other to their labor as instructors.

It is gratifying to state that Bro. Anderson, in his excellent translation, has rendered the verb *poimaino* as we have insisted above that it should be. He has thus thrown a much clearer light upon this important subject, and enabled his readers to trace it out more satisfactorily. We have only to regret that he did not deal with the noun in the same way, giving us "shepherds and teachers," instead of retaining the "pastors and teachers" of the common version. No one by reading his version will be able to see that the elders, who are commanded to act as shepherds to the flock, are officially styled shepherds in Ephesians 4:11.

We now have all the facts before us necessary to a proper estimate of the term pastor. To apply it to a preacher who is not a regularly appointed elder of the church is a misnomer; as much so as to call the Lord's day Sabbath, or to call sprinkling baptism. It is a violation of the law that we must speak as the oracles of God; it is letting go the form of sound words which we have heard from the apostles. But this is the current meaning of the word, and if we use it all we are likely to be so understood; therefore it is better to dispense with it altogether, and adopt shepherd as the proper substitute.

Again: to style a preacher "the pastor" is still more unscriptural, for it robs the eldership entirely of this title, and makes it appear that there is but one pastor to the congregation, whereas the apostolic churches all had a plurality of them. If we use the term at all we must apply it to the eldership, and may speak of "the pastors of the church," and of "a pastor," but never of "the pastor," unless, indeed, a church is so ill organized as to have but one elder.

It may here be pertinently asked whether a preacher should ever be connected with a church in the manner of the so-called pastor; and if so, by what title is he to be known? We answer, that it is certainly scriptural for a preacher to confine his labors to a single community when the circumstances justify it. The apostles directed all their own labors and those of evangelists under their control by the rule of success. Wherever it appeared that they could accomplish the greatest good they went, and remained at each place as long as the same rule would justify. Hence we find all the apostles confined to the city of Jerusalem for a time, and calling to their aid seven deacons beside; so that we behold there nineteen men of the most gifted order laboring to edify and extend one congregation. They continued these labors until the dispersion of the church opened up more inviting fields of usefulness elsewhere; but at every subsequent period in which the church in Jerusalem is brought into view, we find some of the apostles still residing there. Paul remained three years in Ephesus, not merely preaching the gospel to the world, but teaching the brethren both publicly and from house to house, warning each one by night and by day (Acts 20:20, 31). He labored in Corinth eighteen months; and he and Barnabas, and others, spent two long periods together in Antioch. He left Timothy in Ephesus, to set in order things that were wanting long after the church had been fully organized. He frequently also left Luke and Silas, and other evangelists, behind him where churches were established, to continue the good work both within and without the church. It is right and scriptural, therefore, for a preacher to remain with a single congregation, laboring for their edification and increase, whenever he finds that he can be most useful in this way, and so long as this reason continues to hold good. There are many communities which might profitably engage all the time and energies of more than one faithful evangelist.

But what shall be the title of a preacher thus engaged? It has been assumed by some that this position constitutes him a pastor, and gives him joint control with the eldership of all the affairs of the church. By others he is supposed to be above the elders in authority; and by still another class it is urged that he must confine himself to preaching to the world, while the

teaching of the congregation belongs exclusively to the elders and those whom they may invite to take part with them. All of these positions are unscriptural. The truth in reference to all of them, as indicated by the facts above recited, is this: — There is no impropriety in a preacher who has the proper qualifications being elected to the elder's office. Then he has all the authority of that office, and may be designated by the titles, elder, overseer, shepherd. But the disciplinary authority which the Scriptures confide to that office is not his unless he is thus elected, nor can he be properly styled a shepherd or pastor. He is, then, simply an evangelist, or, in purer English, a preacher of the gospel. He is also a minister of the Word. By either of these titles he is distinguished and as such his duties are plainly prescribed in the Scriptures. One part of his commission is to teach the disciples all that Jesus commands; and in this teaching is embraced exhortation, entreaty, and reproof, as well as direct instructions (see II Tim. 4:2; 2:24, 25). In performing this work he is required to imitate apostolic examples, and therefore he must labor both publicly and from house to house. So far as teaching is concerned, his duty and that of the eldership is the same, and therefore it is the duty of both parties to co-operate in the work, and to do so in just that manner which will accomplish the greatest amount of instruction; for all things are to be done to edification. All these duties belong to him as a minister, a preacher, an evangelist; and he needs no other title to designate him, no other warrant to give him the liberty of working for the Lord. Let all our preachers, then, be known by these titles. Let them repudiate all others, and teach the brethren to speak of them as the oracles of God speak. So we shall have pure speech and pure thought, that cannot be spoken against; and when we triumph over sectarianism, as triumph we will if we are true to the Lord, our triumph will be the triumph of truth, and no future reformations will be demanded.

Legalized Adultery

The heading which I append to this article may startle precisely the subject on which I write, and the subject demands, at the present time, a startling method of treatment.

During the last few years I have received many letters asking for advice in reference to the marriage of divorced persons, and I know other brethren who have received many similar letters. It would astonish anyone, not familiar with the subject, to know the multitude of persons who are married in violation of God's Word; who are, consequently, living in legalized adultery; whose consciences give them unspeakable trouble; but who find themselves moral imbecils when they think of severing the bonds of sin in which they are united. I have met but one person thus situated who had the courage and the devotion to duty, when the subject had been fairly canvassed, to promise a dissolution of the unholy relation.

If this sin were confined to private and uninformed members of the church, we might be less alarmed at its prevalence, and hope that the united voices of preachers, teachers, and rulers in the church would, ere long, put a check on it. But preachers themselves are being led away by their lusts, and we confess that the aspects of the case are alarming.

I have now before me the cases of two preachers, one in the mountains of Kentucky, and one in the heart of Missouri, who have recently obtained divorces for other than Scriptural

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, Jan. 11, 1877.

causes, and entered into adulterous wedlock. The former case is stated as follows: The man was an ordained preacher in the Baptist Church. For some cause, not stated, his wife left him. He obtained a divorce and married again, taking, as his second wife, a woman who was living in his house when his lawful wife left him. He was excluded, as he should have been, from the Baptist Church, but was received into a Christian congregation, and made one of its elders! The other Christian congregations in the vicinity are scandalized by this procedure, and ask advice as to what they should do. They have no remedy, of course, except to treat the man himself as an adulterer, having no fellowship with him, and to use all possible moral influences to induce the congregation to withdraw from him.

The other case is that of a young preacher who had a Catholic wife, and for reasons which possibly, but not certainly, justified him, left her and took with him all but one of his children. After living apart from her for several years, he obtained a divorce and took another wife. Soon after this second marriage he applied for membership in a certain church, and the question was raised, whether he should be received. It is to be hoped that no church in Missouri, or elsewhere, will either receive him as a member, or allow him to enter the pulpit until he dissolves the connection and makes an ample provision for the woman whom he has misled. If he was married by a preacher, the church of which this preacher is a member should require of him a hearty repentance and a public repudiation of his part in the unholy transaction.

I am not ignorant of the fact that the parties to these unscriptural marriages affect to find justification for themselves in the instruction of Paul on this subject: He says, "If the unbelieving [husband or wife] depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases;" but he does not say, that after the unbeliever has departed the believer may marry again; nor can the statement that "the brother or sister is not in bondage in such cases," be construed as implying this; for in the very same context, the apostle says, "Let not the wife depart from her husband; but, and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband." (See I Cor. 7:15; 10:11.) He does not hold it to be a crime to live apart from a husband in certain cases, but he does hold

it to be sinful to contract a second marriage while the husband lives. Furthermore, the Savior himself makes the sin of adultery consist, not in the separation, but in the second marriage; it is he who puts away his wife for any other sin than fornication, and marries another that commits adultery. (See Matt. 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11.)

Just previous to commencing this article, I was looking over the *Christian Standard*, and was pleased to find, in answer to a query, a clear and strong statement of the truth on which we insist. The query and answer are as follows:

Two young persons were married, both members of the church. After they were married awhile, he thinking he could better himself pecuniarily, located at a place some distance from her parents. They were dissatisfied and wrote to her to come home and leave him. Finally they wrote her that her mother was sick, and if she would see her she must come at once. He sent her immediately; that has now been nearly seven years, and she has never returned. For a good while he wrote to her and sent her money, and when she did not come to him, he went to see her; but she refused to go with or to tell him her reason for not going. Since that time he has gone to see her, and done all in his power to have the trouble settled, and has failed. She has never charged him with anything wrong, and all who knew them while they lived together, will testify that he treated her kindly, and provided well for her. Now, the question: Is he obliged to go through the world alone, or would he sin if he obtained a legal separation, and married someone that would live with him? Please give your views of the Scriptures bearing on this subject.

A.O.D.

That the wife is wrong in this case, cannot be doubted. She refuses obedience to her husband, and refuses to perform her marriage vows. She is, in the strongest sense, a covenant-breaker, and the church should deal with her as such, and also with those who persuade her to that course of action, and thus become participants in her sin.

But now, as to the husband. He can "let her depart" (I Cor. 7:15). He is not "under bondage" in such a case. He is not bound to continue his suit to her, nor to support her; and there may be good reasons why he should obtain a legal separation, and cut her off from all claim on him or his estate. But is he at liberty to marry again? We think not. See Matt. 5:32; Mark 10:11, 12; Luke 16:18. The man

who puts away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, "causeth her to commit adultery" by entering into a new and unlawful marriage connection. This is not less true of the woman who puts away her husband. There may be good reasons for separation, which still are not good reasons for marrying again.

This may seem hard in such a case as we are now considering. So is it hard if a wife proves to be insane, or is crippled for life. But they are hardships which must be endured for the sake of righteousness. The marriage bonds must be maintained inviolate, or the purity and permanency of society are at an end.

This is unquestionably a true statement of the Savior's teaching; and however hard it may appear to a man "to go through the world alone," as the querist expresses it; or, as it should be expressed, to restrain his passions for the sake of righteousness, the man who will not do it cannot be a disciple of Christ, and much less can he be a preacher of the gospel.

Legalized Adultery Again

Since the publication of my recent article on the unscriptural marriage of divorced persons, I have received a number of communications from different parts of the country, expressing approval of what I have written, but calling for additional light on the subject.

One brother propounds the following question:

"If the husband leave the wife without sufficient cause, and marry again, does this adulterous life, on his part, give the wife a scriptural ground for divorce and the right to marry again?"

I think there can be no doubt that it does; for in this case adultery is unquestionably committed by the husband, and this, according to the Savior's teaching, justifies the wife in contracting another marriage.

Another brother suggests an inquiry as to the proper method of proving the charge of adultery, when preferred as a ground for divorce. Certainly no man can be permitted to divorce his wife on a charge of adultery unsupported by valid proof. Suspicion, or his own unsupported assertion, is not sufficient. The elders of the church must be satisfied that the charge is true, and the grounds of their decision must be such as to place the fact beyond the reach of reasonable doubt. If, in a suit before the civil courts, the charge of adultery is prefer-

From The Apostolic Times, Lexington, Kentucky, Feb. 8, 1877.

red, and is proved to the satisfaction of a jury, this is ordinarily sufficient evidence, and no further inquiry need be made, except when there is good ground to think that a fair trial in court has not been held. When this charge is not preferred before the courts, but the divorce is obtained on other grounds, the plaintiff holding, however, that this crime has been committed, it is the duty of the elders to decide on the truthfulness of the charge and to act accordingly.

The responsibility of the preacher who performs the ceremony in an unscriptural marriage, is also made a subject of inquiry. A marriage of a member of the church to a divorced woman once took place in a church where I was an elder. The elders learned from common rumor, some week or two in advance of the wedding, that it was to take place, and they promptly gave the man the proper advice and warning; but he persisted, and was excluded from the church. The preacher who performed the ceremony was a member of the same congregation, and was waited on to know why he had made himself a party to the sinful transaction. He solemnly asserted that he was ignorant of the fact that the woman had been divorced, and on this statement being made to the congregation, he was excused. A preacher who lives in a city, or in a place of common resort for wedding parties, is constantly liable to be led unwittingly to participate in such marriages, and it becomes him to be on his guard. It is very easy, as a general rule, to learn the facts in the case, and when a stranger proposes to be married to a widow, who is also a stranger, the inquiry should always be made whether she is a divorced woman, and, if so, the ground of her divorce.

Again, I am asked, whether a couple, who are known to be unscripturally married, but who come with letters of commendation from a sister church, should be received into the fellowship of the congregation. Without hesitation, I answer, no. In such a case it is known that the church granting the letter has done wrong in so doing, either intentionally or through ignorance, and if we receive the parties we are participating in the wrong. When a church letter is presented, it furnishes *prima facie* evidence of Christian character, and it must be accepted in the absence of conflicting evidence; but when the congregation into whose fellowship admission is

sought, knows to the contrary, or has good reason to suspect the contrary, she must go behind the letter and judge for herself as to the reception of members into her body.

I hope there will be re-awakening of consciences among preachers, church officers, and church members, on this important subject. The church cannot afford to be stained with the guilt of adultery. If she dares thus to become defiled, her Lord will repudiate her as an unclean thing, and the world will scorn her as a painted hypocrite. It is a shame to Protestant churches that the law of Christ on this subject is more sacredly regarded and more strictly enforced by her whom we sometimes call "The Mother of Harlots," than by ourselves! Let us be abashed and humiliated, until we reform, and can lift up our heads and declare that the Protestant world has returned to the Word of the Lord on this vital element of social and religious life.

"Lord, Teach Us To Pray"

There is a considerable amount of time devoted to teaching young ministers how to preach, but comparatively little in teaching them how to pray. There is a common impression that prayer is not a subject for instruction—that all that is needful is for one to be filled with warm emotions, and then let the tongue loose and let it run at random. The result of this is, that there is a great deal of praying done which reaches no higher than the ceiling, and a great deal that does not reach that high. It is a waste of breath.

Such was not the conception of Jesus and the find the apostles coming to Jesus once, after he had concluded a season of prayer and saying to him, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." This shows that John the Baptist had made prayer a subject of instruction to his disciples. The twelve remembered, doubtless, what John had taught; and not only so, but they remembered what Jesus himself also had taught in the sermon on the mount, that instructive passage in the sixth chapter of Matthew. They knew that John had taught them and they knew the main lesson on the subject which their own master had given; why were they not content with these? Why did they still come to the Master and request him, "Lord, teach us to pray"? I do not know why, unless it was from the fact that they observed him devoting more time to prayer than they did, or even than did the hypo-

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex., The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 39-42.

crites who stood on the corners of the streets with uplifted hands to pray, and stood in the synagogue to pray while others were seated. They had known him to retire into a mountain alone and pray there all night; and there was not one of them that could do that. On one occasion, you remember, three of them went up into a high mountain with him to pray, and while he continued praying they dropped upon the ground and fell asleep. And later, while he was praying in the terrible agonies of Gethsemane, the same three were there and fell asleep, and he waked them up three times. It was impossible for them, and I presume to say it has been impossible since for any man, to pray all night. Some may imagine that they had done it, but perhaps they had been asleep more than once and forgot it when they reported that they had prayed all night.

Evidently the disciples thought that there was a secret in prayer which he had not revealed to them and that he could teach them what it was, so that they could pray as long as he did. What an earnest desire on their part is manifested in this request! They were doubtless very much surprised at this answer. He simply repeated to them that little prayer which he had taught them in the sermon on the mount, commonly called the Lord's prayer, adding to it, however, a parable teaching that they should be importunate in prayer and never cease asking until they had obtained. They must be like the man who came to a neighbor at midnight, aroused him, and begged him to give him three loaves of bread, as company had come in and he had no bread to set before them. The neighbor answered, I am in bed with my children and cannot get up to give it to you. But the other continued importuning him, until at last he rose and gave him all he wished. He did not give them any new secret of prayer by which they could pray a long time, or all night, but only that they should be importunate in prayer.

If you examine all the instruction that you will find directly and indirectly given, you will find that Jesus never taught the disciples prayers, although he prayed a long time himself. He never taught his own example in this. There was a secret in his mind and heart which they did not possess and which we do not possess, that made it peculiar to him to remain long in prayer. When we remember who he was and whom he addressed, we sometimes wonder that he ever prayed at all.

We have two prayers on record which he taught. One I have already referred to, called the Lord's prayer. Have you ever observed how brief that prayer is in point of time of delivery? Look at your watches while I recite it to you. [Recites the Lord's prayer, not hurriedly, and then says . . .] Less than one-half minute. Now think of that. I read in addition to the prayer itself, "Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever," which has proven to be an interpolation. If you test what is called the intercessory prayer in the fifteenth chapter of John, which is his longest prayer on record, you will find that you can read it deliberately in three minutes. The apostle Paul quotes in various epistles quite a number of prayers that he made for churches and for individuals. The longest of them is the one in the third chapter of Ephesians, and that can be read very deliberately in less than one and one-half minutes. What a rebuke, now, this is to the long prayers that we have sometimes heard in the pulpit, and the stories that we have read about the number of hours every day noble men of whom we read felt compelled to spend in prayer.

There is a story told, and it is repeated by the great Canon Farrar in one of his works, about James, the Lord's brother, that he spent so much time on his knees praying that the skin and flesh became thick and hardened like the knees of a camel. James had too much respect for the teaching of his master to do a thing of that sort. This is a tale gotten up by the monks of the dark ages—a result of their own superstitious practice. I have sometime gotten so weary in listening to a long prayer in church that I have been tempted to take my seat before it was finished; and I think it would be a good lesson to some long-winded preacher to open his eyes and see the whole congregation sitting reading their hymnals because they got so worn out listening to his long prayer.

Is it not for edification of the church, and it should be something in which all the audience can unite with him. And if he continues until their knees begin to tremble and their minds begin to wander, there is no edification. On the contrary, they are liable to forget before the end of the long thing, anything edifying that had been said at the beginning. Whenever the audience begins to wish that the man leading in prayer would stop, he has already gone farther than he ought. I think this

habit grew out of the idea, that when we get up in church to pray we ought to pray for everybody and everything. It is true that some preachers try to cut that short by asking the Lord to "bless all for whom it is our duty or privilege to pray," but it is better to remember that if the Lord permits you to live you will have a chance to pray again next Sunday. And if you can pray for some of the people and the good things today, then if you live until the next week you may go the rounds; and if you don't live somebody else may take it up in your place.

I have a good deal more to say on this subject, but I must postpone it for future lectures of this kind. In the meantime, think solemnly and reverently on the subject of your prayers.

Will God Answer Prayer?

This is a strange question to appear in a religious journal. It is still stranger that it should ever become a question among those who profess to worship God. There are but two classes of men who can possibly answer it in the negative, or even hesitate about answering it in the affirmative. They are those who do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and those who believe, but are ignorant of Bible teaching upon this subject. Neither of these classes necessarily answers in the negative, for many who have rejected the Bible have retained the belief that God will answer prayer. But he who accepts the Bible as the Word of God, and is acquainted with its contents, has no alternative. From the days of Abraham's intercession for Sodom to the close of Revelation, he finds examples and precepts and promises almost innumerable, affirming that God's eyes have always been over the righteous, and his ears open to their cries.

Yet there are many persons in the churches who have but little confidence in what the Bible teaches upon this subject. They are those who pray but seldom, or whose prayers are a mere form. How many thousands of worshippers are there in religious assemblies who go through the form of prayer with scarcely a thought of their prayers being answered. How many, indeed, of those who lead in public prayer, and of those who are punctual in private devotions, are moved entirely by a

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, W. K. Pendleton, editor, Vol. 36, Bethany, W. Va., 1865, pp. 161-164.

mere sense of duty, without the least stimulus from the hope that they will obtain what they ask for. They are like an old sister in the West, who stated her experience as follows: "The Bible says, if you will pray for a mountain to be removed into the sea, it will be done. Well, there is a hill between our house and the public road. I have been praying the Lord for a year, to move it out of the way, and he has not done it; and I knew he would not do it when I was asking him."

No doubt much of the want of confidence upon this subject arises from a failure to understand it as it is presented in the Scriptures. Now from the very nature of the case, there are many prayers which are not, and cannot be answered. One man is praying for rain, and another, whose interest is different, praying at the same time for dry weather. Two religious parties are each praying for triumph over the other, and two nations at war are each praying for victory. Thousands are praying, too, for God to do things which he has determined not to do, or to do them in a certain way when he has unchangeably fixed upon another way. That all such prayers can be answered is either physically or morally impossible, and this fact shows that there is a limitation to the rule that God will answer prayer. This limitation, properly defined, will lead us to a better understanding of the whole subject.

The apostle John says, "This is the confidence that we have toward him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he hears us. And if we know that he hears us, whatever we ask we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him." Now the words, "according to his will," constitute the limiting clause of this whole statement, so that only when we ask according to the will of God we can claim that he hears and will answer us. This limitation is not often mentioned in the Scriptures, probably because it is so obvious as not to need frequent repetition. But all the precepts we have, in reference to the place, the matter, and the manner of prayer, imply this limitation, by showing that God has a will upon the subject which must be complied with. The idea, therefore, is abundantly set forth in the Scriptures.

This will of God, according to which we must pray, is not that conceit of the fatalist, by which he has fixed in unalterable fate all things which come to pass in human history. If this

were a reality all that we could gain by praying according to his will, would be obtained just as certainly, if we prayed not at all; and there would be no such thing, properly speaking, as answered prayer. But the will referred to is God's will on the subject of prayer. So the connection of thought requires us to understand it.

We can only know God's will as he has revealed it to us. We know not, therefore, how to make our prayers accord with his will, except by making them accord with the Scriptures. That a prayer which is contrary to the Scriptures, and therefore contrary to the will of God, will remain unanswered, is a maxim of common sense. But a prayer may be contrary to the will of God in several particulars. It may be offered in a place which is forbidden; as the private prayers of the Pharisees while standing in the synagogues or on the corners of the streets. When they entered the synagogue, before taking their seats they lifted up their hands and offered a silent prayer, as the members of some churches now do, kneeling upon the benches; and as some preachers do, kneeling down when they first enter the pulpit. All such prayers are contrary to the will of God, and will not be heard in heaven. Again, a prayer may be offered through the wrong motive; to be seen of men (Matt. 6:5), or to gratify some devil desire (Jas. 4:3). It may be filled with vain repetitions (Matt. 6:7), or it may be a prayer for something not promised. In none of these cases is the prayer according to God's will, and therefore an answer need not be expected.

The rule, that in order to obtain an answer from God, our prayers must be according to his will, is the great governing principle upon the subject. It prohibits prayer for anything, or in any manner, or under the influence of any motive, known to be contrary to his will. In reference to all matters which are doubtful, it requires the prayer to be hypothetical, and renders the answer equally doubtful. Hence in reference to life and all our plans for the future, James teaches us to say, "If the Lord will, we will live, and do this, or that;" and Paul calls upon the brethren at Rome to join with him in praying "that I may come to you with joy, by the will of God, and may be refreshed among you." Jesus himself also prayed, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not my will but thine be done." This uncertainty as to what is the will of God, applies to thousands

of things in the affairs of nations, of communities, and of individuals, and in reference to them all our prayers should be modestly limited by the condition, "If the will of the Lord be so." There is no positive promise that such petitions will be granted, and therefore we should not, when offering them, too confidently anticipate an answer.

Again, when God promises certain blessings on certain conditions, our rule requires us to limit our prayers by the conditions imposed. We cannot pray for rain without a cloud, nor for food without labor. Neither can we pray for pardon in unbelief, in impenitence, or disobedience. Here is the folly of mourning-bench prayers, which call upon God to pardon the sinner before he has complied with the conditions of pardon which the will of God prescribes. Whatever blessing from God, or attainment in Christian life, depends in part upon conditions to be complied with by us, or exertions made by us, can be asked for according to the will of God only when the prayer is accompanied by the conditions or the exertion. Hence, Ananias commanded Saul to call on the name of the Lord as he was proceeding to be immersed, and wash away his sins; and hence we are to forgive when we pray "forgive us." When we pray for wisdom, which God has promised to give to all liberally, we are to let the word of wisdom dwell in us richly; when we pray for stronger faith, we must not forget that faith comes by the Word of God; and when we pray for salvation of sinners, we must preach to them the gospel which is the power of God to salvation.

But finally, when the will of God is certainly known, known in all its conditions, and our prayers are according to it, the answer is certain to be obtained. Of this we have the most solemn assurance of God's Word, and if that cannot give us confidence, where will we go to find anything certain beneath the heavens? Let us, then, constantly study the will of God, and pray with an undoubting faith. We have this great truth to encourage us, that he who knows the most of God's will, will be certain, other things equal, to offer the most acceptable prayers. He who has most escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, and partaken most of the divine nature, will most frequently will the same things that God wills, and therefore enjoy the most frequent answers to his prayers.

There is a boundless room for improvement here, as in all other matters of Christian life. Even Paul could say, "We know not what to pray for as we ought," but "the Spirit helps our infirmities." Let us come, then, with humble hearts to the communication of the Spirit, and learn what to pray for at all times, and to pray as we ought, that our praying may not be in vain.

Paul's Prayer For Two Churches

I have undertaken to set forth before you the apostle Paul as a man of prayer. We have studied Paul in various aspects of his character and career, but perhaps we have never taken up a special study of his example as a man of prayer.

In the brief address last given I called your attention to his habit of prayer and to some special examples that are recorded historically by Luke without giving the words that he uttered. I propose now to call attention to some that are mentioned by him himself. Of course we find these in his epistles, and more of them in the first epistle to the Thessalonians than in any of his longer epistles. You remember that he had been scourged and imprisoned in Philippi and treated shamefully, as he afterwards expressed it. He went to Thessalonica, about 100 miles west and there in the course of three weeks, or including three Sabbath days spent in the synagogue he reasoned with the people setting forth that the Christ must needs suffer death and come forth from the dead, and that the Jesus whom he proclaimed unto them was the Christ. The result of his labor in those three sabbaths and perhaps the twelve intervening days was that some of the Jews of Thessalonica, a great multitude of the devout Greeks, and of the chief women not a few, believed. This remarkable success excited the jealousy of those Jews who believed not. And, being in a foreign city, where they had to be very careful how they conducted themselves, they

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex., The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 47-51.

were afraid to do any violence openly; so they stirred up the people by slander and lies of the basest kind. Taking to themselves certain "vile fellows of the baser sort," they assaulted the house of Jason who had been entertaining Paul and Silas: but not finding them there for some cause which is not explained, they took Jason and certain other brethren and dragged them before the rulers of the city, crying, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all act contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." Now that charge put before the magistrates who knew nothing of the subject, caused a persecution at once against the whole church. They dragged this man Jason before the magistrates and put him under bonds to keep the peace. In the meantime the brethren had sent Paul and Silas away by night. It is a humiliating thing for a man of sensitive feelings to have to leave a place between two days. It is generally the way in which thieves and robbers and criminals in general leave the places of their crimes. You remember that he went down to Berea where he had great success until some of these foreign Jews followed him there and stirred up trouble. He went from there to Athens where he stayed quite a while and where he had good success. From there he went to Corinth where he remained about eighteen months.

Now on leaving Thessalonica he left the church which they had planted there under the persecution that followed the trouble stirred up by those foreign Jews. In writing to them afterwards he said, "You have heard what things the church in Jerusalem suffered at the hands of the Jews," and he draws a parallel between their own sufferings and those which caused the church at Jerusalem to be dispersed. A report of this reached him at Athens, and he said, "I have desired again and again to come to you, but Satan hindered." It is a remarkable declaration—that the devil hindered him from returning to Thessalonica. I presume that it was because the devil kept up that persecution and would have stirred up the people to greater violence and cruelty if Paul had gone back there. So, not daring to do this, on account of the evil it would bring upon the disciples, he sent Timothy back there and he remained in Athens until Timothy returned. Timothy went to "establish

them and strengthen them in the faith and comfort them." Now that brings us the subject of his prayer.

In the beginning of the epistle he says, "We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ." This shows that in all of his prayers he made mention of that body of disciples, with thanksgiving to God on their account. "We give thanks to God always for you all making mention of you in our prayers," showing that in every prayer that he offered he had remembrance of that church. What an earnest, devoted man he was. How deep his sympathies for his brethren in their suffering. And how earnestly he plead with God on their behalf. Here is an example for every preacher. It does good, or else the inspired apostle would not have engaged in it. If you know of a single disciple who is suffering at the hands of the enemies of God, there is an example for you. He tells them, farther on, what he particularly prayed for when he was remembering them in his prayers and giving thanks to God for them. "Now may our God and father himself direct our way to you and remove Satan out of the place where he is hindering us from coming to you. And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men." That "all men" included those persecuting Jews; and his prayer is, that the disciples may abound and increase in love not only toward one another, but toward "all men," including those who were persecuting them. "Now may our God and Father himself and our Lord Jesus, direct our way unto you: and the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we also do toward you; to the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all of his saints." The expression, "All of his saints" includes those who had departed to where Jesus is. And as the word saints means holy ones, he probably refers to the coming of the holy angels; and his prayer is that the Thessalonian saints may be established in holiness.

Then he has another prayer for them which he mentions. "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without

blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He next shows his faith in prayer, not only in his own prayers, but in those of others, by adding, "Brethren, pray for us." What was the use of their praying for him? There was a use for it. There was something good in it. He expected as a result of their praying for him that blessings would come to him which he would not otherwise receive.

I will next call your attention to his prayer for another church which had been established by other hands than his. He tells the Romans that he had had for many years a longing desire to visit them and be among them. I expect some you young preachers would like to go to New York City, or to Boston, or over to Chicago, to serve some great church with its great building, its great organ and choir, and great men sitting there to hear you. Well, why? Curious ambition, or what motive? Certainly the apostle Paul's desire to visit Rome was not of that kind. He tells them that he has desired to visit them for many years in order that he may impart to them some spiritual gift; not in order that he might say, as some now do, I have preached in Rome, or Boston, or New York, or Chicago, but that he might impart unto them some spiritual gift, and that he might enjoy for a time their fellowship and that they might enjoy his. Now that is a pure and noble purpose. When he said I am not ashamed of the gospel, and I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome, he does not mean that he is such a good preacher that he is not ashamed to preach in Rome; but he says, "I am a debtor to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome."

But notice his prayer in regard to them. "For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son, how unceasingly I make mention of you, always in my prayers making request, if by any means now at length I may be prospered by the will of God to come unto you." Notice that. "I make mention of you always in my prayers." Not praying God's blessing, as sometimes is said, upon all for whom it is our duty or privilege to pray, the world over; but mentioning unceasingly the church of Rome; not because they were in the midst of any great persecution, but because, situated where

they were, their fame as disciples of Christ had spread abroad over the whole earth. "First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith in proclaimed throughout the whole world." Everywhere the church had become known and was spoken of. Their faith was published. He thanks God for that and then he, unceasingly in all of his prayers, prays God that he may come to them and impart to them some gift of the Spirit. That was constant.

These prayers were offered in Corinth, where he labored for eighteen months.

There is another noble expression of the apostle at the close of this epistle—a doxology. "Now to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith: to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, be the glory forever. Amen."

Paul's Prayers For His Friends

In my last address I called your attention to Paul's prayers for two churches—that at Thessalonica, which suffered severer persecution than any other of the churches that he planted; and the one at Rome, whose fame for faith and obedience had spread throughout the Roman Empire. He prayed for these most fervently, mentioning both of them in every prayer. The same is true of the church at Philippi and the church at Corinth. We have his own words for his constant remembrance of these four churches in every prayer, naming them and offering, doubtless, for each such supplications as he knew they most needed. We have no right to suppose that these were the only churches of which he constantly made mention in his prayers. There was Berea, and Ephesus, and some others. He was a man of prayer, then, upon whom was laid the care of all the churches, mentioning all these congregations to the Lord in all his prayers. He was worthy of being entrusted with the "care of all the churches." And he who is worthy to be given the care of a single church cannot too earnestly and too often pray for it.

But Paul did not confine this constant remembrance of others to congregations. He extended it also to individuals. He says to Timothy, "I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers in a pure conscience, how unceasing is my remembrance of thee in my supplications, night and day longing to see thee, remembering thy tears, that I may be filled with joy."

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex., The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 53-56.

He had left Timothy in a flood of tears when he last parted from him and those tears were constantly on his mind, and with that constant memory went up his petitions for that young man. And so in regard to Philemon, a man whom he had never seen so far as the record goes, but of whom he had heard much. He says, "I thank my God always, making mention of thee in my prayers, hearing of thy love and of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all the saints." Such a man as that he could not forget when he bowed his knees before God in prayer. Thus we see the mind and heart and memory of this praying man, loaded with the wants, the dangers, the necessities of a large number of persons. For if he prayed thus for Timothy and Philemon, what about Priscilla and Aquila, who once laid down their necks to save his life; or Epaphroditus, or any other of the heroes of the faith whom he loved with all his heart, and who were bound to him by cords of steel? Thus he prayed for the churches with which he was connected, and for individual saints both male and female whom he had known who were his fellow-servants, and whose names were written in the Book of Life. Not only so, but he did not falter in that precept which was taught in the sermon on the mount—"love your enemies." His own countrymen had caused his expulsion from Antioch and Iconium; and more recently from Thessalonica which he had to leave by night. They had also on five occasions stripped him of his garments and given him thirty-nine lashes on his naked back. If there ever was a people whom a man might hate, and whom any one of us would hate, it was the Jews in their dealings with Paul. But in the epistle to the Romans he makes a statement which would be unthinkable with common men, "I have great heaviness and unceasing sorrow in my heart: for I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." If he had said, "I have unceasing wrath in my heart," it would not have surprised us; and in the same epistle he says, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved." Brethren, who is it in the church today that thus prays for those who hate him? He goes farther than even this. "I could even wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh." He did not say, I wish it, but I could wish it. I think if he had said, I do wish it, he would have done wrong. I cannot think of myself as

wishing myself accursed from Christ for anyone, however near he might be related to me. It is possible that when he said he could wish this, he would have failed had he been put to the test. But those expressions show a devotional and self-sacrificing spirit almost equal to that of the Christ himself.

When Paul reached the end of his pilgrimage you would naturally expect to read there some splendid prayers, but not a word of it. When he was ready to lay down his neck that the sharp sword of the executioner might sever his head from his body, he did not spend his last hours in prayer. He had reached the point where prayer is turned to praise, faith to sight, and hope to full fruition. He says to Timothy, "The time of my departure has come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing." So instead of spending his last hours in prayer, calling on faithful men to pray around his bed and comfort him, as we in our weakness often do, he left this world with a shout of triumph.

This now is the way in which this man of God passed through trials and sufferings at the hands of men, often at hands of those who should have been his friends, and gave up his life in the service of his Master. I commend his character and example for your imitation. The more earnest your prayers for others, the more pleasing you will be in the sight of God. It is singular that in the record of his prayers you find him recording only one which he offered for his own personal welfare.

He had been so exalted by revelations from heaven, that it was necessary for him to receive an affliction which would be humiliating. He calls it a thorn in the flesh, and emissary of Satan to buffet him. To buffet means to smite you in the face. What could be more irritating than to have an enemy stand by you and frequently smite you in the face? And what could be more humiliating in the presence of others looking on? He says, Three times I have prayed God to remove this from me. That prayer was never answered. Paul says, "He said to me, My grace shall be sufficient for you." Instead of taking it away God gave him grace to bear it. And we are to suppose that he

had to endure it to the day of his death. He learned, however, to say, "When I am weak, then I am strong." And in this connection he makes a statement that is as incredible as that about the Jews. "I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake." God gave him in answer to that prayer, not the relief for which he petitioned, but that strange feeling which relieves those who reach it by prayer from the pain of suffering and the shame of affliction, so that he no longer felt humiliated as he once did, but on the contrary, he says, "I take pleasure." What a strange pleasure! He took pleasure in afflictions which he had prayed God three times to relieve him from without being relieved. How great a soul was that! How unconquerable the spirit. How devoted to God, to Christ and to humanity! Let him be your example next to the example of your Lord and Savior.

Prayer and Meditation

The apostle Paul, in addressing the church which he praised most of all, said, "We know not how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," or rather "with inarticulate groanings." This ignorance was not absolute. Both he and those to whom he was writing did know to some extent how to pray. They knew from the instruction which Jesus gave on that subject, and from what they found in the recorded prayers of accepted men. But they and all deeply earnest Christians found moments when the heart was heavily burdened with longings and desires which they could not find words to express; and I suppose it is to these that the apostle refers when he speaks of "inarticulate groanings."

Such moments, if our prayers were addressed to a man, would be a failure. But, being addressed to God, the Spirit of God within us knows what we mean when we cannot say what we mean or what we desire; and thus he relieves us of what would otherwise be a very serious infirmity. This fact, however, does not excuse us from making intelligent use of that knowledge which has been imparted to us on this subject, implies the duty on our part of reflection and meditation on our prayers, so that we may apply to them the instruction which has been given audience. If that is true, how much more would

it appear that we should premeditate what we should say to God on a given occasion when we are to express to him the wants and aspirations of a whole audience of worshippers. If we do not premeditate our sermons, we are apt to speak a good deal of nonsense. And is it not nonsense to indulge in random talk to the Lord? Are we not likely to do somewhat as the old farmer who prayed, "O Lord, bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more." If he had premeditated on what he was about to say to the Lord he would never have said what he did. So of that Confederate soldier of whom General Gordon relates that in the time of our civil war was called on to pray in a soldiers' prayer meeting. He said, "O Lord, we pray thee to help us. We need thy help and we need it badly. We pray thee, O Lord, to take a right view of this war and be on our side." If he had premeditated, his prayer would have taken a different shape.

If we offer our prayers in public, or in the prayer meeting, or in the family, without premeditating, without thinking what we should pray for, we shall either fall into the habit of saying over and over and over again on different occasions the same prayer, or else we will offer some foolish prayer. I have known some preachers, and quite a number of elders and deacons who officiate in the prayer meeting, to fall into this habit, so that the young people in the audience learn to repeat the good brother's prayer and laugh about it. Now when a man drops into this habit, he loses the sympathy of the audience and becomes wearisome to them. He has fallen into a habit which makes his own mind inactive. Such prayers may not weary the Lord, but they certainly weary everybody else.

If you were going to meet King George of England and knew that you would be expected to talk with him for a time, you would be very much concerned as to what you were going to say to him. You would settle it in your mind how you were going to address him. If you did not you might find yourself saying, "Good morning, Mister George. How are you, Mistress George and the children?" But, if you were going to meet him tomorrow, you would spend the whole of this day thinking what would be the proper thing to say; and you would get advice from others who had spoken to kings. Now, if you are going to address the great God and Father of us all, and to do

so in behalf of a large audience of praying people, will you rush right into his presence without premeditating beforehand how you will address him? You would consider yourself unfit to offer a prayer if you did that. Not one of you would be guilty of it. If you would fairly premeditate you would ask yourself, what, on the occasion of tomorrow, would be the most suitable subject on which to address my Lord and Savior? You would consider the wants and wishes and necessities of the congregation. And in that way your prayer would be in harmony with the instructions that have been received in the Scripture, and the prayer would be edifying to the audience. All could say Amen. Paul exhorts those who pray in the congregation not to pray in an unknown tongue so that the brethren would not be able to say Amen.

While I was a student in Bethany College, I heard of the prayer offered by an old brother in Western Pennsylvania, not far from the place where General Braddock was defeated and his army almost exterminated by the Indians. While this incident was still fresh in the minds of the people, an old brother who had fallen into the habit of making very long prayers in the family, always mentioned Braddock's defeat. He had a boy who had heard his father pray so much that he knew his prayer by heart. One night the boy had a visitor about his own age, and they kneeled during the prayer close together. The home boy fell asleep and the visitor awakened him. He asked in a whisper, "Has father got to Braddock's defeat yet?" "No." "Well, then I can take another nap." There are a great many prayers that are of this character for the want of premeditation. Have you thought of this? Or have you had a strange kind of feeling that, while it is all right to think through my sermon beforehand, it is rather irreverent to think beforehand through my prayers. What I have said, and what your own minds will suggest, is enough to show you that this want of premeditation is unwise if not irreverent. The most solemn thing that a man can do is to stand before an audience of praying people, with some among them who never pray, and there offer the common petitions and supplications of a whole multitude. There is a very heavy responsibility lying on the man who does this. And I do not think you should be any less anxious about what you should pray for and how you should

pray for it, than you are about what you should preach and how you should preach it.

One of the great difficulties I have in preparing these addresses is to find time to condense them into the allotted time. Isocrates, the Greek orator, at one time spoke much longer than he was in the habit of speaking. And one of his friends asked him why he spoke so long. He answered, "I didn't have time to make it any shorter." He didn't have time to reflect upon what he was going to say, and make it so mature as to be brief. You will find this difficulty in your own experience. You rise with nothing particular on your mind that you want to say, and you keep on talking until everybody wishes you would quite. And so with respect to your prayers. One is often called on to lead in prayers very unexpectedly. You have no time to reflect what you should pray for before beginning. On such occasions you have this relief: You know that there are certain spiritual wants and aspirations that are common to all worshippers, and if you present any of these you will not have gone amiss in respect to the present audience. When you enter an assembly in which it is probable that you will be called on to lead in prayer, begin at once to reflect on the prayer appropriate to the occasion, and offer it in silence.

How To Keep A Good Conscience

The most essential of all the elements of human happiness is a good conscience. The man who has it not, may be blessed in everything else, yet he must be unhappy. The only way, indeed, to even mollify the effects of a bad conscience is to drown its voice in the whirlpool of deeper guilt, which will at last make its lashings the more severe. This proves the wisdom of that life-long "exercise" of which Paul speaks when he says, "In this do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offense toward God and man." He was remarkably successful in this exercise, for he was able to say, about the same period of his life, "I have lived in all good conscience toward God until this day" (Acts 24:16). It will be interesting to scan briefly the method by which he succeeded so well, that we may better know how to succeed ourselves.

There are two parties interested particularly in our moral conduct and to whom, therefore, a good or bad conscience must have reference—God and man. A good conscience, such as Paul maintained, must be free from offense toward each.

How, then did he maintain a good conscience toward God? This question may be viewed with reference to his career as an unbeliever; to his conversion; and to his career as an apostle. During the first period, he "verily thought within himself" (Acts 26:9) that he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus the Nazarene." This was the dictate of his con-

From *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell, editor, Series 5, Vol. 7, Bethany, W. Va., 1864, pp. 102-106.

science. He did not, like many of the present day, propose a compromise with his opponents, saying, If you will let Judaism alone we will let Christianity alone; but he boldly entered the lists of controversy. The difference was vital, so that the success of one party must destroy the other; and therefore a good conscience could not admit of a compromise. Under the head of conscience, he resorted to all the terrible penalties of the Mosaic law against those adjudged as blasphemers and idolaters. But he found that to follow conscience alone, was not safe nor happy; for there were goads against which he had to kick continually (Acts 9:5). These were doubtless the unanswerable proofs of the divinity of Jesus, which, though they did not convince him, were continually awakening fearful suspicions that he might be wrong, and that his conscience needed light. His sin, which constituted him the chief of sinners, was a persistent refusal to see the light which would have guided his conscience in the way of peace.

Finally, the light which his conscience needed was made to shine upon him. By overwhelming demonstration, he was convinced that Jesus was truly the Messiah; and now, to maintain a good conscience, he must cease opposition, he must yield to his authority. It doubtless required a struggle, a struggle so severe that thousands who pretend to be conscientious will not, under similar circumstances, make. I have seen a man, convinced that Jesus is the Christ, that he should be honored and worshiped, so racked with an evil conscience as to tremble, and turn pale, and weep; yet be unwilling to give up an ungodly life that he might have a good conscience in serving the Lord. I have seen another, convinced that he had never been baptized, that he was not in the true church of Christ, and rendered unhappy by the goadings of conscience, yet unable to break away from old associations, and incur the frown of former friends. Such men must be unhappy while they live; they are still more so when they come to die; and without some unpromised extension of divine mercy, they must be unhappy forever. We might add another man, a whole class of them, who preach against the true gospel, while kicking continually, like Paul, against the goads of truth, unwilling to let in the light which is crowding upon them and would guide them safely.

Simultaneously with Paul's conversion, he was called upon to preach the gospel which he had opposed. To maintain, from that time forward, a conscience void of offense toward God, he must give his life to this work. If honor, and ease, and wealth had lain in the line of a preacher's life, it would have been no hard task to maintain a good conscience in this particular. But to embark in this work then was to turn his back upon clustering honors which were in his grasp, to encounter hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness, persecution and death. Where is the man who is now willing to preach the gospel at such cost? How many there are, whom God has called to preach by giving them talents for great usefulness, who, even because they must remain poor if they preach, will turn away to some other pursuit, and bury the Lord's money in the ground! Such men cannot maintain a conscience void of offense toward God, but must endure the woe that was dreaded and shunned by Paul, when he said, "Woe to me, if I preach not the gospel." It was every distress that poverty breeds, and every pain that persecution could inflict for him to preach the gospel; but it was a conscience offensive toward God to neglect the work, and like a wise man as he was, Paul chose the former.

But the source of an evil conscience is more within than without. The storms that beat around a man and spend their force upon him, are no more than the lashings of the winds and waves upon a strong ship at sea whose passengers sleep quietly within and dream of home, if the passions of the heart are at rest. There is not power in anything on earth or in hell to defile the conscience unless it first arouse some impulse of the fleshly man. Paul knew this full well, and we learn the secret of his great success in maintaining a conscience void of offense toward God, in this confession of his daily struggles: "I keep my body under, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

It would perhaps be impossible to maintain a good conscience toward God at the same time with an evil one toward man, and vice versa. But still the two conceptions are different, and there is a line of conduct appropriate to each. There are some things, such as the specification mentioned above, which have reference to pleasing God alone; there are others

which have primary reference to men, but which must be observed in order to please God, because God has so commanded us in reference to our fellows. We will observe Paul's method of maintaining a conscience void of offense towards man, only in a few of those particulars wherein we are most likely to fail.

Some men, seeing that opposers of the truth are certain to take offense at an exposure of their wickedness or false teaching, seek to maintain a conscience void of offense toward them, by most studiously "letting them alone." Others are so much afraid of offending brethren and sisters who are guilty of sin, that, for the same end, they say nothing severe about popular vices. Paul "exercised" himself not in this way. The hatred which his name inspired among all obstinate Pharisees, and all wilfully blind idolaters, attests how sternly he dealt with the enemies of the truth; while the penitent confessions of some disciples, and the unforgiving malice of some who unworthily bore the name, attest how faithfully he admonished all his erring brethren.

While thus carefully avoiding that course which so many men mistake for the true method of keeping a good conscience toward men, Paul pursued another course, that is now but seldom thought of. Towards brethren who erred in opinion, but whose erroneous opinions led them into no sin, he had all the tenderness of a mother toward an unfortunate child. Whilst the opinion and practice of many Jewish disciples in reference to clean and unclean meats and holy days, were entirely erroneous, he would not have them harshly dealt with on that account. In so far as they endeavored to force them upon others, he rebuked them; but he would allow no man to rebuke them for observing these things themselves. On the contrary, he says, "It is good neither to eat meat, nor drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak" (Rom. 14:21). And again, "If meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world stands, lest I cause my brother to offend" (I Cor. 8:13). In this way, by the kindest indulgence, he kept a conscience void of offense toward erring but not sinful brethren.

There were many local and national, and educational prejudices among brethren then, as there are now. They were not the

result of wickedness so much as of ignorance. He did not, therefore, feel it his business to correct them, but he says, "To the Jew I became a Jew, that I might save some." Thus he maintained a conscience void of offense toward all classes of men who were hampered by the unavoidable prejudices of birth and education.

But this indulgence and forbearance for the sake of a good conscience, was carried even farther than this. Of the unbelieving Jews who hated him and so often tried to murder him, he could say, "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness, and continual sorrow in my heart, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." Again, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved." While some of his brethren, even, were partaking of this prejudice against him in Judea, he was busy in Macedonia and Achaia taking up a collection for their necessities, and praying God that their extreme alienation should not make them refuse the gift. To the Corinthians, many of whom had turned against him, he writes, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you, though the more abundantly I love you the less I am loved."

To sum up the whole in a few words, Paul's method of keeping a conscience void of offense, was to promptly abandon everything which he found to be wrong; to preach the whole truth, and continue to preach it under all discouragements; to combat every sin both within and without the church, while indulging every error and prejudice which was not sinful; to bear without resentment the ill treatment of both sinners and saints; and under all circumstances to return good for evil. It was a large price, you may say, that he paid for a good conscience; but when you witness the "peace of mind passing all understanding" which it procured him, and the triumph with which he looked back from the verge of the grave and exclaimed, "I have fought a good fight," you may better say, he bought it without money and without price. You have his example before you, and the alternative of an evil conscience and remorse forever, or a conscience void of offense, and peace eternal.

Lying

My subject this morning is lying. Let nobody charge that I have selected this subject because it is especially appropriate to my audience. I do not think any of you will ever lie unless you get caught in a very tight place.

Lying is, and has been for a long time, one of the most common sins of humanity; so much so, that David said in one of his psalms, "I said in my haste that all men are liars," and some wag added to it that when he got out of his haste he ought to have said the same thing. But there has been a great deal of improvement since then, especially in some portions of the world.

In heathen countries and in some Christian countries lying is not considered very base. I recollect that the dragoman we had on my trip through Palestine would lie at any time and was not the least ashamed of it. He would tell us some big lie and when we caught him in it he would not blush or apologize. He called himself a Syrian Christian.

Even preachers have been known to be liars. I remember one very unique illustration of this. While I was still living in Missouri, a preacher from Kentucky began to move about there and make some reputation. Another preacher stated that he was a common liar. He heard of it and immediately brought charges against his accuser before a board of elders. At the appointed time he came with his saddlepocket full of documents in his own defense and made it appear that he had been grossly

From *Chapel Talks*, Lufkin, Tex., The Gospel Guardian Co., 1956, pp. 57-60.

slandered. It happened that Raccoon John Smith was in town and was invited to meet with these elders. After the accused had gotten through reading his many documents, he said, "Brethren, here is Bro. John Smith. I am willing for him to tell you what kind of a man I am. He has known me for many years." John Smith arose and said, "Well, Brother Wiley, I have never heard any of the brethren speak any harm of you, except that you would lie. They said that you did not lie to do anybody any harm, but just for the love of it." That was the last appeal. He took up his documents and went his way in peace.

There are various kinds of lies. The worst kind is malicious lying, as when a man tells a lie for the purpose of injuring another's reputation, property or by causing unjust punishment to be inflicted; that is undoubtedly the worst kind of lying, the motive of malice being the worst part of it. It was lies of that kind that were told against Jesus, by witnesses that had been suborned; and afterwards the same kind of suborned witnesses told the same kind of lies against Stephen and had him stoned to death. You remember also that Naboth was stoned to death by Jezebel's order upon the testimony of liars who had been suborned. This is the kind of lying that is specified in the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." And the punishment under the only civil law that God ever gave to a nation was very severe. A man falsely testifying against his neighbor was punished with the same penalty that would have been inflicted upon the neighbor had he been found guilty, whether stripes or fines or death. If a man falsely charged his neighbor with a crime for which the penalty was death, then this false witness was put to death. And I can but think that this was a very just law. And that statute as in many other instances shows that the law of Moses was in many ways in advance of the laws of the United States. Now, if a man is convicted of having testified falsely, he is fined; and if he has any money the fine is collected, and if not he goes scott free. Sometimes, in an aggravated case, he is sent to the penitentiary for a few months. The law of Moses dealt more justly with liars than does the law of this country.

There is another kind of lies that might be called harmless. That is, they do no harm and are not intended to do any harm

to anybody else. They are much more common than malicious lies. They are very common with some people, one of whom would be very much insulted if you were to call him a liar. He would knock your teeth down your throat if he could. There is nothing more insulting to the average man than to be called a liar, and yet this kind of lying is very common, so common that people make easy names for it. They call it lies, fibs, or white lies, or something of that sort to make light of them. The biggest lie of this kind that I have ever heard of was told by a man who said once he crossed the Atlantic Ocean and just as the ship got out of the harbor a man jumped overboard and swam beside the ship all the way to Liverpool. It seems that he and another man had made a wager to see which could tell the biggest lie. The other man spoke up and said, "Did you see that, sir?" "Yes, Sir, I saw it with my own eyes." "Well, I am glad you did, for I am the man who did the swimming." I don't know which one got the wager. Now those two men did not intend to harm anyone with those two big lies. It was all for fun, and yet as big a lie as you could think of. A lie is a lie, whether told for fun, or for malice, or just for the love of telling it.

Then there is another kind of lies that might be styled selfish lies, lies told for the benefit of the one who tells them. This is the kind of lies told by people engaged in trading, and especially horse-trading. It is commonly thought that horse-traders are the biggest liars in the world. I do not know whether they excel some men who sell you goods over the counter. And sometimes those who are buying are as guilty as those who are selling. This is the kind of lie that Ananias and Sapphira told. That was a selfish lie. It was in order that they might keep a part of that money and at the same time have credit for giving all of it. You know the result. God took them in hand. They dropped dead at the apostles' feet, Ananias first and then Sapphira. He was the starter of the club that now bears his name. It is every common now for a man who is guilty of this kind of lying to be charged with belonging to the Ananias club. But any man who is guilty of anything that he is ashamed of and lies to hide it, is guilty of this kind of lying as well as he who lies to make money. And it is nearly always the case that a person that will do a mean thing will lie to hide it.

And then he will tell another to hide that one and another to hide that and another to hide that and so on, and they seldom get to the truth except when forced to confess it. What about these men that commit murder? They are arraigned before the magistrate and they plead not guilty, swearing that they are not. Then they go to the Circuit Court and there they swear they are not guilty. They employ the best legal talent to argue that they are not guilty, and hire false witnesses to testify in their favor to convince the jury that they are not guilty. And when they are convicted and sentenced to death they send for the priest or a half-witted preacher to come and pray with them until they get religion. Then on the scaffold they hold out their example to young men and warn them; and claim to be ready to die; and call upon their friends to meet them in heaven. This kind of lying is the result of cowardice. A man is afraid for it to be known what he has done, and through a mean, sneaking cowardice lies about it. That is not the worst kind of lying, but it is mean and sneaking. A sheep-killing dog would not be guilty of it if he understood these matters. Now what the Law of Christ says about liars you read in Revelation 21:8, "But for the fearful, and unbelieving and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars," the only one in the list which is emphasized, "their part shall be in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." There is where Christ places liars, without discriminating the different kinds of lies that they tell. All liars, whatever kind of lies they tell, shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone.

While none of you may be liars, of course you are not and I hope you never will be, still it is very important for you as preachers of the gospel to know how to treat this sin in the presence of the people so as to give all the young people and all the old, a high ideal of truthfulness, and to build up a body of people who are strong in the truth. The apostle Paul exhorts us to put on the whole armor of God, and the very first thing in that armor is to be "girded about the loins with truth." The man who never lies, the man who always speaks the truth, and who has resolved that, whatever comes, he will speak the truth, is not afraid. He can stand up before the accusing world and never have a fear of what man may do to him.

Compromising With Sin

Sin, whether weak or strong in its position, is all the time crying, "Let me alone." When strong, it means, let me alone or you will suffer; thus appealing to our fears. When weak, it means, let me alone or you will be condemned as unmerciful and bigoted; thus appealing to our generosity and our vanity. Weak men compromise with sin in both cases; in the former, they call it prudence, in the latter, charity or liberality. As a result, much of that which passes in the world for prudence is nothing but cowardice, and much that passes for liberality is nothing but culpable moral weakness. The devil is constantly assailing us by trying to bring about a compromise in one of these ways or the other. When he fails in one way, he is apt to succeed in the other.

The history of Ahab furnishes an example in point. Benhadad, the king of Syria, had invaded his kingdom with an irresistible force, swept over the whole land without opposition, and shut up the army of Israel within the walls of Samaria. Having formed his camp around about the city and cut off all possibility of escape, he demanded of Ahab his silver and gold and wives and children. In his extremity Ahab replied: "My Lord, O King, according to thy saying, I am thine and all I have." Elated by this concession, the King of Syria demanded still more, saying, "I will send my servants unto

From *Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, Oct. 9, 1873.

thee tomorrow about this time, and they shall search thy house, and the houses of thy servants, and it shall be that whatsoever is pleasant in thine eyes, they shall put it in their hand, and take it away." This was too much for Ahab. Fearful as was the extremity to which he was reduced, he could not degrade himself by yielding to his demand. When he refused, Ben-hadad exclaimed, "The gods do so to me and more also, if the dust of Samaria shall suffice for handfuls for all the people that follow me." To this message Ahab sent back a reply which has become famous, and is about the only good thing of his life: "Tell him, Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." He had almost yielded to the demand of sin in its threatening, but he has finally braced himself for courageous resistance, and now the Lord comes to his relief. A prophet of God draws near and says to him, "Thus saith the Lord: Hast thou seen all this multitude? Behold, I will deliver it into thy hand this day, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord." Ahab ought to have thought of this at the first, and should never have thought a moment of compromising with the heathen enemy. He is reminded of it now; he sends forth his little army, not by night, not with any strategy, but in broad daylight, when the sun was riding at noon. The very audacity of the attack proved, in the hands of God, the means of victory. A panic seized the besieging army, the king himself escaped only by leaving his chariot and mounting a swift horse, while Israel slew the Syrians with a great slaughter.

At "the return of the year" Ben-hadad, mortified by his former defeat, and panting for an opportunity to wipe out the national disgrace, returned with another army of like number and munitions, but under the command of better officers. When the two armies confronted each other on the plains of Aphek, the children of Israel appeared "like two little flocks of kids" while "the Syrians filled the country." There was no compromising now. Cheered by the words of a prophet, Ahab's two little flocks of kids rushed into the face of the foe, and the mighty host melts away until one hundred thousand of their dead bodies are stretched out along the lines of retreat, and Ben-hadad himself, unable to escape by flight, is shut up within the walls of Aphek. A large part of those walls have already fallen, and over the breach the army of Israel is momentarily expected to enter the city.

Now comes the time for the trial of Ahab in another way. The servants of Ben-hadad said to their king, "Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings; let us, I pray thee, put sackcloth on our loins, and ropes on our heads, and go out to the King of Israel; peradventure he will save thy life." It was done. The nobles of Syria, as if mourning their past enmity to Ahab, and as if confessing themselves worthy of being hung, approach his chariot with sackcloth on their loins and ropes on their heads; and piteously whine out, "Thy servant Ben-hadad saith, I pray thee, let me live." The device was a success. It touched Ahab in a tender place, and, declining the term servant, he exclaims, "Is he yet alive? He is my brother." The men, we are told, "did diligently observe whether anything would come from him, and did hastily catch it." They were sharp fellows, playing a very sharp game, and their ears were pricked up sharply to catch anything encouraging. As soon as they heard the word brother, they exclaimed, "Thy brother, Ben-hadad." Ahab says, "Go, bring him." The King of Syria was led forth, and instead of hanging him to the nearest tree, Ahab invited him to take a seat in his chariot, made a treaty of peace with him on very easy terms, and set him home in safety.

Now this, according to the rules of modern warfare, was magnanimous on Ahab's part, and just what he should have done. But under the Jewish theocracy, no King of Israel was allowed either to make war or concede a peace except at the express command or permission of God. In releasing Ben-hadad, therefore, without inquiring of God, Ahab was led by his own weakness to violate the law of God, to make a compromise with sin, and to say peace, when there is no peace.

As Ahab returned from the battle at the head of his victorious army, he met a man in the highway who was all begrimed with ashes and blood, so that no one could distinguish his features. He cried out to the king until the latter stopped and heard his story. "Thy servant, said he, went out into the midst of the battle; and behold, a man turned aside and brought a man to me, and said, Keep this man: and if by any means he be missing, then shall thy life be for his life, or else thou shalt pay a talent of silver. And as thy servant was busy here and there, he was gone." The king answered, "So shall thy judg-

ment be; thyself hast decided it." No sooner was this said than the man wiped away the bloody ashes from his face, and showed the well known face of a prophet of God. It is clear now that the story just told is only an allegory. The prophet exclaims, "Thus saith the Lord, Because thou hast let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people." "And the King of Israel went to his house heavy and displeased.

Thus the man who could not be quite overcome by sin when it swelled with pride and put on an air of threatening, was completely subdued when sin proposed friendship and made its appeal to his generosity. So it has been and so it is with thousands. The dearest interests of God's Kingdom, and the eternal welfare of the individual soul are constantly bartered away under the guise of generosity, liberality, charity. The wars of Israel were all types of the Christian's warfare against sin; and they were regulated by the singular divine interpositions which distinguish them, in order to make them as nearly as possible the likeness of the anti-type.

Gehazi's Avarice

There are but few men in the world who will refuse a present, especially if it be one of great value; and when such a man is found there are always many to speak lightly of the refusal. Legislators, judges, jurymen and civil officers in general, most usually set a high estimate on the services which they render to individuals while performing duties which they owe to the public; and while they would scorn to take a bribe, they very graciously accept a present, and they know they will be laughed at as overly righteous if they refuse. Indeed, a refusal would in instances be regarded as a reflection on their colleagues in office, as if it were to say, "I am holier than others."

I doubt whether the world has grown any worse in this particular than it has been for some thousands of years. I rather think that, bad as it is, it has grown somewhat better. Certain it is, that we have abundant evidence that this weakness has characterized our race in every age and in every country of which history speaks.

The prophet Elisha belonged to the exceptional class, while his own servant, Gehazi, belonged to the class more numerous and more frequently imitated. Naaman, the rich Syrian officer, had been healed of the leprosy, and had offered the prophet, as an expression of his gratitude, the ten talents of silver, and the six thousand pieces of gold, and the ten changes of raiment which he had brought with him for the purpose; but the

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, July 9, 1874.

prophet, with a contempt for wealth which astonished his servant, refused the present, and allowed all the rich robes and the glittering bars of gold and silver to be carried away toward the heathen country whence they had been brought. This was too much for Gehazi. He exclaimed, "Behold, my master has spared Naaman, this Syrian, in not receiving at his hands that which he brought; but, as the Lord liveth, I will run after him, and take somewhat of him." So after him he ran; and seeing that some new representations must be made to keep up appearances, he did not hesitate to tell Naaman the following lie which he invented as he ran: "My master has sent me, saying, Behold, even now there come to me from Mt. Ephraim two young men of the sons of the prophets; give them, I pray thee, a talent of silver, and two changes of garments." The money was promptly given, and double the amount that was called for.

The only sin which Gehazi seems to have seen in this transaction was the small amount of lying which he did and this was with him a matter of little moment, provided he could keep the whole transaction hid from his master. What man is there, who, when his soul is fired with a desire to secure a large sum of money which he sees glittering before him, and which he can secure without any greater sin than a small amount of lying, will hesitate? Surely no avaricious man ever did hesitate in such a case. Indeed, I think it would be a tolerably good test of a man's character for avariciousness, to place before him an opportunity to make a handsome sum of money by means that would involve no sin except one lie which could not be easily proved on him and which no one would be likely to suspect. If all men could stand this test, with how much more satisfaction could we contemplate the business transactions which fill up the daily life of Christian men? Gehazi was the servant of a prophet, and many a man that was no better than he sustains intimate relations to the true servants of God.

The worst feature of Gehazi's conduct, so far as it affected the man himself, is the one we have considered; but there is another which affected chiefly the honor of the cause of God. Naaman had started home with a lofty conception, not only of the power of Israel's God, but of the holiness of his accredited servants. The prophets of all other gods were accustomed to

enriching themselves by means of their office; but here was a God who would heal incurable diseases, and whose prophets, though rendering services for which millions would be a poor compensation, exclaimed when the reward was offered: "As the Lord liveth, before whom I stand, I will receive none." Struck with awe, the officer begged for two mules' burden of the earth on which the prophet walked, in order that he might have holy ground with which to build an altar in his native land and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel. How shameful, that in the very hour of this glorious triumph over a heathen mind, one half the victory should be taken away by the lying and avaricious servant, who recalls in the prophet's name the disinterested refusal, and takes a paltry sum with a flimsy and false excuse! Yet such is the constant effect of avaricious practices among the servants of God. They rob God of his glory and by dishonoring his service turn the hearts of men into forbidden ways and hurry them off to perdition.

Gehazi met with a punishment richly deserved. Having hid his ill-gotten money by the wayside, when asked by his master, "Whence comest thou," he was forced to cover up his former lie with another, and answered, "Thy servant went not hither." But he forgot that he was dealing with a prophet. "Went not my heart with thee?," demanded Elisha. "When the man turned again from the chariot to meet thee? Is it a time to receive money, and to receive garments, and olive yards, and vineyards, and sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and maid-servants?" Gehazi had thought that all times were times for these things, and that almost all ways were the ways in which to get them. His soul had never been elevated to any loftier views of life, and as a reward for his avarice, the leprosy which had passed from Naaman came unto him and his seed forever. A still worse fate awaits the man of avaricious practices who shall now dishonor the church of God.

With The Lord

To be with our friends in heaven is a source of joy which we all can appreciate. It is to many the chief source of enjoyment, as we anticipate our heavenly home. For this reason the most popular hymns are those which picture to the kindled imagination that meeting which is to know no parting. But such is not the chief joy of heaven as it was seen prophetically by the eyes of Jesus and by that of Paul. When Jesus would comfort his disciples in the hour of separation, he said to them, "I go to prepare a place for you. I will come again and take you to myself; that where I am there you may be also." To be where he is, rather than to be with the angels or with earthly kindred, is the crowning hope and the chief consolation. So, when he offered for them his last prayer, the closing petition was this: "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." To see his glory is the one absorbing sight which will ravish the eyes of the redeemed, and to be with him where he is, the one presence which shall satisfy the soul.

Paul's sentiment on the subject was the same. To be absent from the body was with him, not merely to rest in Abraham's bosom, as Lazarus did, nor to be with loved ones gone before, though all this was true; but it was to be "present with the Lord," and in the thought of this his soul overleaped and forgot all other thoughts. So, when he would comfort the

From *The Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Kentucky, July 23, 1874.

brethren in Thessalonica, bereaved by the loss of friends, while he assures them that those who sleep in Jesus God will bring with him, he reaches the consummation of his consoling words when he says, "Then we who are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words."

I fear that such is not the experience of many Christians of the present day. Though we may not be like the Gergesenes, who, when they knew that Jesus had cast out the legion of demons by his word, were so much afraid of his power, and so much troubled by his presence, that they begged him to go away "out of their coast" or like Peter when, on seeing the amazing miracle of that first draught of fishes, fell down at the Master's feet and exclaimed, "Depart from me, O Lord, for I am a sinful man;" yet we are too much like the apostles when they saw him still the tempest: they were filled with fear, and gathering themselves together as far from him as the little ship would allow, they whispered, "What manner of man is this, that the winds and the sea obey him?" In other words, we often think of meeting the Savior face to face with trepidation and alarm. On this account it is hard for some Christians to realize that the presence of Jesus will be the chief joy of heaven, hard for them to make the hope of this their comfort amid the sorrows of earth.

But even though none of us could realize this heavenly thought, it would still be true, and our realization of it at last will not be prevented by our failure to anticipate it now. How many times have you gone on a visit to distant friends with glowing anticipations of the pleasure which you would enjoy in the society of certain persons, when, though not disappointed in this, you have met one person there from whom you expected little or nothing, but in whose friendship you found more enjoyment than from all other sources. Thus will it be in heaven; whatever mistaken anticipations we shall have entertained, the highest bliss and glory of that eternal abode will be the presence and the smile of Jesus.

He looks, and then thousands of angels rejoice,
And myriads wait for his word;
He speaks, and eternity, filled with his voice,
Re-echoes the praise of her Lord.

Though the living do not realize this blissful thought, the dying often do. When have you heard a dying saint speak much of the earthly friends whom he soon expects to meet on the farther shore? Not often do you hear this. The name of Jesus; the consolation and good hope which he gives; the near approach to his presence; these are the themes of the dying Christian. In this way our weak faith is strengthened by the experiences of those who have gone before us, and we can hope that as we, too, approach the river's brink, our Savior will become to us more and more the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely.

It was not till after Peter had seen many of the miracles of Jesus, and observed that all were wrought in love and mercy, that he ceased to be afraid of him. It was then that Jesus said, "Yet a little while I am with you, and whither I go ye cannot come." At this announcement the man who had once exclaimed: "Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man," cried out, "Lord, why cannot I follow thee? I will follow thee to prison and to death?" What had wrought this wonderful change? It was familiarity with Jesus, the gratitude kindled by receiving his blessing, the admiration excited by meditating on his character, the response in Peter's heart to the love which he had found in the heart of Jesus, the sacrifice which Peter had already made, preparing him to sacrifice his all. So let it be with us, and we shall find our greatest consolation on earth in the invisible presence of Jesus, thus preparing ourselves while here for that enjoyment which will be the brightness of the skies of heaven hereafter, the visible presence of Him whom we adore.

Is The Story of Jonah Incredible?

If I were to hear the naked statement, without preface or supplement, that a man was once thrown overboard from a ship, was swallowed by a fish as he fell into the sea, was kept in the fish's bowels three days and three nights alive, and then thrown up alive on dry land, I would regard it as a "fish story," and pay no attention to it. So, if I were to hear the naked story that a man once went into the greatest and wickedest city on the earth, and by preaching against it one day caused the people, from the king on his throne to the beggar on the street, to sit down in sack-cloth and ashes and call mightily on God till he heard and forgave them, I would think of the life-long preaching done by Spurgeon in London, and that of other great preachers in other great cities, and I would not believe the story. Again, if I were to hear, without historical connections, that a man was sitting once on a sandhill in a very hot country, suffering almost death with the heat, and that in a single night a gourdvine grew up, and the next day made a delightful shade over his head, I would think of Jack and the bean stalk, and would treat it as an idle tale. In like manner, were I to hear that a man once stood at the mouth of a cave, and called to a dead man within, who had been dead four days, and that the dead man immediately stood outside the cave alive, still bound hand and foot with the grave cloths, I would not believe that till I learned who did it, and why it was done.

From *Jesus and Jonah*, Cincinnati, Ohio: The Standard Publishing Co., 1896, pp. 42-64.

Now unfortunately this is the way in which the three principal incidents in the story of Jonah came to the ears of many persons, and it accounts for the widespread incredulity respecting them. To believe them is to believe three miracles; and we cannot believe that a mere idle wonder is a work of God's hand. A year or two ago I went to see the performance of Herrmann, the great magician; and I witnessed feats that were as mysterious to me as any miracles of which we read in the Bible; but if Herrmann had claimed, which he did not, that they were wrought by the direct power of God, I would have denied it flatly; for I could not believe that God would take part in a show which did no good except to gratify idle curiosity, and to fill Herrmann's pocket with silver. If I am called on to believe a wonder which could be wrought only by the direct power of God, I must see in it something that makes it worthy of God. When the occasion is such, or the manifest purpose is such, as to demand, or even to justify, the interposition of God's hand this at once removes the incredibility which would otherwise attach to the story. I propose now to look at the story of Jonah from this point of view, and to see if it will remain incredible after it is understood.

Behold, then, the city of Nineveh, "that great city," the greatest that had thus far been built on earth, the head of the Assyrian Empire, which was the greatest and most powerful empire yet established among men. The city is wholly given to idolatry, and to all those abominations which ever characterize idolatrous peoples. It leads in these abominations all the nations of Western Asia, over all of which its king has rule. God looks down upon the vast population of both city and empire, and he sees in every individual of the teeming millions one of the immortal creatures of his hand reveling in iniquity and rushing on to eternal ruin. He is the same God who so loved the world that he gave his own Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have eternal life. Did he who cared so much for men afterward, care nothing for them then? Or, do not the words just quoted express the divine compassion which moved him in all the ages before the advent of Christ? He longs for these prodigals, and he is about to institute measures to bring them to repentance.

The Scriptures reveal to us no way in which God brings men to repentance, except in connection with preaching. But if Nineveh is to be brought to repentance, the task must be assigned to no ordinary preacher. God assigned it to the prophet Jonah, the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher. Very little is said of this prophet outside the book which bears his name, but that little implies a great deal. He lived under the reign of Jeroboam the Second. This prince came to the throne of Israel under most discouraging circumstances. During the reign of his grandfather, Jehoahaz, Hazael, king of Syria, had subdued and overrun Israel. In the expressive language of the Book of Kings, he "destroyed them and made them like the dust in threshing." He left Jehoahaz only fifty horsemen, ten chariots and ten thousand footmen (II Kings 13:3-7). His son Joash, by three successful battles fought under encouragement given by the prophet Elisha, succeeded in throwing off the yoke of Syria, but the country was left in extreme weakness and distress, so that with reference to the beginning of Jeroboam's reign it is said: "The Lord saw the affliction of Israel, that it was very bitter; for there was none shut up or left at large, neither was there any helper for Israel " (14:26). Though coming to the throne under such circumstances, Jeroboam, in the course of a reign of forty-one years, not only re-established the prosperity of his nation, but he conquered Syria, and extended the northern boundary of his kingdom to the utmost limit that it had attained under David and Solomon. In the language of the text, "He restored the border of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the Arabah [the Dead Sea]," and he did this, the text adds, "according to the word of Jehovah, the God of Israel, which he spake by the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher " (14:25). The account of this long reign and of these mighty conquests is remarkably brief, being limited to *four verses*; but the author refers the reader for the "rest of the acts of Jeroboam, and all that he did, and his might, how he warred, and how he recovered Damascus, and Hamath," to the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel. Doubtless if we had that book we should find the story a long one.

Now if, in the absence of the fuller record, we inquire how it was that all these conquests were made "according to the word

of Jehovah, the God of Israel, which he spake by the mouth of his servant Jonah," I think we shall find the answer in what the author tells us in a few chapters back of a similar work done by the prophet Elisha. This famous prophet lived under the reign of Jehoram of Israel, who was continually at war with Ben-Hadad, king of Syria. During those wars the king of Syria frequently took counsel with his chief officers, and said: "In such and such a place shall be my camp." But Elisha would not say to Jehoram: "Beware that thou pass not such a place, for thither the Syrians are coming down." By accepting this warning the king of Israel "saved himself, not once or twice," which means many times. It was impossible that the king of Syria should fail to see every time that his plans had been anticipated; so "his heart was sorely troubled about this thing." As his plans had been made known only to his confidential advisers, he came to the conclusion that one of them was betraying him. He called them together and demanded: "Will ye not show me which of us is for the king of Israel?" One of them promptly answered: "Nay, my lord, O king; but Elisha, the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber" (II Kings 6:8-12). Ben-Hadad inquired where Elisha was sojourning, and sent a troop of cavalry to surround the town of Dothan and take him prisoner, with the result that Elisha took captive the whole troop, but gave them a good dinner and sent them home unharmed. Having given us this account, when the author says that the victories of Jeroboam were achieved according to the word of Jehovah by Jonah, he leaves us to suppose that the process was the same, or similar. We must understand, then, that during the forty-one years of Jeroboam's reign, Jonah was his prophetic adviser respecting his military movements and that his fame as such was spread abroad among surrounding nations. Especially would it have spread into the region about Nineveh, which was separated from the field of Jeroboam's conquests only by the river Euphrates. It is very clear from all this, that Jonah was the most famous and the greatest prophet then living. It was in accord, therefore, with the wisdom which governs all of God's dealings with men, that he, rather than any other man, was selected to preach to the Ninevites.

There are times in the experience of every community, when rebukes from a preacher of righteousness fall unheeded on the ears of the people; and there are others, when the same rebukes are rewarded with the richest results. In our common experience we can learn in which of these conditions a community is only by trial; and we are often very bitterly disappointed. But God, who knows the secrets of all hearts, can never be mistaken in choosing the hour at which to strike, and he chose a favorable time at which to send Jonah to Nineveh. The history of the city at that particular time is to us wrapped in profound obscurity; and it is a fair inference that the empire was in a depressed condition, furnishing no startling events to catch the attention of historian or sculptor. Such a state of affairs would be favorable to a call for repentance. At the precise time in which the people were best prepared for such a message, God spoke to Jonah at his home in Gath-hepher, and said: "Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me" (Jonah 1:1). Instead of obeying, Jonah arose and started in the opposite direction. God's command would have sent him toward the north, but he turns toward the south, and he stops not until he reaches Joppa, the principal seaport of the kingdom of Judah. Here he finds a ship sailing to Tarshish, the farthest port of the west to which vessels then sailed. He was running "away from the presence of Jehovah," which means from the region in which he thought it probable that Jehovah would speak to him again. He supposed that if he could get as far away as Tarshish, God would not call him back from so great a distance to send him on the disagreeable mission.

We might conjecture a number of motives for which Jonah undertook this desperate flight, and perhaps all of them might have had some part in causing it; for men do not often embark upon desperate enterprises without a number of motives; but there is one which he himself mentioned afterward, and we must accept this as at least the chief of all. When, afterward, he saw that God did not destroy the city according to his prediction, "it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was angry"; and in a prayer, which was rather a remonstrance against Jehovah's mercy, he said: "O Jehovah, was not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I hastened to flee to

Tarshish; for I knew that thou art a gracious God, and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repentest thee of the evil" (4:1, 2). This shows that he fled to Tarshish because he did not believe that God would destroy the city. He believed that even after its doom was pronounced, God's grace, compassion, and mercy would lead him to spare the great population, and that his own mission would therefore appear to be a failure. This reasoning shows plainly that if he had been sure that the destruction of the city would follow, he would have gone; and why? Undoubtedly because Jonah, in common with his countrymen, hated the Ninevites, and would have been glad to witness their destruction. That proud city had sent forth its desolating armies into neighboring kingdoms, through mere lust of conquest, and had aroused the intensest hatred of every conquered nation, and no less that of every nation which sympathized with the oppressed. While God, then was moved by the grace, compassion, and mercy of which Jonah speaks so admirably, and desired through the ministration of Jonah to bring the Ninevites to repentance, that he might save them, the preacher whom he chose was full of hatred toward them, and refused to go because he desired their destruction. Jonah but reflected the sentiments of all Israel; and this brings prominently to view another problem for Jehovah to work out, the riddance of his own people of a feeling so unworthy, not to say degrading. We shall see in the sequel that the aim at this riddance played an important part in directing the course of events.

Jonah's flight to Joppa, whence he expected to set sail for Tarshish, covered a distance of not less than one hundred miles. He doubtless traveled rapidly, and his mental agitation must have been extreme; for he had reason to fear at every step some providential interference with his attempt to escape God's command. But when he found passage in a ship, and was far out at sea with every prospect of a favorable voyage, his excitement naturally subsided, and nervous depression followed. He sought his berth, and fell asleep. So profound was his sleep, that when the storm arose even the tossing of the vessel did not awaken him. The master of the vessel was astonished to find him asleep under such circumstances, and calling him a "sleeper," he cried: "What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call

upon thy God, if so be that he will think upon us, that we perish not." The cry was like a thunderclap to Jonah. He rushed on deck to find that while he slept such a tempest had fallen on the ship as threatened its destruction; that the sailors had cast the freight into the sea to lighten the vessel; that every one had then called mightily upon his god for safety; and that they had just agreed to cast lots that they might know on whose account this evil had come upon them. The true cause flashed across Jonah's mind in an instant; but he had nerve enough to join in the casting of lots. When he drew the black ball from the urn, he was immediately plied with questions faster than he could answer them: "What is thine occupation? Whence comest thou? What is thy country? Of what people art thou?" When they gave him a chance to speak, he confessed the whole truth: "I am a Hebrew, and I fear Jehovah, the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land. I flee from the presence of Jehovah." His questioners had perhaps never before heard of this God—a God who made the sea and the dry land—and when they heard that it was He who had been offended, they were "exceedingly afraid." If the God who made the sea had raised the tempest against them, what could they do? Believing what Jonah confessed, and naturally thinking that the knowledge of this God would enable him to judge what would appease his wrath, they demand of him: "What shall be done unto thee, that the sea may be calm for us?" This demand put Jonah to the test of all the manliness that was in him. Had he been a coward, or a sneak, he would have begged the sailors to let him remain on board till the ship went to pieces. But he was too manly to permit others to perish on his account, and too honest, now that God had overtaken him, to try to escape the fate which he deserved. To the surprise of all, he answered: "Take me up and cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto you: for I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you."

Generosity begets generosity. As he was unwilling for them to suffer on his account, they generously resolved not to save themselves at the expense of his life. They turn again to their abandoned oars, and "rowed hard to get back to land." Their efforts are in vain. The sea grows more and more tempestuous against them, and they see clearly that the God who

made the sea is determined to have his own way, as declared by Jonah. Trained to stand by a comrade to the last, and to perish if need be in the effort to save him, they tremble at the thought of casting even a strange passenger into the sea to save themselves; and fearing lest, even with the clear demonstration before them, they might offend the God whom they were seeking to appease, before they laid hands on Jonah they offered this prayer: "We beseech thee, O Jehovah, we beseech thee, let us not perish for this man's life, and lay not upon us innocent blood, for thou, O Jehovah, has done as it pleased thee." Thus, for the first time in their lives they prayed to Jehovah, the only true and living God. Then, with the steady step which only trained sailors could command on a vessel tossed as that one was, they took Jonah, several men seizing him from either side, walked to the rail and cast him into the boiling sea. The vessel sped on its way and they saw him no more. The wild tempest sank to a moderate breeze, the tossing waters stretched themselves out in a gentle swell. "The sea ceased from her raging." The effect upon the seamen was irresistible: "Then the men feared Jehovah exceedingly; and they offered a sacrifice unto Jehovah, and made vows." It is not necessary to suppose that they waited till they went ashore before they offered this sacrifice. They could erect an altar on the deck of the ship and offer such victims as they had on board; and, if neither their altar nor the victim was such as the Mosaic law required, of which they knew nothing, they could hope for acceptance. The vows they made were doubtless vows to serve Jehovah.

Thus far the flight of Jonah has resulted in some good—in the conversion of these seamen to the worship of Jehovah. And did the good work stop with them? Did they not tell the story in every seaport visited by their ship in its long voyage? Did not every one of them continue to tell the strange and glad story as long as he lived? This ship's company, we may safely assert, were made missionaries to the heathen, preaching the true God in all the seaports of the Mediterranean, and thus a light was kindled in the dark places of the western world.

But leaving this part of the story, which grows on our imagination as we dwell upon it, we return to Jonah. When he was cast headforemost into the raging sea, he undoubtedly believed that it was a plunge into hell, for he was caught in the

midst of his sin, and now he faces instant death. But he finds himself sliding down the cold throat of a great fish, of whose widespread jaws he barely caught a glimpse ere he passed within them. He is in the bowels of the fish, with every limb cramped as in a vice. He cannot breathe, though he struggles for breath desperately. He suffers the pangs of the dying in every nerve and muscle. He realizes the plunge of the great animal into the deep waters; he hears the scraping of seaweeds on its sides; and, as the fish, now full of pain and alarm caused by the struggles of a living man within him, rushes hither and thither in his fury, Jonah is conscious of all his movements. What was his sense of time? He tells us, and in the same breath he reveals the anguish which his soul experienced. He exclaims: "The earth with her bars closed upon me *forever*. Out of the belly of Sheol I cried." He expected every moment to be his last; he was already suffering in body and mind the very torments of the damned; every slow moment as it passed appeared like years, every day like a cycle of eternity.

Suddenly he feels the warm sun in his face. He opens his eyes. He sees the dry land around him, and down below is the sea. The fish is gone, and this seems to be the shore of his native land. How long he lay there before he acquired strength to rise and walk; whether he was found there in helpless weakness by some passerby, or made his way unassisted to some dwelling where he might procure food and drink, we are not informed. We are left equally in the dark as to how long it took him to get back to his home in Gath-hepher, and as to the way in which the news of his adventure was spread abroad. The remarkable reticence which characterizes all of the sacred records, and which distinguishes them from all fictitious writings, is strikingly prominent here. But now that the prophet has been delivered, and is restored to home and family for a time, we may pause and look back with the question, is this his mode of return incredible?

We cannot be mistaken in affirming that God, having formed the purpose of bringing the Ninevites to repentance, was not to be defeated. Having selected the man through whose preaching the good work was to be accomplished, he was not to be outwitted by that man. The runaway preacher must be brought back. God could have caused the wind to

blow in such a direction as to force back the ship, or he could have seized Jonah by the hair of the head, and brought him back to Gath-hepher; but neither of these methods, nor any other that I can think of, would have been so wise as the one stated in the story. No other would have involved so complete a conversion of the heathen sailors; no other could have taught Jonah so good a lesson; and none, except the second just mentioned, could have brought him back so quick. The fish ran faster than a ship afloat, and even the ocean racers of the present day would have been left by him far in the lurch.

Jonah learned, and through his valuable experience millions have learned, that when God enjoins a disagreeable duty, it is far easier to go and do it than to run away from it. It was an act worthy then of Him who sees all things in all places, and who is ever-watchful to provide for all the foreseen generations of men the instruction which they need. The far-reaching effects of the event in the moral training of the world removes it as far as the east is from the west away from the category of idle wonders. And this is not all. We may safely say that if Jonah had gone to Nineveh when the word of Jehovah first came to him, his preaching would have been in vain; for though he would have come as a great prophet, he would not have been "a sign to the Ninevites," in the sense in which our Lord, as we have seen, uses that expression; and lacking this element of power, his mission would have been a failure. God knew this; for he knows all things. He knew that Jonah would run away as he did; he intended from the beginning to bring him back as he did; and all this was necessary to the effective execution of his benevolent purpose to save the Ninevites. From every possible point of view the whole scheme was worthy of God, and I confidently affirm that the story could not have been invented by man. No myth, no legend, in the whole range of human literature, can compare with it in all the elements which make it an incident worthy of divine interposition. If any man doubts this assertion, let him select his example and present it for comparison.

We are not informed how long Jonah remained at home before God spoke to him again; and this is an other example of the reticence quite unnatural to fiction, which characterizes this narrative. It may have been a day, a week, or a month; but when the chosen moment came, God spoke to Jonah again. He

says nothing about the first command, about the flight to Joppa, about the storm at sea, about the fish. He says, as if for the first time, "Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee." There is no flight or hesitation this time. "Jonah arose and went to Nineveh." Why this change? Has he altered his opinion as to whether or not God will destroy the city? Is the distance to Nineveh any less than it was before? Is the journey any less expensive or laborious? Ah, Jonah has learned the lesson of implicit obedience, the lesson of leaving all consequences with God. He goes to Nineveh. As he goes, I confess for my own part, that if the story of Jonah had closed here without another word, I would be constrained to regard it as one of the most valuable of all the episodes in the Old Testament.

When he began to cry out in the streets of Nineveh, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown," the question necessarily went from lip to lip, Who is this? The answer, that it was the great prophet of Israel, by whose supernatural foresight the victories of Jeroboam, running through a period of forty years, had been won, was enough to arrest solemn attention; but when it was added that on first receiving the command to come and utter this cry, he tried to escape the task by running away, and sailing far out upon the sea, but that Jehovah, who had given the command, overtook him, brought him back in the bowels of a fish, cast him out alive on dry land, and then renewed the command, this added tenfold power to the word of the prophet. The Ninevites believed, proclaimed a fast, put on sack-cloth, turned every man from his evil way, and called mightily on Jehovah. Is this incredible? I have tried to think what effect such a proclamation, by such a man, under such circumstances, would have in our modern society; and I can think of only one class of persons who would probably not repent, and that is the class made up of men who have listened to the gospel for years and years, heard it in all its power, in all its tenderness, and have so hardened their hearts by continued resistance to it, that nothing less than the thunders of the judgment day is likely to bring them to repentance. Men untrained to such resistance, as were the Ninevites, men who had never in their lives before been confronted with the outspoken wrath of the Almighty, could only tremble and repent and pray.

The repentance of the Ninevites was natural. Most unnatural is the impenitence of the gospel-hardened sinners of our own day.

But the effect of Jonah's preaching could not, in the nature of things, be confined to the people of Nineveh. Throughout the Assyrian empire, and wherever on earth the name of Nineveh was known, the influence of her example must have been felt; and the revelations of eternity alone will enable us to know how much good was accomplished. It would not be strange if many souls unknown to fame, both in Nineveh and elsewhere, were brought to lasting repentance and finally to eternal life. Jonah was a great missionary to the heathen, and we may be sure that his work was not in vain.

How Jonah ascertained that God "repented of the evil that he said he would do unto the Ninevites," we are not informed; and this is another instance of the reticence common to this and other books of the Bible. But when he did ascertain it he was angry; and he gave vent to his anger by exclaiming: "Jehovah, was not this my saving when I was yet in my own country? Therefore I hasted to flee unto Tarshish; for I knew that thou art a gracious God, and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repentest thee of the evil. Therefore now, O Jehovah, take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live." God answered him, "Doest thou well to be angry?," and there the interview ended.

One would have supposed that Jonah would return to his home, having accomplished the mission on which he was sent; but instead of doing this, he "went out of the city, and sat on the east side of the city, and there made him a booth, and sat under it in the shadow, till he might see what would become of the city. Why had he any question as to what would become of the city, when God had repented of the evil which he said he would do to it? I can think of no answer, unless it be that he had no confidence in the repentance of the Ninevites. They had been so desperately wicked that their sudden repentance appeared more like a spasm of fright than a genuine turning away from sin; and he did not believe it would last. If it did not, if they turned back to their old ways he knew very well that God would certainly bring upon them the doom which he had pronounced. What was to become of the city, then, depended

upon the genuineness and the permanency of the reformation which had been effected; and Jonah, still wishing to see his prediction fulfilled, determines to await the result. He must wait till at least forty days expire, and possibly longer; but the presumption is that he intended to remain only through the forty days.

Instead of taking up his temporary abode within the city walls, he chose a point of observation in the plain to the east, and probably it was the summit of some elevation from which he could have an extended view. The booth which he built was not to keep off the wind or the rain; but to shelter him from the heat, which is very intense in that region during the hot season. It was not made of leaves, which would wilt and curl in a single day under such heat; but of sticks and small boards which he could pick up in the vicinity. It afforded a very imperfect shelter from the direct rays of the sun, and none from the reflected heat which rose from the surrounding sand. He suffered much, but God had pity on him, and "prepared a gourd, and made it to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head, to deliver him from his evil case." That gourd sprang up in a single night, so that it might appear, as it was, a special and miraculous gift from God. Jonah was "exceedingly glad because of the gourd." Doubtless it covered the whole of the shanty which had so imperfectly sheltered him, shutting out the side heat as well as the direct rays of the sun, and giving him the full benefit of any breeze that might blow. But the relief lasted only one day. The next morning, God having prepared a worm that smote the gourd, when the sun became hot its leaves wilted, turned yellow, curled up, and dropped off. When the heat of the day had come Jonah suffered more than ever. "The sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted, and requested for himself that he might die." He was now angry again, and God said to him, "Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?" He said, "I do well to be angry, even unto death." I suppose that he meant, he was so angry that it would kill him if he did not get relief. He does not claim to be angry with God, or with the Ninevites, or with any person or thing in particular. It was one of those fits of anger to which many persons are subject when suffering, and which makes them growl and snarl like a wild beast in pain.

The opportunity had now come; God had brought about the opportunity to teach Jonah the last lesson for which this series of events was projected. Had Nineveh been destroyed he would have gone home happy. His present misery was brought on in consequence of his desire to **see** it destroyed even yet. He was displeased with the mercy which God had manifested toward it, and refused to believe that this mercy would continue. So God says to him: "Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for which thou hast not labored, neither madest it to grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: and should not I have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"

What a rebuke for the unfeeling hostility of the prophet toward a vast population; and what forgetfulness it displayed on his part of the multitude of innocent babes who would have been swallowed up in the destruction which he desired to witness! The rebuke was instantaneous; but what shall we say of the train of thought which it awoke in Jonah's mind never to cease while he lived? And when the knowledge of this last scene came to be spread abroad in Israel, who can tell the good impression made on thoughtful minds, as day after day and year after year the thrilling story was told, and God's chosen people were made to realize that he was not their God only, but the God of the whole earth?

If now we review the whole story in the light of our reflections on it, we see that it represents God as desiring the repentance of the Ninevites, and of all in the proud empire of Assyria who could be influenced by their example. He selects as the preacher through whose word this great reformation may be effected, the most renowned prophet of the age. Knowing in advance that this prophet, great as he was, would be moved by his knowledge of God's goodness, and his own hatred of Nineveh, to run away from the task assigned him, God permits him to flee far out upon a stormy sea, that he might make him the means there of turning a company of heathen sailors to the true faith, and send them preaching round the shores of the western world, and that he might at the same time bring the prophet back better than ever prepared to do effective work in Nineveh. As a result of this preparation,

the whole population of the great city is brought to repentance, and they appeal so earnestly to Jehovah for mercy that he spares them after having doomed them to destruction. We need no historian's pen to assure us that as far as Nineveh was known, the news of this thrilling experience traveled with the speed of the wind; and that an impression in favor of fearing and honoring Jehovah must have been made on every mind. What could have been more worthy of God than all this? Then, that he might send the prophet back to his countrymen with a new and kindlier sense of the brotherhood of man springing out of this universal Fatherhood of God, the weary waiting on the sand hill follows, and the whole story terminates with the tender lesson drawn from the magic shade which refreshed the suffering prophet. Is the story incredible? I think my readers are ready to answer, Not if any other miracles are credible.

But there is another side of the question of incredibility. If the story of Jonah is not history, it is, of course, a piece of fiction, and fiction which originated in the brain of an Israelite. Now I think it may be made to appear that the latter alternative is incredible. It is incredible, in the first place, that any Israelite, capable of conceiving and of writing such a story, would be so irreverent toward one of the great prophets of his nation as to make him act the part ascribed to Jonah. And even if an intellectual Israelite had been so recreant to the ordinary traditions of his countrymen as to write such a story, it is still more incredible that the leaders of the chosen people at any period of their history would have allowed such a document a place among their sacred books. There is nothing of the kind to be found elsewhere in the Bible, and such aspersions upon the names of prophets and patriarchs is not to be found in the apocryphal literature of the Jews. On the contrary, the Jewish writings which are known to be fictitious are often characterized by extravagant eulogies of Biblical characters.

This alternative is incredible, in the second place, because no Israelite, inventing a story of God's dealings with a great Gentile city like Nineveh, would have represented him as being so regardful of the welfare of its people, so quick to forgive their sins, and so tenderly mindful of the innocent within its walls. Especially would no Israelite write a story whose culminating point was a stern rebuke of his nation for animosity

toward an oppressive heathen power. From this point of view, as well as from the other, such a book, if written as a fiction, would have so outraged the feeling of zealous priests and scribes that it would never have obtained a place in the sacred canon. How can we imagine that a people who attempted to slay Jesus because he showed them that a Gentile woman and a Gentile warrior, in the days of Elijah and Elisha, honored these two prophets as no man or woman in Israel did or would, have permitted a book so full of rebuke for their hatred of the heathen to be made a part of their own Bible? The thought is preposterous. Yet, this is the alternative to which those are driven who affirm that the story as told in the Scriptures is incredible. Like unbelievers in general, they take the harder side.

This incredibility is intensified when we consider the date assigned to the Book of Jonah by those who hold it to be fictitious. According to Dr. Driver, as we have seen, it was written in the fifth century B.C., after the return from the Babylonian captivity. Nineveh, at that time, together with the Assyrian Empire of which it was the head, had long since perished; yet, this book, though dealing with its sins and its doom, gives not a hint of its final fate. This reticence, if the assumed date is the real one, could have been assumed by its author only for the purpose of making it appear that the book was written before Nineveh's fall; and it was, therefore, a piece of deception. As Nineveh had not only perished at this date, but had, between the time of Jonah and the time of its downfall, carried into captivity the ten tribes of Israel, and visited upon them unspeakable cruelties, a Jew of a later age would be the last man on earth to invent a story showing tender regard for it on the part of Israel's God. Furthermore, at the supposed date of composition, the whole of the twelve tribes, with the single exception of the remnant who had returned to Jerusalem, were being ground under the heel of heathen oppression, and were learning to hate the ways of the oppressors more and more with every passing day. In no former period in Israel's history was it so improbable that such a book could be written by an Israelite, or that, if written, it would be received with any feeling but abhorrence by his countrymen. In other words, the farther down the stream of time you bring the date of the book,

the more incredible it is that any Jewish writer would have invented its story, and the more incredible that it could have obtained the place which we know it did obtain in the sacred writings of the Jews. To bring the matter nearer home, let us suppose that some ingenious writer should now publish a volume containing aspersions upon the character of one of the leading generals or statesmen of our revolutionary war, and rebuking severely as unjust and cruel the feeling of the American patriots toward their British foes; and suppose that, by common consent of this generation of Americans, these sentiments should come to be incorporated in the standard histories of the United States. This would be a state of things not one whit more incredible, not to say impossible, than the theory that the Book of Jonah is a fictitious narrative written by an uninspired author in an age of Jewish subjection to a heathen power.

Finally, when we add to the incredibility of the theory that this book is a fiction, the solemn assertion by Jesus that its leading incidents are real transactions, we can safely conclude this protracted discussion with the affirmation, that none of the supernatural events recorded in the Old Testament are supported by stronger evidence of authenticity than those recorded in the Book of Jonah.

Jewish Wars As Precedents For Modern Wars

Upon the first announcement of the proposition that all war is sinful, the mind of the Bible reader instantly reverts to the Jewish economy, and to the fact that the chosen people of God were often engaged in war; and this, too, with express divine sanction, This is the first resort for objections to the proposition, and objections from this source almost invariably suggest themselves to those with whom the question is a new one. At the same time, those advocates of war who have studied the question most maturely, find in the same fact the ground of one of their most potent arguments. It is proper, therefore, that we should begin our discussion of the question by considering this argument, and by setting forth the exact bearing of Old Testament precedents upon the whole subject.

The argument to which we refer may be stated, in its most popular as well as its most ingenious form, as follows: God can not sanction that which is morally wrong. But God has sanctioned war; therefore war is not morally wrong.

We are not disposed to make haste in the consideration of this argument, but prefer to linger upon it until its merits are fully exhibited and made quite familiar to the mind of the reader. We will not, therefore, attempt its refutation in the most direct method, until after we shall have approached it somewhat indirectly. The advantages of this course will be apparent, we trust, as we proceed.

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses Lard, Editor, Vol. 5, n.p., 1868, pp. 113-126.

It is sometimes well, in considering an argument, to first note the consequences involved in the supposition of its validity. Such a course quite frequently reduces to a very bald absurdity an argument which, in any other way, can be refuted only by uncommon logical skill. Observe, then, some of the consequences involved in the argument just stated. If valid at all, it must be so in reference to the character of the wars included in the minor premise, as certainly as in reference to war in the abstract. For if God cannot sanction that which is morally wrong, he certainly cannot and has not sanctioned wars which are wrong in their character. In other words, God cannot sanction a wicked war; and to the full extent that his sanction justifies war, it justifies wars of the same character with those which he has sanctioned. If such wars are justified, then nations, and even Christians, may innocently engage in them. But the very first war which the Jews were commanded to undertake was a war of invasion, conquest, pillage, and extermination. They entered the land of Canaan, not in self-defense, but to exterminate the native tribes, to seize or destroy their movable property, and to take permanent possession of their country. They came to cultivate vineyards which they had not planted, and to dwell in houses which they had not built. In a subsequent age King Saul, with the sanction of God, undertook a similar war against the Amalekites, sparing neither age, sex, nor condition, but putting the whole population to the sword. But our argument justifies such wars; and if a nation in which Christians live were now to undertake a war of this character, they could innocently take part in it; for God commanded his chosen people to wage such wars, and what God has commanded or sanctioned cannot be morally wrong. Where is the Christian advocate of war who is willing to abide this inevitable result of his own logic?

In the second place, this argument, if valid in reference to the main question, must be equally so in reference to the causes which justify war. If God cannot sanction that which is morally wrong, he cannot and has not sanctioned a war undertaken for an unjust purpose or an insufficient cause. But the Jewish war of extermination against the Canaanites was not provoked by a single act of hostility, or even of unkindness. There had been no intercourse between the parties for genera-

tions previous, and they had, just previous to the war, scarcely a knowledge of each other's existence. The only exciting cause between the parties was a desire on the part of the Jews to possess the land, and a determination on the part of the Canaanites to repel an unprovoked invasion. The same may be said substantially of Saul's war against the Amalekites. The only complaint of the Jews alleged in the history is, that the ancestors of the Amalekites, nearly five hundred years before, had attacked the ancestors of the Israelites as they were passing through the wilderness (I Sam. 15:1-3). The attacking party had then met with a severe defeat, but now their descendants, of a remote generation, must be slaughtered, men, women, and children, without any new offense to the invading party. Yet, if our argument is a sound one, Christians may now as the Jews did then, invade the territories of a neighboring nation, and slaughter the inhabitants, without even a complaint against them. God has sanctioned such wars, and what he has sanctioned cannot be morally wrong. Those who insist that such wars are wrong, must admit that God himself has sanctioned wrong. How unfortunate for the world's great warriors that this argument was not sooner discovered! It would have justified all the conquests of Alexander, Caesar, Tamerlane, and Napoleon, and even the ravages of every savage chief who ever burned a peaceful village and slaughtered its inhabitants. It gives them all the sanction of divine approbation; yet, strange to say, it is the argument of men who deny the innocence of any but defensive war. There is no escape from this conclusion; for the fact that God has sanctioned wars of extermination does most unquestionably prove that such wars are not, necessarily, because they are such, and for no other reason, morally wrong. That such a conclusion springs legitimately from an argument employed by those who deny the innocence of all offensive wars, should make them suspect that it is fallacious, for it proves too much for their own cause. They are certainly right in condemning offensive wars in general; and when we come to see in what way they may be condemned, with these divine precedents before us, we will see clearly the defect in the argument which we are considering.

But this argument involves the parties who employ it in an inconsistency still more gross, if possible, than the above. Condemning offensive war, and declaring the innocence of defensive war, they go to the divinely sanctioned wars of the Jews for an example in proof, when, lo, they find their exemplars engaged in the very warfare which they condemn, while the enemies of the Jews are waging the wars which they justify. No people on earth ever waged more strictly defensive wars than did the Canaanites. They fought in defense of their country, their property, and the lives of their women and children, against an enemy to whom they had no cause for offense. No Christian advocate of defensive war, had he then lived in Canaan, could have refused to enlist, like the prophet Balaam, in the ranks of the invaded nations. He might have objected that they were a very wicked people, who, if they had their deserts at the hand of God, would be severely punished; but then it would have been demanded: "What right have these refugees from Egypt, whom neither we nor our fathers have offended, to pronounce judgment on us, and undertake our extermination? Have we not a right, so far as they are concerned, to worship what gods we please, and to regulate our own domestic institutions? And when they come to deprive us of this right, and not only so, but to consign us without conditions and without mercy to utter extermination, who will deny to us the right of self-defense?" I confess, that as an advocate of war, I could not have answered these questions, except by granting that right and justice between the parties was all on the side of the Canaanites. Such must be the judgment of the world, when the parties are considered only in their relations to one another, the only way in which parties to any war can now be considered, and therefore the only way in which these facts can furnish precedents for the present day. How wild and reckless, then, the logic by which the Jews, whom to imitate now would expose any nation to the execration of mankind, and held up as furnishing an example, in the matter of war, for the imitation of Christians! The advocate of defensive war should pause here, and deliberate, before he reads further. If he is capable of thinking consistently, he will find himself involved in some confusion.

There is still another unlooked for conclusion to which our argument necessarily leads us. If God cannot sanction that which is morally wrong, then all his decisions upon the question of war must be regarded as infallibly right. We have seen that he could not sanction war for a wrong or insufficient cause; and we now conclude, that, if our argument is valid, whatever causes God regarded as insufficient to justify war must really be insufficient. But, upon examination, we find that causes which all advocates of defensive war now declare to be entirely sufficient for taking up arms, were entirely insufficient then. In the days of King Saul, Judaea was invaded, without provocation, by the Philistines. Saul, instead of attacking them at once, which he was not at liberty to do, waited so long for the prophet Samuel to give him God's permission to fight, that his men became alarmed and deserted him, until his army was reduced to six hundred men. Some unauthorized skirmishing undertaken by Jonathan, resulted in the rout of the Philistines, and the rallying of Israel; but when Saul again applied for divine permission to lead forward his army, it was again withheld, and he was constrained to disband his forces (I Sam. 13 and 14).

Later in the reign of Saul, the Philistines once more invaded his kingdom with no wrong to redress, and when he applied for divine permission to repel them, "The Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." But so anxious was he to fight, that he induced the witch of Endor to call up the dead prophet Samuel, that he might ask permission through him. When the spirit of Samuel appeared, Saul said to him: "I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God has departed from me, and answers me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams; therefore I have called you, that you may make known to me what I shall do." The prophet replied: "Why do you ask me, seeing the Lord has departed from you and become your enemy?" He gave him no permission to fight, but Saul did fight, and his army was totally routed, himself and his three sons falling in the battle (I Sam. 28:3-20; 31:1-6).

Again: in a still later period of Jewish history, the armies of Nebuchadnezzar invaded Judaea, and laid siege to Jerusalem itself; yet Zedekiah, the king, was forbidden to resist them,

though told by the prophet that he himself was about to be taken captive and carried away to Babylon (II Kings 25; Jer. 21). In all these cases, right and justice between the parties were on the side of Israel, while their enemies were, in each instance, ruthless invaders whose only objects were conquest and plunder. The fact that in these cases the Jews were forbidden to fight, shows conclusively that in the judgment of God even unprovoked invasions like these do not in themselves constitute a sufficient cause for war. Thus, again, in the opposite direction, does the argument from Jewish precedents prove too much for our modern defenders of defensive war.

But an insurrection for the avowed purpose of dismembering the nation was no more sufficient cause for war than an invasion. When Rehoboam came to the throne, ten tribes dictated to him conditions on which they would continue to submit to the established government, saying, "Thy father made our yoke grievous; now, therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee." The young king foolishly followed the advice of the young men who had grown up with him, in preference to that of the old men who had stood before his father and threatened them with heavier burdens and greater severities than Solomon had inflicted. Upon this the ten tribes revolted. Rehoboam, indignant at an attempt to dismember the nation, destroy its military resources, and degrade it in the eyes of the world, assembled an army of one hundred and eighty thousand men, to bring the rebels back to a sense of duty. But Shemaiah, the prophet of God, commanded that the army should be disbanded, "and they returned every man to his house" (I Kings 12). The revolution was effected without the shedding of blood, and the proud young king was compelled, by the express command of God, to swallow his wrath, and submit quietly to the loss of much the greater part of the kingdom. This shows that a revolt against an established government is not in itself a sufficient cause for war, even when the revolting party has no better cause than the fear of future oppression at the hands of their rulers. If insufficient in one case, it is insufficient in every other case; and if such war is ever justifiable, it must be made so by some consideration not found in the nature of the quarrel. Here,

then, is another cause of war held sufficient by all the modern defenders of war, but proved entirely insufficient by the very precedents to which they appeal.

It may be objected to the argument, from these cases of invasion and insurrection, that the Jews were forbidden to resist the former because they had sinned against God and deserved to be punished; and that Rehoboam was forbidden to resist the latter because, as the prophet told him, "this thing is from the Lord." But this explanation only confirms our previous conclusions, for it shows that a justifying cause for war, under the Jewish economy, had to be found in some circumstance entirely distinct from the conduct of the parties toward each other. In the absence of that other circumstance, neither invasion nor insurrection, however unprovoked they might be, could justify an appeal to arms.

If the justifying circumstance referred to, in case of invasion, were the innocence of the invaded party, so that when they were conscious of no guilt in the sight of God they might repel an invasion, this would not enhance the practical value of the precedent for modern nations, for there is no nation free from sin against God, or undeserving of punishment at his hand, and therefore there could still be no resistance to invasion under this precedent. And if, in case of insurrection, the question of resistance depended upon the further question, whether or not the insurrection were "from the Lord," no insurrection could, in modern times, be suppressed; for God has ceased to inform men what insurrections are from him, and men are now able to know it only by the result. If an insurrection is successful, men are apt to conclude that it is from the Lord; but if it fails, they pronounce it from the devil. This is rather a superficial method of judging; for God might accomplish good by an unsuccessful insurrection, as a successful one might subserve the purposes of the devil; but granting its correctness, it leaves nations utterly unable to know at the outset of a given insurrection whether it is from God or not, and therefore the precedent binds them to non-resistance. This is unquestionably true, unless God, in the New Testament, has given some standard by which we may know whether given insurrections and invasions are sanctioned by him.

We now repeat the question: By what strange perversion of reason is it that the authorized wars of the Jews are appealed to as a precedent for Christians, when, as a precedent, they so utterly condemn the party that makes the appeal? There is not an advocate for war now living, with any pretensions to Christianity, who would justify in modern nations wars like some of those waged by the Jews, or who would not justify now an appeal to arms against such invasions and rebellion as they were forbidden to resist; and yet, in the same breath, the Jewish wars are appealed to as a justifying precedent. A more glaring inconsistency could scarcely be imagined. It is proof conclusive that the Jewish wars are not yet understood—that the lesson they teach has not yet been learned by the religious world.

We must here remark, that we by no means wish to make the impression that the Jews never repelled invasion nor suppressed rebellion. They often did the former, and once, in the case of the Benjamites (Judges 20), they did the latter. This fact might strike the mind of the objector as furnishing an offset to the argument which we have based upon their mode of dealing with other invasions and insurrections. For example: it might be urged that the suppression of the Benjamite insurrection by the command of God, proves that insurrection was a sufficient cause for war. But this would be to represent God as acting capriciously, as permitting war at one time and forbidding it at another, when the cause for war was in both cases the same. Such a representation is inconsistent with the character of God. Undoubtedly he acted in both cases from some uniform principle, and the reason of the difference is, that in the one case the justifying circumstance to which we have referred above was present; in the other it was absent. This very diversity of conduct, therefore, shows that neither the invasion nor the insurrection was in itself the justifying cause for war.

Neither, in showing that the Jews waged wars of extermination which would be shocking to the moral sense of mankind at the present day, would we intimate that their object in so doing is really inexcusable: But our object is to show that the argument in favor of modern wars, deduced from these facts, is fallacious, by showing, as we have most conclusively done, that it proves too much.

We can now state the principle running through all the history of the Jews, which justified them in waging wars of invasion and extermination at one time, yet, at another time, submitting, without resistance, to invasion and conquest; the principle which made it right for them to suppress one rebellion, yet wrong to suppress another equally unprovoked. This principle is not found in the modern conception that defensive wars are right and offensive wars are wrong; for it is a principle by which, at times, both were tolerated, and at other times both were forbidden. It is not found in the nature of the offense given by the enemy; for, with the same offense, it required them at different periods to pursue lines of policy as different as submission and resistance. It is a principle which could make any war right, and without which no war could be right. It is the principle of implicit obedience to God. Sometimes, as in the case of the Canaanites and of the Amalekites, it was God's will expressly revealed to them, that they should invade and exterminate nations who had done them no injury. To do this without a command from God would have been a most infamous crime; but under his command it became a solemn religious duty. God himself, for reasons of his own, decided that these nations should be exterminated, and he made the Jews the executioners of his will. They undertook war not by their own volition, or at the instance of their own judgment; and they found hazardous to have any will of their own in reference to its prosecution or its termination. Because they objected to invading Canaan when God first commanded them to do so, they were condemned to wander forty years in the wilderness, till every fighting man among them, but two, should perish. When they turned afterward to obey the command they had refused to obey when it was given, they were beaten back with great slaughter (Num. 24:26-45). The children of these men at last invaded the land, and when they had prosecuted the war to an extent which they thought sufficient, they made peace. But the displeasure of God was pronounced against them in prophetic words which were afterward fulfilled to their sorrow: "I made you go up out of Egypt, and have brought you to the land which I swore to your fathers, and I said, I will never break my covenant with you. And you shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; you shall throw down their altars; but you have not obeyed my voice. Why have you

done this? Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you; but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare to you " (Judg. 2:1-3). Again: when King Saul undertook to follow his own judgment in the war with Amalek, sparing Agag and the best of the cattle and the sheep, the consequence of his disobedience was the forfeiture of his throne (I Sam. 15:10-28).

The same principle controlled them in their dealings with all enemies, both foreign and domestic. The reason why they suppressed the revolt of the Benjamites, but permitted that of the ten tribes to go unresisted, was not because the latter was more excusable than the former, but because God, by his prophet, commanded them in the latter case: "Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel; return every man to his house;" but in the former case, when they asked God, "Shall I go up to battle against Benjamin my brother?," the Lord said: "Go up against him" (I Kings 12:24; Judg. 20:18, 23, 28). If the revolt of the Benjamites were the only one which occurred in Jewish history, it might suggest the conclusion that God regarded revolt as a sufficient cause for war; but the fact that the revolt of the ten tribes was not resisted prohibits this conclusion, and shows that while the people had to act upon the decision of God in each case, God's decision was formed from premises distinct from those furnished by the quarrel between the parties.

In the cases of invasion mentioned above, God forbade them to resist for reasons of his own; and when the whole nation was tributary to surrounding tribes, as was often the case during the period of the Judges, they quietly submitted to oppression till "the spirit of the Lord came upon Othniel," or upon Gideon, or Jephthah, or Samson; or till some prophet, or some prophetess like Deborah, called out the armies of Israel in the name of the Lord. In the period of the kings, when war was contemplated, a prophet of God was consulted, or, in the absence of a prophet, an appeal was made to God by the high-priest in the temple. Thus the authority of God, revealed in reference to each particular war, was their only justifying excuse for taking up arms, and their only guarantee of success. This express revelation of God's will not only justified them, but left their enemies without excuse. Whilst the law of

defense against unprovoked invasion would justify the Canaanites in their resistance, and would have enlisted every advocate for defensive war in their favor, the principle which governed Jewish wars condemns their resistance. They had committed crimes worthy of death; not, indeed, against the Israelites who assailed them, but against God; and the fact that it was God who ordered their extermination, is the consideration which made it their duty to quietly submit. They were in the condition of a condemned criminal led to the gallows by an executioner who has no quarrel against him, and who rightly takes his life under authority of law, though the same act without such authority would be as inexcusable as the conduct of the criminal himself.

In order to see how these Jewish precedents affect the right of nations to wage war at the present day, we must consider them as if they were the only precedents known to us. We must take the nations back under Jewish law, and suppose them, while under that law, to wage just such wars as they now do. Or, to effect the same object in another way, we must suppose that revelation ceased with the Old Testament scriptures, and that nations are now living under that law. This supposition is necessary in order to prevent confusion of thought, and to enable us to see these precedents in their own light alone. It places us in this singular condition—under a law which justifies us in waging any kind of war which God may specifically authorize, but forbids to wage any war for which he does not grant specific authority. In addition to this, we find that he has absolutely ceased to communicate authority to undertake any particular war, and has thereby deprived us of the one only cause which can justify us in fighting even in self-defense. If there had been left to us a general grant upon the subject, this might have obviated the necessity for a special grant in each individual case; but whatever may be thought of New Testament revelation in this respect, it is absolutely certain that no such general grant is to be found in the Old Testament, and it is the force of its precedents that we are now considering. The true and proper effect, therefore, of applying to modern nations the law which governed Jewish warfare would be to render it impossible for them to wage any war; for it would render insufficient the best causes which they can have,

unprovoked invasion and insurrection, while it would throw them back for excuse upon one which they can never have, the will of God specifically revealed for the occasion. The Jewish wars were certainly justifiable, and all wars precisely like them would be equally so; but no modern wars can be like them in the one only particular which made them innocent; therefore no modern wars, judged by Jewish precedents, are innocent, or can possibly be so.

We have now exhibited the insufficiency of the argument for war under consideration in two different ways. By first supposing its conclusion to be granted, we have shown that it involves the absurdity of justifying wars of unprovoked invasion and extermination, and yet would prevent resistance to wars of the same kind. This absurdity involved in the argument proves that it must be fallacious. In the second place, we have shown that the wars, upon the use of which, as precedents, the validity of this argument depends, were such that, as precedents, they condemn all modern warfare. This fact again proves that there must be a fallacy lurking in the argument. We have now only to point out that fallacy, and dismiss the argument from further consideration.

Plausible as the argument appears, it contains no less than two fallacies; first, a false assumption in the major premise; second, an ambiguous use of the minor term. To speak of the latter first, it is clear that the term war is used in a broader sense in the conclusion than in the minor premise. God cannot sanction that which is morally wrong; he has sanctioned war; therefore war is not morally wrong.

Now it is not admitted, nor does the minor proposition assume, that God has sanctioned war in general; but merely that he has sanctioned some particular wars waged by the Jews. As these particular wars are all that the minor premise embraces, they are all which can be embraced in the conclusion. But the term war in the conclusion is employed in its general sense, and therefore the argument is fallacious. This can be seen still more readily by comparing it with the following, which is parallel to it. God cannot approve sinful beings. God has approved men; therefore men are not sinful beings.

Here the minor term men is employed with the same ambiguity which attaches to the term war in the argument above. The men whom God had approved are not men in general, as would be required by the conclusion; but certain men whose sins had been forgiven, and who were leading righteous lives. The premises would justify the conclusion that some men are not sinful beings, but they can prove no more than this. So the argument on war proves that some wars, *viz.*, those Jewish wars which God sanctioned, were not morally wrong; and it might be employed to prove that no wars precisely like them are morally wrong; but it can prove no more than this. We have already seen, that to prove this much would not serve the purpose of the defenders of modern wars, seeing that none of the latter are or can be precisely like the approved Jewish wars, because they have not that special revelation of God's approval which made those wars innocent, and without which they would have been sinful.

But the major premise contains a false assumption. God has sanctioned some things which are morally wrong. Our opponents themselves admit that wars of extermination are morally wrong, yet we have seen that God has sanctioned some of them. Again: treason is morally wrong; but God sanctioned that in the case of Rahab, "who received the spies, and sent them out another way." The murder of one's own child is morally wrong, yet God commanded it in the case of Abraham. That which is morally wrong, is known to be so by the precepts of God's moral law. But God has seen fit, at times, to command, for special reasons for his own, the performance of deeds which his moral law forbids. In such cases the positive command sets aside the general moral precept, and must be obeyed in preference. But a positive law can set the moral law aside only to the extent of its positive requirements; so that such a command given to a man on a special occasion could not justify him in the same act on another occasion, nor could it justify the same act in another man on any occasion. No man can argue the general right to sacrifice our children, from the command to Abraham; nor the general right to betray our native city to its enemies, from the justification of Rahab (Jas. 2:25). Some of the Jewish wars, *viz.*, their wars of extermination, are admitted to be of this same class of actions,

and it is further admitted that they cannot be used as precedents to justify any other nations in waging similar wars; nor could the Jews have used them as precedents for exterminating any other tribes than those whom they were specially commanded to exterminate. But all their wars, whether of offense or defense, were governed by the same law; they were justified only by special grants of divine authority; therefore no one class of them more than another can be used as general precedents.

We have now fully exhibited, both directly and indirectly, the fallacy of the argument under consideration. It has deserved the amount of space we have devoted to it, only in consideration of the astonishing influence which it has exerted over the minds of men. From the twilight which preceded the dark ages, through all the succession of wars which have been waged by Christian nations and applauded by preachers of the gospel down to the fierce struggle through which our own country has just passed, these wars of the Jews have been appealed to as justifying precedents by both parties, with a confidence which would be almost sublime were it not so utterly unfounded. It is time that the world were waking from this dream of ages, and beginning to see the true light which shines from these pages of Jewish history. They would doubtless have seen it long ago, but for the blinding effect of passion, and for the readiness with which men catch at even the appearance of argument, to support them in a course which they are determined, at all hazards, to pursue. With the advance of a severer and more logical study of the word of God, which is beginning to dispel the darkness of ages, we may expect to see this subject, like many others, come forth into new light before the world.

Destiny of the Wicked

The controversy in reference to the eternal punishment of the wicked, like many other controversies, has been greatly prolonged, by the want of system with which it has been conducted. This want betrays itself in reference both to the sources from which evidence is drawn and the arrangement of the points in dispute. The two great sources from which evidence is drawn, are speculative philosophy and the Bible; and the disputants often pass rapidly from one of these to the other without proper discrimination between them. When both parties are believers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the testimony of the latter should be regarded as all sufficient; for no speculative conclusion, however potent the logic from which it springs, can invalidate the testimony of God's Word, nor is any such conclusion needed by the believer to confirm the testimony of the Scriptures. A man shows his faith in the Word of God by relying implicitly upon its statements. But if one of the parties is an unbeliever, the question which they ought first to discuss is not whether reason teaches the fate of the sinner; for the believer is little concerned about the teaching of reason upon such a subject; but whether the Bible is the Word of God. Only when both debaters are unbelievers, and have, therefore, nothing more certain to rely upon, is it proper to discuss the question by the light of speculative philosophy.

From *Lard's Quarterly*, Moses E. Lard, editor, Vol. 2, Lexington, Kentucky, 1865, pp. 424-442.

These observations are made, not because truth has anything really to fear from speculative philosophy, but because she has no use for it in the presence of a safer guide. She can defend herself against all assaults which come from that quarter; but she chooses to arm herself with better weapons than the armory of speculation can furnish. A strict observance of this necessary distinction would narrow the ground of controversy, and bring the parties into closer conflict, so that error would have less room in which to play, and the triumph of truth would be more decisive.

A similar discrimination is necessary in reference to the points at issue. It is idle to dispute about the duration or severity of future punishment, until it is first decided that some future punishment will be inflicted. It is idle, too, to discuss the meaning of the word "eternal" until you first ascertain definitely to what punishment that term is applied. So in reference to all the facts which constitute the different stages in the progress of the sinner's future history. Each should be made a separate subject of thought, and the issue upon each should be separately decided. We should decide, first, whether there is any punishment at all after death. If not, the whole discussion ends at its beginning. If there is, then it is proper to make it a subject of inquiry in reference to all its characteristics, and each of these separately. We should inquire when it begins, what is its degree of severity, what changes will it undergo, and how long will it continue.

Our present inquiry is designed primarily for those who believe that the Scriptures are inspired of God. We have nothing to do, therefore, with any facts, real or supposed, not mentioned in the Bible. If, when the testimony of this book is exhibited, anyone should assert that a book containing such testimony cannot be the Word of God, it would be proper to open with him a discussion as to the authenticity of the Bible, thus defending the doctrine, by defending the book which announces it. But we will not anticipate such a circumstance in the present essay.

We will endeavor, while prosecuting our inquiry, to bear in mind the arrangement of thought above indicated. We will advance by progressive steps, and let each step we take be such,

that if it rest not on solid ground it shall be the last, or if it be sustained, it shall prepare the way for the next. These steps shall be marked by six distinct propositions, each one of which shall stand upon its own merits, and shall be demonstrated by unambiguous statements of the Word of God, while the whole of them shall constitute a complete statement of the future destiny of the wicked.

Proposition 1. *There is punishment for sin after death.*

We do not affirm, in this proposition, that *all* sins are punished after death; for sins which are forgiven are necessarily excluded. Of these God declares in the New Covenant: "I will remember them no more." In all our propositions we shall have in view only those whose sins remain unforgiven at the close of the present life. Neither does our present proposition deny that there is punishment for sin *before* death. Of this we now have nothing to say. Nor do we now affirm anything at all in reference to the nature or duration of punishment after death. We simply assert that there is some kind of punishment for sin after the death of the unforgiven sinner. If this proposition is not sustained, our inquiry terminates right here. If it is, we may then proceed to make some other inquiries in reference to that punishment. Here the parties to the controversy should join issue, and remain here till this issue is settled.

For proof of this proposition, we select a single statement of Jesus, in which its truth is declared without the slightest ambiguity or obscurity. We quote it as expressed by both Matthew and Mark:

"Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28).

"Fear not them that kill the body, but after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: fear him who after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell. Yes, I say to you, fear him" (Luke 12:4, 5).

It concerns us not in the least, at present, to inquire what precisely is meant by Luke's expression "cast into hell," and Matthew's equivalent expression "destroy both soul and body in hell." All that concerns us now is, that it is something to *fear*, and that it comes *after death*. These two facts are as

plainly declared in the passage as human speech can utter them. It is also perfectly certain that this which is after death is to be feared as the consequence of sin; for by the expression "them that kill the body" is evidently meant human beings, and by "him who has authority to cast into hell," is meant God. The fear of man, which leads to sin, is put in contrast with the fear of God, which leads to righteousness; and the command to fear God is enforced by the consequence of not fearing him, which is to be *cast into hell after death*.

All attempts to evade the full force of this proof are utterly fruitless and frivolous. If it be urged that while it is true that God has authority to cast into hell after death, he certainly will not do so; we answer, then it is not a thing to be feared; for man cannot fear that which he knows will not take place. Moreover, in that case, Jesus knew that what he was bidding them to fear could not possibly have any real existence, and was therefore guilty of deception, while mocking the fears of his ignorant disciples. But this is contrary to the assumption with which we set out, that the Word of God is true and Jesus divine. He bids us fear this punishment after death, or fear God on account of it, and this is proof to every believer that it will certainly be inflicted on all who comply not with the conditions of escape. We now hold that our first proposition is demonstrated, and its truth will be again involved in the truth of every proposition yet to be presented.

Proposition 2. *There is punishment for sin in hades.*

At death the souls of all men leave the body. Their presence can no longer be detected by sight or by sound, and the state into which they have gone is invisible. To that state the Greeks gave the name *hades*. This term means, etymologically, *the unseen*, but is used in an appropriated sense for the *unseen abode of spirits*. They so called it, because the spirits which had entered there, were gone beyond the reach of human sense, and whether far or near no man could tell. Whether above the sky or beneath the ground, or far beyond the ocean's wave, they knew not. They only knew that it was invisible, that it was, in the familiar language of our own poet, an "undiscovered country, from which bourne no traveler returns." In our common English version, this term is incor-

rectly rendered *hell*, and once the *grave*. In our quotations we shall render it *hades*.

In this state the condition of the righteous is represented by various expressions indicative of tranquil enjoyment. The dying thief went into "Paradise;" the spirit of Lazarus was borne into "Abraham's bosom," where he was "comforted;" the departed saints are "asleep in Jesus;" they "rest from their labors." All these expressions belong to the disembodied state; none of them except the first to the state which follows the resurrection.

In the same state the wicked suffer punishment. For proof of this, we refer, first, to the case of the rich man and Lazarus. It is said: "The rich man *died*, and was buried, and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in *torments*, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." It is here positively asserted that the rich man *died*, and the other events are located *after* his death. One of these events is his burial. This refers necessarily to his body alone, for the spirit is never buried. It is said, that in *hades* he was in *torments*. But the spirit alone enters *hades*, seeing that *hades* is the abode of disembodied spirits; hence, it is as certain as the words of Jesus, that the rich man's spirit suffered *torments* in *hades*. It is equally certain that these *torments* were in consequence of sin, and that others who do not repent will meet the same fate; for the rich man begs: "I beseech you, father, that you send Lazarus to my father's house; for I have five brothers; that he may testify to them, lest they also come to this place of torment; if one should go to them from the dead, they will *repent*." Abraham said to him: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded though one should rise from the dead."

There is only one possible method of evading the force of this proof, and that is, to deny that the incident represents the actual condition of a disembodied spirit. This is sometimes attempted. It is urged that the phraseology is inconsistent with the nature of disembodied spirits; for the rich man is represented as lifting up his *eyes*, and calling for *water* to cool his *tongue*, while Lazarus is represented as resting in Abraham's *bosom*, and is requested to dip his *finger* in water. But this objection is frivolous in the extreme; for we are compelled, whether we would or not, to conceive and speak of spirits as

possessing such members as belong to us in this life. This necessity is so imperious, that the Scriptures even speak of the finger and hand and arm, and ear and mouth and eye of God. It would have been impossible for the Savior to convey in words a vivid idea of the sufferings of a spirit without using this very phraseology.

But those who urge this objection insist that the account of the rich man and Lazarus is a parable drawn from the imagination to illustrate the dealings of God with the Jews and the Gentiles. The rich man, in this rich interpretation, represents the Jews while they were the chosen people of God, his death their rejection by God, and his torments in hades the humiliation and dispersion of the Jews. The beggar at the rich man's gate represents the Gentiles before the church was opened to them, his death their passage into the church, and his resting in Abraham's bosom their comfort in the church of Christ. But see in what absurdities this assumption involves the narrative. The Gentiles, in the person of Lazarus, die in order to get into the church; they are then borne into it by angels, instead of being brought in by preachers. After they are in the church they can give no relief, not even a drop of water, to the poor Jews out of the church, for an impassable gulf is placed between those in the church and those out of it. Then they are intreated to leave the church and go back to their unconverted state again, to warn certain unconverted Jews. In the meantime, the Jews, in the person of the rich man, are playing antics quite as ludicrous. They die and are buried in order to get out of the church. There is then an impassable gulf between them and the church, so that neither can they get back into the church, nor can those already in it get out. Then, to cap the climax of their misery, they are greatly concerned about their five brothers, lest they should get out of the church, though they are already out, and the impassable gulf so fixed that they can never get in. Such is the confusion in which the hapless Universalist finds himself involved while seeking to evade the plain words of Jesus. Truly the way of the transgressor is hard.

It is difficult to believe that an honest soul could accept this absurd evasion. Even if its absurdities could be removed, and it could be admitted that the story is used to illustrate the

case of the Jews and Gentiles, still the facts of the story remain unchanged. That certain facts are used to illustrate certain others does not in the least affect the reality of the former. On the Universalist's own hypothesis, therefore, we still have the fact that the rich man, after his death and the burial of his body, was in torments in hades, sought relief which he could not obtain, and held a conversation in reference to the effect upon living sinners of the return of one from the dead to testify of the torments awaiting them in hades. Such is the indisputable import of the narrative itself; and when we come to understand the real proposition which it was intended to sustain, we shall find that no other meaning could possibly have answered the Savior's purpose. That proposition is stated in the 13th verse of the chapter, in these words: "You cannot serve God and Mammon." The covetous Pharisee derided the saying. Seeing that they were servants of Mammon, yet highly esteemed among men, he turned upon them and amended his proposition by this addition to it: "That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." To prove, now, that the successful servant of Mammon, though highly esteemed among men, is an abomination in the sight of God, the story of Lazarus and the rich man is introduced. One of the characters is the successful and highly-esteemed servant of Mammon—"a rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen, feasting sumptuously every day." Never was the picture drawn, in so few words as these, of that which the world most admires and strives most to imitate. The other character is he who, of all human beings, is least esteemed among men—"a poor man, full of sores, laid at the rich man's gate, and begging for the crumbs that fell from his table." Any man on earth, knowing nothing more of the two characters than these visible circumstances, would say that the former is the delight of God—an honorable and virtuous man, whose labors God has delighted to bless. He would say of the latter that the curse of God rests upon him, and he is now enduring the wretched consequences of a misspent life. Thus far, then, the cases presented contain no proof of the Savior's proposition, for as yet, the one highly esteemed among men appears also to be the favored of God. Jesus follows their history until each of them dies; but here, so far as their bodies are concerned, the case remains the same, for the rich man is buried with all the

respect that he commanded in life, while the curse of seems to follow the very dust of the beggar, which is trundled away like the carcass of a beast. Of necessity Jesus must follow their history further still, before it can at all answer the demands of his argument; but when he draws aside the curtain which hides from us the invisible world, the dreaded truthfulness of his proposition flashes suddenly and irresistibly upon us. Here the condition of men declares the esteem in which they are held by God alone; for no human praise or blame can follow the spirit through the gates of death. And here we behold the highly esteemed rich man crying for help amid unspeakable torments, while the despised beggar is escorted by angels into a place of comfort. The proposition of Jesus stands demonstrated, and the world is told in unmistakable terms that the wicked suffer torments in hades.

We find another proof of our second proposition in the figurative use of the term hades and its corresponding Hebrew word. It is frequently used figuratively in the Old Testament, and sometimes in the New. When David sings of the deep troubles in which he had been engulfed, he expresses himself thus: "When the waves of death compassed me, the floods of ungodly men made me afraid, the *sorrows of hades* compassed me about, the snares of death prevented me" (Psa. 116:3). Here hades and death are distinguished, and the "sorrows of hades" is one of the images to represent his sufferings. But if the conception of hades had nothing of suffering in it, he could not possibly have so expressed himself. If the disembodied state is to all men a state of rest and enjoyment, it would be as incongruous to speak of the sorrows of hades as of the torments of heaven.

Jonah uses the term in the same way when describing the intensity of his agony while shut up in the bowels of the great fish for three days and nights. His physical suffering must have been great, besides the mental agony consequent upon the remembrance of his sin, and the consciousness that he was floating about in the great depths of the sea. Nothing experienced in this life could adequately portray his wretchedness; hence he borrows an image of horror from the spirit world, and exclaims: "I cried by reason of my affliction to the Lord, and he heard me; *out of the belly of hades* I cried, and thou didst

hear my voice." The Savior, when depicting the wretchedness that would come upon the city of Capernaum, expresses himself in the same style: "Thou, Capernaum, who art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to hades." Here the high privileges which this wicked city had enjoyed are represented by the term *heaven*, while the miserable contrast yet before it is depicted by the term *hades*.

This usage, found on the lips of inspired men throughout the Jewish ages, shows that the idea of indescribable misery was deeply engraven upon the Hebrew idea of hades, so that the darkest of all images were those taken from the disembodied state. But it is only of the condition of the wicked there that this is true. To the righteous this same abode is represented by Job as a place "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." To Lazarus it was a place of comfort; to the thief on the cross it was paradise; and to all the dead who die in the Lord it is a Sabbath-keeping, where they rest from their labors. We dismiss, then, our second proposition, with all the assurance of its truth that the Word of God can give. There is no certainty in human speech, and no reliance to be placed in the words of inspiration, if the unforgiven wicked do not suffer punishment in the disembodied state.

Proposition 3. *There will be a universal judgment at the end of the world.*

There have been many special judgments in this world, and to these the term frequently refers in the Scriptures. Jesus once said, "Now is the judgment of this world; now is the prince of this world cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the world, will draw all men to myself." This judgment is clearly that by which the sentence of death passed upon Jesus by the world was reversed in heaven, and the issue formed between him and the world was settled in his favor by his resurrection from the dead. But besides this, and all the judgments of this life, there is a judgment of which men are to be the subjects after their death. This is positively asserted by the apostle Paul. He says: "And as it is appointed to men once to die, and *after* this the judgment, so the Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and to those who look for him he will appear

the second time, without a sin-offering, in order to salvation" (Heb. 9:27, 28). Here is a parallel between two events in the history of men, and two in the history of Christ. The latter are the facts that Christ once died for the sins of many, and that he will return to this earth in order to the final salvation of those who look for him. The parallel facts are those appointed to men once to die, and *after* this the judgment. That Christ died, is compared with the fact that is appointed to *men* to die; and this is equally appointed for all men. The fact that after his death he will come again, is compared with the fact that to men is appointed a judgment after death.

A silly subterfuge has been invented, by which the men here spoken of are declared to be the Jewish priests; and the judgment after death, that of their fellow-men upon their characters. I mention this, not for the purpose of gravely discussing its merits, for a child can see that the men to whom it is appointed once to die are all the men on earth; but for the purpose of showing that those who make the most desperate efforts to destroy the meaning of the passage are still unable to even obscure the fact that there is a *judgment after death*.

This passage does not inform us, in positive terms, at what time after death this judgment takes place, though its being made parallel to the fact that Jesus will come to the earth a second time, would, at least, suggest the thought that it will occur at his second coming. But we are not left to inference on this point; for other statements of the Scriptures in reference to it are distinct and positive. Jesus says: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here. The Queen of the South shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and condemn it; for she came from the most distant part of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, something greater than Solomon is here " (Matt. 12:41, 42). Now, the men of Nineveh and the Queen of the South had long been dead, and as they were yet to rise in the judgment, here is another proof that the judgment is after death. Moreover, as they were to *rise* in the judgment, and to rise *with* that generation, the judgment must take place when both they and the generation which lived with Jesus shall rise from the dead. When they

rise, they will "rise in the judgment." But all other men will rise when they do; hence the judgment after death is also after the resurrection of the dead.

The time of the judgment is fixed with equal precision by the Apostle Peter, though in connection with another event. He says: "The heavens and the earth that now are, by the same word are kept in store, reserved for fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (II Pet. 3:7). Here "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" is identified with the day to which this earth is reserved for fire, as for final destruction. Referring to the same day in a subsequent verse, he says: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are in it shall be burned up." This is an expansion of the thought previously expressed, that the present heavens and earth are reserved for fire; and the day is the same, for it is the day of the same event, called interchangeably "the day of the Lord," and "the day of judgment." Here, then, the very day of the judgment after death is again fixed, and is the day in which this earth and these heavens are to pass away. This harmonizes with the preceding fact, that it is to occur at the resurrection of the dead; for it is certain that the dead will rise immediately previous to the destruction of the world.

We have now only one more point to establish, in order to the complete demonstration of our present proposition. It is, that the judgment now spoken of will be universal. For proof of this we turn to Matthew 25:31. "When the Son of man shall come in his own glory, and all the holy angels with him, then will he sit on the throne of his own glory, and all nations shall be gathered before him; and he will separate them one from another, as a sheep separates his sheep from the goats." A weak attempt is sometimes made by Universalists to find the fulfillment of this statement in the siege of Jerusalem; but no amount of ingenuity can torture the words into harmony with such an interpretation. There was no incident of that siege which can answer to the coming of the Son of man in his own glory, in company with all the holy angels. He came to the earth, then, in no sense adequate to the demands of his lang-

uage. Much less can it be made to appear that all nations were gathered before him, and that he separated them one from another as a shepherd does his sheep from the goats. Not till those nations which have perished shall arise from the dead, so as to stand before him with the living, can all nations be gathered before him. Neither will he come in his own glory, attended by all the holy angels and sit upon the throne of his own glory, till the final resurrection of the dead and the day of judgment; for the scene here described is the scene of the final judgment, as is manifest both from the facts just noted, and from the nature of the separation which here takes place. The judge says that the one class shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the other into everlasting life. It will be a *universal* judgment, for "all nations" are to be subjects of it.

We have now demonstrated, by statements of the Scriptures which admit of no question as to their meaning, that there is a judgment after death; that it occurs immediately subsequent to the resurrection of the dead and the destruction of this earth; and that it will be a universal judgment of the human race.

Against this proposition one or two objections are sometimes urged, which are based, not upon Scripture statements, but upon the fitness of things. It is objected, that there is no necessity for such a judgment, because God, by his omniscience, already knows the character of every human being, and the destiny due to each. And again, that there can be no propriety in judging men at the end of the world, after some of them have already been punished for thousands of years in hades; either the judgment ought to occur at the death of each man, before he is punished, thus making a continual judgment, or all punishment ought to be postponed till after the final judgment.

Both of these objections are based upon a misconception of the nature and design of the judgment. It is nowhere represented as a day of trial, in which God, by the evidence presented, may determine the deserts of men, for, as the objection insists, His omniscience precludes all necessity for this. On the contrary, it is a day for the public announcement to the universe of the decisions already formed, together with the reasons therefore. This appears from the description of the

judgment given in the last passage under consideration. The King says to those on his right hand: "Come, you blessed, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of earth; *for I* was hungry, and you fed me; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in; naked, and you clothed me; I was sick, and you visited me; I was in prison, and you came to me." And to those on the left he says: "Depart, you cursed; *for I* was hungry, and you fed me not, . . ." Here is a decision announced, not formed; and as it is announced, the reason for it is given. It must be observed, too, that this reason has exclusive reference to things done or left undone during the present life. This accords with Paul's statement that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done in the body*, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad." Inasmuch, then, as the decision is based upon the things done in the body, it is necessarily completed when the last deed in the body is done. It is fitting, therefore, that the suffering of the guilty should then begin, and it is equally fitting that the Judge should choose for the public announcement and vindication of that decision, a time when all men who have been and who are to be subjects of his judgment, together with all heavenly beings who take interest in it, could be assembled together to hear it at once. But no such time is possible except the one already chosen, the day which closes the earthly existence of man, after which no human being will be born, and none will die. There is no valid objection, then, to the universal judgment at the end of the world; but it harmonizes with the fitness of things, while it is a fixed fact in the government of God.

Proposition 4. *At the judgment, the wicked will be condemned to punishment which lies beyond it in eternity.*

We have traced the history of wicked spirits to the judgment of the great day, and have found that they suffer punishment in hades. But hades is not an eternal state. Being the state of disembodied spirits, it necessarily terminates with the resurrection: hence, Paul represents the rising saints as exclaiming, "O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?" And in his vision of the judgment, John saw "the sea give up the dead which were in it; and death and hades gave up

the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death" (Rev. 20:13, 14). When death and hades gave up all the dead that are in them, they themselves must necessarily die: for there will be no more death, and therefore no more disembodiment of spirits. The end of these two states is represented in the vision by their being cast into the lake of fire.

When wicked spirits shall have passed through the punishment of hades, and shall have appeared, after reunion with their bodies, before the judgment seat of Christ, their history will still be incomplete, and our present proposition covers another chapter in its progress. It affirms, first, that at the judgment they will be condemned. Of the truth of this affirmation we have an express declaration of Jesus himself. He says: "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." Here is an assertion of the universal resurrection of the dead; not of those dead in trespasses and sins; but of "all that are in the graves;" and a declaration that the resurrection of that portion of them who have done evil is a resurrection of condemnation. But condemnation implies a judgment in which it is pronounced; and we have already seen that the judgment follows immediately upon the resurrection. The condemnation, therefore, to which the wicked shall rise is a condemnation at the judgment. But condemnation necessarily implies punishment; hence we might assume that in this single statement of Jesus we have proof of our entire proposition. We have, however, more specific testimony to the punishment which follows the judgment in such passages as these: "The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the ungodly for the *day of judgment to be punished*" (II Pet. 2:9). "The heavens and the earth that now are, are reserved for fire against the *day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men*" (II Pet. 3:7). By these three statements of the Word of God we hold it to be settled beyond all question that the ungodly will be condemned to punishment which lies beyond the final judg-

ment. This proposition will be proved again and again in the proof of those yet to be submitted.

Proposition 5. *The punishment after the judgment is represented by words and phrases of the utmost pain and desolation.*

There is nothing which produces so intense physical pain as the application of fire to the flesh. When savage cruelty has exhausted every other method of torture, a resort to this always produces fresh pain. From this circumstance it arises that fire is the most terrific symbol of pain, both mental and physical, known to the human mind. It is frequently used as a symbol for the punishment of men, and for great mental agony. David exclaims, in reference to a period of intense suffering through which he had passed: "I was dumb with silence; I held my peace even from good, and my sorrow was stirred. My heart was hot within me; while I was musing the *fire* burned; then I spoke with my tongue, Lord, make me to know my end, and the measure of my days, what it is, that I may know how frail I am" (Psa. 39:3). Again: he says of the murmurings of Israel in the wilderness, and their punishment for it: "The Lord heard this and was wroth: so *a fire* was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel" (Psa. 78:21).

Of the many passages in which the term is applied to the final punishment of the wicked, we select the following as entirely sufficient for our present purpose. In his own description of the judgment, which we have already proved to be such, Jesus represents himself as saying to those on his left hand: "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting *fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). The Apostle Paul, referring to the same event, uses the intensified expression "*flaming fire*." He says: "It is a righteous thing with God to repay affliction to those who afflict you, and to you that are afflicted, rest with us, at the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (II Thess. 1:6-8). The preposition *in* is here used before "flaming fire," rather than *with*, which we might expect, to harmonize strictly with the fact that the wicked are

to be cast *into* the fire. That this punishment in flaming fire is to begin at the period demanded by our proposition, is manifest from the fact that it takes place "at the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven with his mighty angels," an event which, as we have already proved, constitutes a part of the judgment scene.

The vision of John presents the same punishment in a still more appalling light, by spreading the fire into a vast lake, and intermingling it with brimstone. He says: "The fearful, and the unbelieving, and the detestable, and murderers, and lewd persons, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death" (Rev. 21:5-8).

Whether these expressions be regarded as literal descriptions, or as merely symbolic representations of final punishment, affects not our proposition. It is sufficient that they are the most intense expressions of pain which human language furnishes. It is impossible to express more; and as God has expressed this much, it is vain for the wicked to expect less.

But these are not the only terms employed to describe that punishment. These are enough to indicate the external pain that will be inflicted; but there are other aspects of the sufferer's condition, which demand the use of other expressions. If the human imagination were taxed to its utmost for a picture of desolation and anguish, it could not do more than to conceive a person enveloped in darkness, where not a single object could be seen, not even his own person, and surrounded continually with weeping from invisible sufferers, and the gnashing of invisible teeth. Yet, such is the Savior's portraiture of the desolation and anguish which shall characterize the last state of the unforgiven sinner. We find it in the parable of the talents. There are three circumstances which prove incontrovertibly that the settlement with the servants in this parable represents the final judgment. 1. There is nothing in the mediatorial reign analogous to the return of the master of the servants, after a long time, to settle with them, except the Lord's return to judgment. 2. The master says to each of the faithful servants: "You have been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many." This implies a great exaltation of the faithful servants, but there is no exaltation of the

servants of God above their earthly condition, until they are exalted to heaven. 3. The Master says to each of the faithful servants: "Enter into the joy of thy Lord." But the joy of the Christian's Lord, as described by Paul, is the joy of taking his seat at the right hand of the throne of God (Heb. 12:2); and when his faithful servants enter into his joy, it will be to sit down with him on his Father's throne (Rev. 3:21). Now while these things, which can but refer to the final judgment, are said to the faithful servants, at the same time it is said of the other: "Cast the unprofitable servant into outer darkness. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 25:30). Such desolation, then, as wandering in outer darkness; such sorrow as is indicated by the weeping of a vast multitude, for multitudes will be there, and such indications of remorse as the gnashing of teeth by unseen companions, will be the portion of the unforgiven when this world shall be no more. By a bold and majestic metaphor the Apostle Judas calls one class of these doomed and miserable beings, "*wandering stars*, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." They have broken away from their proper orbit, and, like blazing comets, are darting swiftly away from the great center of light, to which they shall return no more. Growing dimmer as they pass away, they quench their light at last in that outer darkness which lies beyond the sun's most distant ray; for they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power."

This abode of the lost, whose pain is a lake of fire and brimstone, and whose desolation is blackness of darkness, while its anguish is weeping and gnashing of teeth, must have a name. In applying names to things of the unseen universe, the Holy Spirit has not invented a new vocabulary, but has selected from human speech such existing terms as could, with as little change of meaning as possible, be transferred to the new objects. Thus, the term *fire*, as we have seen, and the terms *darkness*, *weeping*, and *gnashing of teeth*, have been transferred to the future state of the wicked without any change of meaning. The term *messenger*, in Greek, became the name of *angels*, who are sent on messages of mercy to the world. The term *heaven* has undergone a similar transfer. Originally, as in the first chapter of Genesis, and many other

places in the Bible, it meant the visible dome of air above us. In that usage, it was the most lofty and glorious term in human speech, because it was the name of the most glorious object which human eyes ever beheld. When, therefore, a place of infinite and eternal glory was to be revealed, where the sun never sets, and where no storms nor darkness are ever known, there was just one word, and only one in human speech, which had already a meaning analogous to it, and it was called *heaven*.

In the same way originated the name by which the final abode of the wicked is distinguished. Near Jerusalem there was a deep narrow gorge in the mountains, called Gehenna, or the Valley of Hinnom. In the times of Jewish idolatry this valley was stained with the blood of their innocent children, which "were burned with fire for burnt offerings to Baal" (Jer. 19:1-6). The deepest depths of human guilt and misery were here combined; the guilt of men who compelled the sacrifice, and the misery of the children who were burned, and of the mothers from whose breasts they were torn to be cast into the fiery furnace. When these abominations were suppressed, the most horrible associations were connected with that place. To the superstitious Jew it was a resort of ghosts and hobgoblins, and to the pious it was a place of unspeakable horror. There was no other word in Jewish speech so full of this meaning, and this word Jesus seized upon as the name of that final state where the wicked are enveloped in fire and darkness and continual weeping. He called it *gehenna*, and this, when translated into English, is *hell*.

That the term is thus employed by Jesus is susceptible of the clearest proof, without much multiplication of words. Jesus says: "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). Now the soul and body are separated at death; the soul entering hades, the body the grave. They are then in different states. But when they are both destroyed in hell they must be in the same state, for they share the same fate. This can not be till after the resurrection, when the soul returns from hades, and the body from the grave, and the two are reunited. The destruction of both soul and body in *hell*, then, must take place after the resurrection of

the dead, and can be no other than the punishment to which the unforgiven are then to be condemned. The conclusion is irresistible, *hell* is the *name* of that state of punishment.

This conclusion springs with equal necessity from another statement of Jesus. He says to his own disciples: "It is better for you to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go away into hell, into the fire that is not quenched, where their worm dies not, and their fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:43-48). Here, going away into hell is the antithesis of entering into life, and is made the alternative. But the disciples had already entered into life in the only sense true of this world and of hades. They enjoyed that relation of spirit to God, which constitutes Christian life in this world, and the rest of the soul in the disembodied state. The only life which they had not yet entered is that which follows the resurrection of the body, a life of both soul and body, which shall never end. As the alternative is to enter that life, or go into hell, the latter expression must necessarily refer to that condemnation to punishment, which, at the judgment, will be the doom of those who enter not into eternal life.

Such is the usage of the term *gehenna*, the only word properly translated *hell*. This application of it originated with Jesus, and had significance, at first, only among the Jews. But the publication of the narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in which alone it occurs, throughout the Gentile world, soon made it familiar to all the nations who heard the gospel. That which once was a name of terror only to the heart of the Jew has thus become a tocsin of alarm to every soul that sins, in almost every quarter of the globe. The infidel and the skeptic affect to smile at the terror which it inspires, as a result of superstition; but while the readers of the New Testament hear it emphasized by the lips of Jesus, who alternately wraps it in flame, clothes it in darkness, and fills it with weeping and gnashing of teeth, they will still believe that it is better to lose an eye, a hand, a foot, and all that a man has, rather than "go away into hell." With this most terrific of all the words in human speech still trembling on our lips, we dismiss our fifth proposition, assured that it will not be questioned by one who believes the Bible.

Proposition 6. *The punishment after the judgment will be endless.*

In the progress of our investigation, we have found two distinct states of suffering after death, separated from each other by the judgment; one of them in hades, this side the judgment; the other in eternity, beyond the judgment. They differ, in that the former is confined to the disembodied spirit, while the latter involves both soul and body. They differ, also, as to some of the epithets applied to them, and they differ in duration. The former necessarily terminates with the resurrection; we now affirm of the latter, that it will never end. We have reserved the question of duration to this state of the inquiry, because it is naturally and logically the last question in the series. If there is no punishment after the final judgment, then the question of duration is excluded, and all debate upon it is labor lost. If there is, still the question of duration is comparatively of little value, unless the punishment possess some degree of severity. But having settled both of these questions, the question of duration properly comes in to close the inquiry.

The best way to test the exact meaning of a word in familiar use, is to write it, or pronounce it by itself, and note what idea it conveys to the mind. We write down, then, the word *everlasting*. We leave a space on each side of it, and put it in different type, that it may be perfectly isolated — everlasting. There it stands, connected with no other words which might modify its meaning, but speaking simply the idea which it contains within itself. What idea is this? It may be safely ventured, that to every single mind acquainted with the English language it conveys instantaneously one and the same idea, the ideal of endless duration. Even with men who have trained themselves to attach to it some other signification, the first impulse of the mind is the same, and it requires a second thought to reach another meaning. No more invariably does the pendulum, when disturbed, drop back to a perpendicular than the mind drops upon this meaning, when the eye or the ear catches this word. It may, like the pendulum, vibrate afterward to other points, but this is invariably its first motion. This statement met with a very striking illustration a few years since, in the course of a public discussion in the West, on

Universalism. The gentleman opposing this system, had observed how frequently Universalists themselves use the terms everlasting and eternal in their proper sense, when they are not on their guard. He determined, therefore, to take full advantage of this circumstance in the discussion. He laid aside a piece of paper, on which to note down, if possible, one or more instances of this usage in every speech his opponent delivered. The device proved a complete success. Near the close of the debate, when the issue upon the meaning of this term had been distinctly joined, he addressed the audience somewhat as follows: "My opponent is now laboring to prove that the word everlasting has not the meaning which is commonly attached to it; that it designates no definite period, but may mean as short a period as three days and three nights. Such is his position while he is before the audience to maintain his favorite dogma. But there is a secret here which I must now disclose. You are aware that when a man has committed murder, he hides the dread secret effectually in the presence of others. But if you could stand by his bedside at night, and listen to his mutterings amid the visions which disturb his rest, that terrible secret would be divulged; for there the spirit unconsciously speaks itself. Well, I have been standing by the bedside of my opponent, paper in hand, and have noted some of the truthful mutterings of his soul, while he was unconscious of my presence. By this means I have discovered a secret of his thoughts, which he is carefully concealing from you. It is this: in his secret soul he knows that the meaning which we attach to the terms eternal and everlasting is their true meaning. In proof of this, listen to some sentences which I have written down as they fell from his lips." He then read to the audience two sentences from each speech which the Universalist had delivered, in which the term was used in its proper sense. The effect was overwhelming. It shows that there is a meaning fixed in the word which cannot be divorced from it, but will continue to reassert itself whenever the attempt is made.

We deem it unnecessary to say more upon the literal meaning of the term everlasting, except to remark that its etymology stamps its meaning upon it unmistakably. Compounded of two most familiar terms, *ever* and *lasting*, it reads out its meaning to every child that has learned to pronounce these

terms. The same is true of the Greek original, which is compounded of *aei*, *always*, and *oon*, *being*—*always being*.

We now proceed to show that this term is applied to the punishment which lies beyond the judgment. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, where we have already proved that the Savior speaks of the last judgment, he represents himself as saying to the wicked: "Depart, you cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels." And at the last of that description, he says of the same parties: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Here, now, is the same punishment of which we spoke in our fourth and fifth propositions, a punishment to which the wicked are sentenced at the final judgment, and which, therefore, lies beyond it; and to this punishment is applied the term everlasting. If this term, then, as here employed has its literal meaning, there is an end of controversy on our present proposition. How shall this be determined?

It is a law of language, as fixed and unchangeable as any law of nature, that words must be understood literally, except where there is something in the context to indicate that they are employed figuratively. Is there anything to require this in the present instance? It is sometimes urged that the term *punishment* so requires, from the fact that all just punishment must be corrective, and therefore cannot be unending. We admit that some just punishment is corrective, but it is not asserted in the Scriptures that such is the design of the punishment beyond the judgment, nor can we possibly know anything of it except what the Scriptures teach. To assume, therefore, that it is corrective, is to settle the question by assumption instead of proof. The punishment called everlasting may be, for aught that we know, and for aught that the Scriptures declare, simply punitive, like the execution of a murderer, or the destruction of Sodom. There is nothing in this term, therefore, to limit the meaning of the word everlasting; but the latter term gives to the former the idea of endless continuance.

The term everlasting is sometimes applied, by hyperbole, to things which will come to an end; as "the everlasting hills," the "everlasting covenant" with Abraham. But in all such cases we learn the fact, not by the nature of the term, but by other statements of the Word of God; and but for these other

statements we could not possibly suppose that these things would be less than *ever* lasting. In the case before us there are no statements to thus modify the meaning of the term, and therefore it must stand unlimited.

It is urged that the term sometimes means *age-lasting*. But what is an age? In its narrower sense it is the period in which a generation of men exists on earth; and in its wider sense it means the same of a nation. It is measured by the birth and the death of individuals or of nations. But in that state beyond the final judgment, where we have located the punishment in question, there are no ages. There will never be another individual born, nor will another die. Nations will rise and fall no more. There are no alternating nights and days, nor months and years, for time itself shall expire as that period is ushered in. The term *age-lasting*, therefore, in its temporal sense, cannot apply to that state. In another sense, it is possible that it may. If the birth from the grave, with which that state begins, and the duration without end, in which it continues, may be styled an age, then all that belongs to it may be styled *age-lasting*. But in this sense *age-lasting* would be but another expression for *everlasting*. In the only sense, therefore, in which the term could possibly apply to the punishment beyond the judgment, the meaning is *everlasting*, and our proposition is established.

It is now clear that, whatever may be the other uses or senses of the word *everlasting*, when applied to things beyond the end of time it can have but one meaning. There are no temporal things there, and there is only one word of duration employed to project thought into that period. All things that are there, both the things of heaven and the things of hell, are stamped with the one word, *everlasting*, and then the curtain of revelation drops, leaving the human mind to ponder the deep significance of that word, until the gates of heaven or the pit of perdition shall open to receive it forever.

We have now traversed the entire compass of our subject, and delineated the entire future destiny of the wicked. We have not drawn upon conjecture or imagination for a single thought. We have not drawn our conclusions from doubtful premises. But the reader will bear witness that we have allowed plain and unambiguous statements of the word of God to settle every issue, without straining their meaning or obscuring the

exact force of their terms. The conclusions deduced, or rather the divine statements made, are the most fearful which human speech was ever employed to communicate. They tell us that those who die without obtaining the pardon of sins committed here will enter immediately, in hades, into punishment the intensity of which is represented by flames of fire. This state of punishment is followed by a resurrection from the dead. The sinner stands before the judgment-seat of Christ, in the presence of all men and all angels, where his iniquities are enumerated, and he is condemned to punishment yet in the future. He goes away into hell, where the fire of his burning is never quenched; where the worm which feeds upon him never dies; where the darkness is relieved by no ray of light, and where the presence of many companions, weeping and gnashing their teeth, increases the misery which is already beyond endurance. The wretchedness of this state no tongue can exaggerate, for Jesus has described it in words which defy exaggeration. It will never, never end.

It is only when we contemplate this fearful destiny of the unfortunate sinner that we can properly appreciate the efforts which have been made to redeem man from sin. If there is no reality in it, then the death of Jesus, as Scripturally presented, was a waste of tears and blood; while the toils and sorrows of saint and martyrs have had no adequate design. But admitting this dark reality, we have a fact to justify every groan and every prayer, every drop of blood, and every life-long struggle to bring the guilty to pardon. Only pardon can release the guilty from punishment. To release them from such punishment, it was becoming that even Jesus should die; and it is proper that saints should labor, and pray, and exhort, and entreat, with all long-suffering and endurance, not willing that any should perish, but that all should turn and live.