







THE

# Spiritual Side of Our Plea

BY A. B. JONES

St. Louis  
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY  
1901

Copyrighted by  
**CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
1901

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	7
I. AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF RELIGION . . . . .	17
II. WITHOUT AND WITHIN . . . . .	35
III. THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT . . . . .	54
IV. THE REAL AND THE FORMAL . . . . .	70
V. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON RE- MISSION OF SINS . . . . .	108
VI. THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT . . . . .	193
VII. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT . . . . .	316
VIII. RIGHTEOUSNESS AND LAW . . . . .	363



The Spiritual Side of our Plea.





## INTRODUCTION

A FEW introductory words may help the reader to a better understanding of this book. It is a rare thing for a man to speak or write for the public without subserviency to party interest or popular favor in some measure. Really independent thought and unbiased utterance on topics of public concern, and on which issues have been formed and partisan feeling awakened, are uncommon commodities in social, political or religious life. The very claim of having attained to such a condition is calculated to provoke doubt and criticism. And yet there are sometimes circumstances which of themselves tend to superinduce that state of mind. The author of this volume has been a semi-invalid for fifteen years, wholly incapable of regular active labor of any kind. This enforced retirement from all public official relations to society has placed him in a position of immunity from the influences of popular clamor, partisan prejudice and sectarian bias, and has brought to him a rest from the usual conflicts of society, and given him a season for reflection and meditation. The result has been a careful

review of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament Scriptures, and as advocated by Alexander Campbell and those associated with him in his effort to restore to the world a pure apostolic religion. And the result of these investigations and studies is, in a large measure, expressed in this book, concerning which it is proper to make the following further explanations:

In the preparation of this volume there has been no aim whatever at literary excellence. That thought, if present at all, has been so unconsciously. Perspicuity and strength have been the chief objects, in so far as the thought of style has entered into the work. To be understood, and to carry conviction to the reader in the matters whereof he has spoken, have been the dominant influences with the writer. We have written, too, with reference to the general, average reader, rather than the elect few; for the people, and not the critics.

Beyond and above all other things, this book is written and published in the interest of truth, and, as it appears to the author, very important truth. It was written to encourage and foster truth, the love of truth, and the spirit of seeking truth—truth as revealed in history and as contained in the Holy Scriptures—truth as related to the Christian world in general, and

especially with reference to my own brethren, the Disciples of Christ.

The author has held the conviction for many years that there was a necessity for a review and a restatement of some of the prominent points of Christian doctrine, as held and advocated by Alexander Campbell and those associated with him, in their efforts at a reformatory movement and a restoration of primitive Christianity. This necessity grows out of the fact, as the writer of this volume believes, that there exists in the minds of many people a gross misapprehension of the real position of Mr. Campbell with regard to these vital doctrines of Christianity. No man ever assailed established institutions without incurring opposition, misapprehension and misrepresentation. There is still a necessity existing to-day for explanations of the teachings of Luther, of Calvin, and of Wesley. They are still quoted on both sides of some questions. The different phases of truth which to their minds were consistent and harmonious appear to some minds inconsistent and contradictory. The same thing is true in the case of Alexander Campbell. This is particularly so in regard to his teachings on the design of baptism and the work of the Holy Spirit. Two capital points with Mr. Campbell, on which he placed great stress, were, first, the

value and importance of the Word of God as revealed in the Holy Scriptures; second, the value and importance of the ordinances of Christianity—baptism and the Lord's Supper. He believed in the divine personality of the Holy Spirit as the agent in the conversion, sanctification and salvation of men. But he held that the Holy Spirit operates on the minds and hearts of men, not without light and truth and love, intelligence and thought and feeling, but through these, and along with these. And, in order that this light of intelligence, this thought of truth, and this feeling of love, may be brought to the mind, and planted there for the Spirit's use and opportunity to carry on his work, Mr. Campbell held that the Word of truth, as contained in the Gospel of Christ, should be preached and believed. And that this Gospel, as revealed in the Word of truth, may be successfully preached and believed to the saving of souls, the Holy Spirit is ever present, operating and co-operating with this Word in the conversion of men—operating and co-operating, as Mr. Campbell himself expresses it, by "the ministry of men," "the ministry of angels," "special providences," "suggestions," "impressions," "direct communication of original ideas," "bringing things to remembrance long since forgotten," "bringing men's minds

to consider these matters," "removing difficulties," etc. But Mr. Campbell contended that however and wherever souls are converted to Christ, "it is the light and love of God in the Gospel that finally converts them." Hence his earnest contention for the value and importance of the Word of God in the scheme of human redemption, and his aversion to and repudiation of any system of theology that rejects the power and efficiency of the preached Gospel, and which maintains that the Holy Spirit converts men without the light of truth. Speaking of the ministry of Christ on earth, his working of miracles to attract attention and create interest, and his preaching the truth along with the miracle, and the accompanying presence of the Holy Spirit along with both, Mr. Campbell says, in his debate with Mr. Rice, page 622: "The miracle opened the heart, the testimony of the Lord entered, and *the Spirit of God with it*; and the work of conversion was finished." But it was his contention that without that "*testimony of the Lord*"—the light of divine truth, the Spirit never converted men. It is not difficult to see how this contention, this demand for the Word of God as indispensable to conversion, declared, proclaimed and emphasized before the world, by tongue and pen, grew in its proportions until it grew in some minds

out of proportion, and men began to think and to proclaim that Alexander Campbell rejected the Holy Spirit, and believed in the "Word alone."

Nor is it strange and unaccountable that a class of men, preachers with a legalistic and a materialistic turn of mind, even among his own brethren—men not given to spiritual modes of conception, of thinking, and of living, good men albeit, and, in some instances, strong men intellectually—should drift into this false notion of Mr. Campbell's teaching.

The same things are to be observed with reference to Alexander Campbell's teachings concerning the design of baptism. He held that baptism was for the remission of sins, "*in a sense,*" as he was wont to express it. He did not believe the transition from the world into the church was *complete* without baptism. He did not believe the remission of sins was *complete* without this complete transition from the world into the kingdom of God. But he did believe and did teach that there is a moral, a spiritual transition from darkness to light, from unbelief to belief, from condemnation to acceptance and favor with God, before and without baptism, but not to the neglect of baptism. He did believe and teach that sins are remitted, "in a sense," before baptism, and upon the

grounds of the sinner's trust in the blood of Christ. The distinction and difference between moral states and legal states were clear in his mind—clear as a sunbeam. He held that “baptism is for the remission of sins,” and that no man is legally remitted or legally enfranchised in the kingdom of God on earth until his baptism. That on the grounds of his penitent trust in the Lamb of God, and on the grounds of his obedience in baptism he is completely remitted, and completely enfranchised in the kingdom, the Church of Christ; and that until both the moral and legal provisions of the Gospel are complied with, the remission and the enfranchisement are *incomplete*. This was Alexander Campbell's position on this subject.

Now, it is not difficult to understand that, holding this view, he felt it necessary to emphasize the value and importance of baptism; that he felt it his duty to declare that no man was remitted, that no man was enfranchised *completely* until he was baptized. And it is not difficult to see how, declaring, proclaiming and emphasizing this with tongue and pen, at home and abroad, far and near, privately and publicly, some people came to think that Alexander Campbell held to baptism for the remission of sins in an unqualified sense—



held that sins are never remitted in *any* "sense" until a man is baptized. Nor is it difficult to perceive how some of his own brethren, given, as we have said, to legalistic and materialistic ways of thinking, should believe and preach this view as in accordance with Mr. Campbell's ideas.

With a view to setting forth all these facts in their true historical and scriptural light the author of this volume has labored in its preparation—labored through physical infirmities of years' standing. There has ever been present with him a consciousness of his own inadequacy to present this subject, in its details and in its outlines, in the full measure of its importance, and of his own laudable ambition in the matter. His highest hope has been to contribute something in the direction of a more spiritual conception of Christianity, and a more spiritual life on the part of his brethren.

That our movement for a restoration and a realization of original Christianity has been, through misconception of the subject, hindered and in some sections diverted from its true mission in the religious world, the writer does not hesitate to believe.

This book, then, is an effort to set before the world the views and the teachings of Alexander Campbell and his colaborers in their full-orbed

light, and to show that these views are in harmony with the Word of God as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. To accomplish this extensive references are made to the writings of Mr. Campbell; extensive quotations have been made from his writings. It has become necessary in some instances to employ the same quotation more than once. The different phases of the discussions as we have pursued the various lines of investigation, have rendered this necessary. In the effort to be understood and to make the subjects treated clear, there may appear at times some redundancy and superfluity. For this no apology is made. "Line upon line, and precept upon precept," is the method by which the understanding of the average man is reached.

Another incentive to the publication of this book is the hope that the young preachers may be benefited. One of the strongest preachers that ever occupied a pulpit among the Disciples, or among any other people for that matter, an educated man, and a writer and speaker of distinguished ability and irresistible power, said to the writer of these lines a few years ago, just before his death, "I doubt whether the first half of my ministry did more harm or good." He had grown up and had begun his ministry with gross, superficial views of Christianity.

At the time of our conversation he was nearing his threescore and ten years. He was then preaching a series of sermons for the church of which the writer was pastor. We had heard him preach in his younger days. There was a striking contrast in the manner and matter of his former and his latter preaching. In his early preaching he was severely legalistic and literalistic; in his later preaching he was intensely spiritual and religious. It is an immense saving to a young preacher if he can begin his ministerial life with correct views of Christianity. That some assistance might be given in this direction has been a strong incentive with the author in the preparation of this volume. And were he to formally dedicate the book to any one, it would be to his young brethren of the ministry.

With these forewords of explanation this volume is committed to its errand while the author invokes the blessing of God upon the book and upon its readers.

A. B. J.

# The Spiritual Side of Our Plea

---

## I.

### AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.

In what court are the matters of religious faith to be adjudicated and determined? By what authority are the affairs of my spiritual life to be settled and accepted? What is authority? The Standard Dictionary gives, as its first and most essential definition of authority, this: "The right to command and enforce obedience." That is clear, comprehensive and satisfactory. But where does this "right to command and enforce obedience" rest? The question of infallibility obtrudes itself into this investigation. This authority, it is thought, ought to be infallible, as a necessary qualification "to command and enforce obedience."

The Roman Catholic Church, in ecumenical council, in 1870, decided that this infallibility was lodged in the Pope. But how are we to know that that decision was correct—infallibly correct? Must not the council itself be infalli-

ble in order to settle that article of faith? Whence its authority, its infallible authority, to determine the infallibility of the Pope? Did this council find this great truth in the Bible? Why, then, cannot the rest of us find it there as well? Did God guide their minds into the discovery of that truth in the Bible? Then why does he not so guide the minds of all other earnest seekers after truth, and lead them to see the same important doctrine in the Bible?

With Protestants, generally, infallibility is assigned to the Word of God as revealed in the Bible. But in what sense is the Bible infallible? Who wrote the Bible? Men. Are men infallible? The world has known but one infallible man—the man Christ Jesus, the God-man. How, then, can fallible men produce an infallible Bible? Is not this similar to the question the Catholics have to face—how can a fallible council produce an infallible Pope? But it is agreed on all hands, by believers, that the men who wrote the Bible were inspired. But does inspiration imply infallibility? Certainly not, in a general sense, else the writers of the Bible were infallible men. This they were not, by general consent. They did not claim to be infallible men. But inspiration means inerrancy, infallible certainty in the writing down of that wherein they were inspired. The

Holy Spirit illuminated their minds to understand unmistakably and to write down unerringly *the matters wherein they were inspired*. Within this limit they were made inerrant, infallible; without this limit they were like other men. They were not, then, absolutely infallible. But, by general consent, there are many other things in the Bible than those “matters wherein they were inspired.” Now how are we to infallibly draw the line between the ‘matters wherein they were inspired’ and the matters wherein they were not inspired? This is certainly important. But even in the “matters wherein they were inspired,” that were originally written down with infallible accuracy, how have they been transmitted to us? Through transcription after transcription, and translation after translation, from one language to another. Who made these transcriptions and these translations? Uninspired men, fallible men, like ourselves. Then, even if “the matters wherein they were inspired” were infallibly written down at first, how can they come to us, through the handling of fallible transcribers and fallible translators, and through intervening centuries, as the infallible Word of God, the inerrant Bible? Evidently not at all, in any absolute sense—only in an approximate sense. But again, even if the original, inspired

and infallibly written Word had come down to us, through an infallible handling, how can fallible men like ourselves read and understand that Word with infallible certainty? Language is mercurial; words have different meanings. Figurative speech abounds in the Bible. The plain and the ornate shade into and out of each other imperceptibly. Without an infallible interpreter, how are we to know that we have the true sense of the infallible Word? And this introduces us again to the Pope, and to the old question, How shall we know that the Pope is infallible?

There is no *absolute infallibility* but with God, the immaculate, infinite God. All other infallibility is but approximate—an ideal.

But we crave a standard whereby we may settle our difficulties and bring contentment to our hearts. Where is it to be found?

Protestants claim the Bible as that standard. But what means all this contention among Protestants; this diversity of views; this alienation of feeling; this denominationalism? A perfect standard, yet an imperfect measurement; an infallible standard, yet a fallible use of it. How is this?

“The Bible is for the people, and the right of private interpretation is theirs,” cried Luther in the sixteenth century. “The Bible and the

Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," cried Chillingworth in the seventeenth century. "Where the Bible speaks we speak; where the Bible is silent we are silent," cried the Campbells in the nineteenth century.

At a conference of ministers, held in Lexington, Ky., in 1841, at which Alexander Campbell was present, the following resolution was adopted, indited, doubtless, by his presiding genius:

*Resolved*, That the Bible, and the Bible alone, is a sufficient foundation on which all Christians may unite and build together; and that we most affectionately invite all the religious parties to an investigation of this truth."

Luther fought for his principle of "private interpretation" against the usurpations of the priesthood of the Catholic Church. The Campbells fought for their principle of an open Bible for all the people against the "hireling clergy" of Protestantism. "What is the great difference," asked Thomas Campbell, "between withholding the Scriptures from the laity, as the Romanists do, and rendering them unintelligible by arbitrary interpretation, forced criticisms and fanciful explanations, as many Protestants do; or by making the people believe that they are nearly unintelligible by urging



the necessity of what is called a learned clergy to explain them?"

But let us not lose sight of the question before us—How is the infallible Bible to receive an infallible interpretation? or rather, How is the *approximately* infallible Bible to receive an *approximately* infallible interpretation? *Every man is to read and interpret the Bible for himself.* This is liberty; this is responsibility; this is Protestantism; this is Christianity. But, in this view, where is the "authority"—"the right to command and enforce obedience?" As there is no absolute infallibility but with God, so there is no absolute authority but with God. But, if the Bible contains the revealed will of God to man, then it is, in some sense, vested with authority over man, and it becomes his duty to recognize that authority to the full extent of its significance. But why do we accept the Bible as of Divine authority?

We accept the Bible as the inspired Word of God, as containing the revealed will and, in some sense, the authority of God, not because some council has so decided (many reverent, religious people do not know that a council ever did so decide), not because the Pope so decides (many godly people do not care a snap for the Pope); but because there is something

*within* us that tells us that the Bible is God's Word, God's will, God's authority. But what is that something within? Man was created in the image of God. In spite of his weaknesses and infirmities, he is still an intellectual, moral and spiritual being. He has something within that responds to thought, to moral ideas and to spiritual conceptions. The acorn planted in the soil responds to the conditions and grows. A marble so planted does not respond and grow. "The Word of God is the seed." Human consciousness is the soil. The authority of human consciousness in matters of religion is a subject that needs to be more carefully studied. The *authority*, did I say? Yes, the Bible is submitted to every man to examine and determine its claims and its merits. On his own personal responsibility he is to consider it, to accept or to reject it. Then he is vested with the *authority* of a judge over the fate of the Bible so far as he himself is concerned.

But what has consciousness to do in this matter? The word "consciousness" is here used instead of the word "reason," which is generally employed in such discussions. It is used in preference because it is more comprehensive and because it has the appearance of placing the judgment-seat deeper in the human soul. Religion appeals not only to man's rational

nature to excite thought and to exercise reason, but to his heart, to arouse his emotions, his feelings, his affections; and to his intuitional nature his spiritual intuitions. That these are distinct powers or capacities, if not distinct faculties of the soul, is conceded. There are some subjects that address themselves to our intellectual perceptions exclusively, and leave the heart unmoved.

Problems in mathematics, for example, while they provoke thought, frequently most intense thought, yet do not touch our sympathetic and affectional nature. The heart is dormant during all the hours of our mental activity in considering and settling questions of geometry and trigonometry. Pure thought determines such matters. But there are other questions that pure thought cannot determine and settle—how to deal with your children, for example, with your parents, or with your wife. People who never had children can easily tell us how to govern and raise our boys and girls. They have no feelings, no heart in the matter. They simply reason on the subject. But parents both reason and feel, they think and love. The parental consciousness is a compound of these two factors. And it is plain to be seen that this consciousness is more comprehensive than reason, since it is composed of

reason and affection combined. These two elements are blended together in our decisions, our judgments.

But intuition is still another distinct faculty or power of the soul. There are some things we know without reasoning about them, since they are primary truths that shine by their own light. They are the initial points of all reasoning. We cannot reason without using them as the means of reasoning. Such are the axioms in mathematics—things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other, etc. On this foundation the whole science of mathematics is constructed. So, then, even in mathematics, both intuition and reason are involved and co-operate. But they both move together in the cold realm of intellectuality.

In the same way moral science, the science of right living, is conceived and established. The idea of right *versus* wrong is intuitional. It is a primary truth. While men may err in judgment as to what is right and what is wrong, they clearly understand and agree that there is such a distinction and such a difference. Without this we could no more teach morals to children than to animals.

Now religion is a science, the highest and grandest of sciences. The Bible comes to man as an authority on this subject, and invites man

to sit as a judge, his own judge, his own authority, in considering its claims to be God's Word. In exercising his right of private judgment in a general way, and of private interpretation in detail, his profoundest consciousness is awakened. His mental, moral and spiritual powers are all laid under contribution. Thought finds its noblest sphere of activity, the heart its amplest field of delightful employment, the intuition its arena of highest effort and attainment.

Man's intuitional nature responds to the idea of God. The reality of his being is both a conception and a perception of man's spiritual insight. It is a primary truth on which all religion is founded. Without this, religion would be an impossibility. With this solid rock on which to stand, reason begins her constructive work, and to every effort of reason to use the facts and truths of the Scriptures in the framework of religion the heart brings its reinforcement. Nothing stirs the emotional nature like the idea of the eternal, immortal, infinite God.

But in this process, intuition, reason and emotion conspire together. There is a blending of forces, a combination of powers, a co-operation of agencies and a unity of energies, in the general make-up of *consciousness*. And consciousness is invested with a responsibility and royalty as never before.

Human consciousness, then, as the resultant of intuition, reason and emotion, is the supreme court to which the Bible makes its appeal. In the use of it every man sits as the arbiter of his own spiritual fortune and destiny. He must decide on the claims of the Bible for himself. Man has authority, then, to sit in judgment on this divine authority of the Scriptures. When his authority concedes the authority of the Bible, then his authority yields and submits to the authority of the Word of God; or his will and the divine will unite and blend together in one stream of sympathy and fellowship where all thought of authority is lost. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life," said the Savior. And in a public address, in 1820, Alexander Campbell said to the people: "Read your Bibles; examine the testimonies of those holy oracles; judge for yourselves and be not implicit followers of the clergy." And again he said: "We cordially wish to take the New Testament out of the abuses of the clergy and put it into the hands of the people."

When Luther maintained the right of the people to read and interpret the Scriptures for themselves, and when the Campbells contended for the same principle, did they concede the ability of the masses to successfully exercise

this right? Are the masses competent to sit in judgment on the august claims of the Bible to be an inspired record, to contain a revelation from heaven, and to be clothed with the delegated authority of the Eternal God? Are they competent to interpret the Living Oracles, to understand the life-giving Word? These great men knew, as we all know, that the masses are uneducated, unlearned. To enter the great field of evidences for and against the claims of the Bible, to ply the arts of textual and contextual criticism, to follow the stately steppings of conservative and destructive critics, to be exegetes and interpreters of difficult and doubtful passages of Scripture—for all such feats and exploits the common people, the great masses, are wholly unprepared and disabled. But is it necessary that this whole field of investigation should all be learned, these tasks mastered, before the heart can repose its confidence in the Word of Life; before the soul that is hungering and thirsting after righteousness can be filled? If so, then indeed “there are few that shall be saved.”

Humanity is painfully conscious of its weaknesses and its burdens, of its own limitations and inadequacy. The Infinite One has established a throne of authority in this human consciousness, and a throne of authority in the

Word of eternal truth and promise. And these thrones are not rivals, but *allies*. "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." The light greets the eye and the eye greets the light. The ear revels in sound and sound revels in the ear. The stricken, aching heart cries aloud for help; and the Word of God says: "My peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth. Let not your heart be troubled." We bury our dead, and fall down upon the grave in despair. And the Word says: "He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live again; and he that liveth and believeth on me shall never die."

The path of life becomes obstructed, and the way of duty is not clear. We call for light. And the Word says: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not." The great moral and spiritual lessons of the Bible, the essential and fundamental principles of righteous and holy living, lie plainly written upon the surface of Divine Truth. The necessary facts and precepts for moral intelligence and godly discernment, the wisdom needed to produce and to sustain "faith, hope and charity," are not hidden away in the obscure, doubtful and difficult portions of the Divine Record; but they stand out in bold relief, and always of



easy access and understanding to ordinary intelligence. The authority of human consciousness, in its universal application, is adequate, fully adequate, to receive, appropriate and enjoy these essentials of divine revelation.

Some fifteen or twenty years ago there was published in one of our American magazines a symposium by several of the leading minds of England and America. The question discussed was substantially this: "Which is the safer guide in all political issues involving moral principles, the leaders or the people?" The names of the contributors to that article have all faded from my memory save that of the great commoner, Gladstone. He argued that the people were the safer, for the reason that they simply followed their instincts of *right*, while the leaders were liable to be swayed by the influences of self-interest, ambition, rivalry, etc. His noble thought and eloquent words were such as to leave an imperishable impression on the mind, and to carry conviction to the heart.

A few years ago, Judge Miller of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered an address before the Bar Association of New York, on the jury feature of our national system of jurisprudence. He said, when a young lawyer he considered the jury system unwise and unsafe.

The court being educated and versed in the law, he thought the ends of justice more likely to obtain in its hands than in the hands of an unlearned jury. But now, he further said, after years of experience and much observation, he would rather risk the equities of any case with twelve plain, honest, uneducated jurors, than with the most learned court of the country.

So much for the question of *morals* in the view of the immortal Gladstone. So much for the question of *justice* in the view of the distinguished jurist, Judge Miller. The most prominent feature of the Bible is its recognition of the people, the great masses of humanity. The poor, the ignorant and the outcast are the special objects of attention. "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the mighty." The highest eulogy ever pronounced upon the Son of God is this: "And the common people heard him gladly." So much for *religion* in the view of the Bible.

Human consciousness, then, is adequate in its authority to wrestle with the important and essential questions of justice, morals and religion. And in the light of this fact, the declaration that "the poor have the gospel preached unto them" becomes luminous. It

implies their capacity to deal with the great facts and truths of the gospel.

But this religious consciousness may grow and extend its capacity and thereby enlarge its authority. Its very exercise is a process of education and development. And with the enlargement of capacity comes the enlargement of responsibility. "If you know these things," says the Savior, "happy are you if you do them." The practical incorporation into life of the truth discerned in the Word of God brings in a revenue of happiness, of self-appreciation, of conscious moral worth and aggrandizement. Again, the Savior says: "If you do these things you shall know of the doctrine." Knowing is an inspiration to doing, and doing increases the capacity for knowing. And thus the life, the growing life, becomes, like "the path of the just, a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Nor is this battle to be fought single-handed and alone. "Heart within, God o'erhead," is the divine assurance. Human effort shall be reinforced by the divine agency. "We will come unto him and make our abode with him" (John 14:23).

Our definition of authority in the beginning was "the right to command and to enforce obedience." The "right to command" has

been considered. The "right to enforce" has no place in religion. Man can enforce nothing against God except to refuse God the privilege of enriching man's life. God can enforce nothing against man except the consequences of disobedience. An enforced religion destroys the essential elements in it—freedom and choice. Religion to be genuine must be voluntary. "Whosoever is of a willing heart let him bring it an offering of the Lord" (Ex. 35:5). "Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17).

We have thus striven in this investigation to bring ourselves with open hearts and with a profound consciousness of our personal rights, capabilities and responsibilities, face to face with the open Bible, as the depository of divine truth, that we may hear the voice of God calling all men into fellowship with himself and with one another, on the essential and fundamental principles of our holy religion. This was the fondest dream of Alexander Campbell's life. In 1839, in a very fraternal letter to Andrew Broadus, a prominent minister of the Baptist Church, of Virginia, written in reply to a similar letter from Mr. Broadus, Mr. Campbell said:

“Could the friends of truth and union agree to meet on the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, acknowledging one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body of Christ and one Spirit—could they leave the conscience free where God has left it free, and not bind their private opinions upon one another, and could they open their pulpits, their ears and their hearts to a free intercommunion of preachers and people, and occasionally celebrate the Christian festival together, and devote themselves more to the study of the Bible and to the Christian holiness of life—what a blissful time we should soon have!”

## II.

### WITHOUT AND WITHIN.

MAN has a body and a spirit. The body is without, the spirit is within. "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day" (2 Cor. 4:16). The body is visible and material; the spirit is invisible and immaterial. The body is a reality and the spirit is a reality.

Religion, like man, has a body and a spirit. And this body is without, visible, material and a reality; while the spirit is within, invisible and immaterial, but also a reality. The Savior says: "Did not he who made that which is without make that which is within also?" This he said as a rebuke to those who gave undue importance to the outward forms and ceremonies in religion, while they neglected the more important part—that which is within, the ethical and the spiritual, a sound morality and a pure religion. "You make clean the outside of the cup and the platter," says the Master, "but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness" (Luke 11:39, 40). And again he says: "Ye pay tithes of mint, anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier

matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone'' (Matt. 23:23). The body of religion is in the sphere of its objective life, the spirit is in the sphere of its subjective life. The body is composed of ordinances, rites, forms and ceremonies—the ritual observances of a man or church. The spirit consists of all those mental, moral and spiritual activities, enjoyments and experiences that are within the soul of man, and which form for him a Christian consciousness—a conscious Christian life and felicity.

Man's dual nature of outward and inner self is suited to his present life, is indispensable to his enjoyment under the conditions of this world. He needs his body. This puts him in touch with the material world around him. Through his physical senses he receives and appropriates what God offers him in the natural world. Earth, rocks, trees, flowers, water, air, light and electricity are all, through our senses, made subservient to our comfort and happiness. And this is the physical basis for his higher, spiritual perceptions and pleasures. What capacity the spirit has for enjoying this world, except through the body, we know not. But we do know that our loftiest spiritual powers are intimately associated with our physical organism

and through its senses we commune with nature and with nature's God.

In the same way the body of religion—the ordinances of the church and the forms of worship—becomes the means through which its spirit, its thoughts and feelings, its faith, hope and love find expression. This dual nature is here also indispensable. We cannot conceive of abstract spiritual forces disseminating and propagating themselves in any way so well as through outward forms and ritual service of some sort. And when “that which is without” and “that which is within” are thus joined together, we no longer have religion in the abstract, but in the concrete.

There is also an interaction and a consequent reciprocal influence between the body and the spirit. This sensuous, physical nature of ours, while it may be the medium through which the spiritual man finds access to his noblest achievements and highest delights, yet it may, by carnal tendencies and self-indulgence, blockade the way of spirituality. On the other hand, the spiritual man may so diffuse his moral influence and power over the carnal nature as to bring it into subjection to the law of God. And in this way the highest attainments are made of both the physical and spiritual man.

This fact is especially noteworthy as applied



to the interaction and reciprocal influence of the body and spirit of religion. How easy it is for our religious life to become formal; for us to be satisfied with observing the ordinances of the church; for all spirituality to be lost in ritualism. How frequently baptism is administered, the Lord's day observed, the Lord's Supper kept, without the heart's being stirred and moved by the sublime thoughts and memories which these institutions were intended to make sacred and to perpetuate. And this sort of worship blights the spiritual discernment of men and dries up the fountains of reverence and devotion. A congregation thus led by a godless preacher will soon be in spiritual bankruptcy and moral decay, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." On the other hand, where there is an intelligent understanding of the ordinances and of their real significance and importance, they are not only divested of all fictitious and misleading values, but become the means of awakening the heart continually to richer experiences of spiritual life. The very consciousness on our part that we do a thing reverently because God has appointed it, and we can see in it his wisdom and goodness, serves to increase that feeling of reverence for him and all his institutions. It is thus we "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord

Jesus Christ.” A wise adjustment of the external and the internal elements of religion and their scriptural association insures, by their helpful action and reaction upon each other, a healthy and robust Christianity. But to maintain this normal condition of things, this just proportion in the importance of that which is “without” and that which is “within,” to quell all discontents of the outer against the inner, and all tendencies to mutiny and riotous inclinations of the inner against the outer—here is an “irrepressible conflict.” And here, too, “eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.” This contention for supremacy between the spiritual and the ritual forces of Christianity is a present and perpetual influence in every individual heart, in every church, in every religious body and in every age. It is indeed historic. A cold, lifeless formalism on the one hand, and a spiritual, mystical fanaticism on the other, are the extremes between which the pendulum of religious thought and religious life has vibrated in all the past.

In 1831 Alexander Campbell, in replying to some criticisms of Andrew Broadus, a Baptist minister of Virginia, on Mr. C.’s teachings with regard to the nature and functions of the ordinances in Christianity, thus speaks:

“There are no acts of worship or of religion ordained by Jesus Christ that are at all to be regarded as *outward* or *external bodily acts*. ‘God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.’ *Vocal* prayer and praise, though they are exercises of the larynx, the tongue and the lips; the bending of the knee, or the standing erect or falling upon the ground; the eating of bread, the drinking of wine or any other exertion of one or more or all of our organs, mental or corporeal, are not to be regarded as acts of religion except that they are exercises of the understanding and the heart; and no man of any sense pleads for these, as bodily acts, as of any importance whatever.”

And again, in his debate with Rice, in 1843, he says:

“All outward ordinances (*and all ordinances are outward*), prayer, praise, the Lord’s day, the breaking of the loaf, fasting, etc., have each a peculiar grace or intercommunion with Christ in them.”

In the former case Mr. Campbell says: “There are no outward or external bodily acts in religion;” in the latter case he says: “All ordinances are outward.” And yet there is no contradiction here. In the former case Mr. C. was making the point that ordinances do not consist of “outward, bodily acts” *merely*, but as *religious* ordinances they necessarily involve “the exercise of the understanding and the heart.” In the latter case he spoke with reference to the obvious distinction between “that which is without” and “that which is within”

in Christianity, Notwithstanding there may obtain a legitimate, scriptural relation and co-operation of the internal and external elements of religion, yet the distinction and the difference between the outward and the inward can never disappear in any intelligent, adequate consideration of the subject.

The Jewish religion was largely external. Its forms and ceremonies, beginning with circumcision and extending through an elaborate system of ablutions, sacrifices, offerings, feasts, fasts, holy days, etc., constitute a ponderous and burdensome ritual. This religion of the Old Testament, lying in great measure without, addresses itself chiefly to the physical senses, and finds a slow and difficult way through these to the spiritual understanding of the people. An apostle speaks of the law as "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear," and exhorts his Jewish brethren not to become again "entangled with the yoke of bondage." Christ, he says, became "the end of the law," "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross."

While Judaism and Christianity are related, while the former was preparatory to the latter, and the latter was the outgrowth of the former, yet they present a striking contrast on the

point we are now considering—the external and the internal elements of religion. While Christ was a Jew, born under the law, was himself circumcised and conformed to the institutions of Moses with strict fidelity, yet he was sent to lead men out of Judaism and away from its cumbersome rites and formal worship. The yoke which an apostle said “neither our fathers nor we were able to bear,” the Son of God replaced with his own, saying: “My yoke is easy and my burden is light.” But what a mighty task was laid upon the Savior! To lift a nation above their own convictions, their own cherished ideas, their own religion, recognized, authorized and established by signs and wonders from God through Moses; to “break down the middle wall of partition” between the Jews and the Gentiles, and “of twain make one new man;” to respect and observe the religion of Moses, and yet to make men see that it was but “a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation”—what a mighty task was his! It was his attempt to accomplish this that brought him to the cross and the

crucifixion. But his death in turn became the means and the signal of victory. The religion of Christ was established. And how simple! As we read the New Testament record concerning the early church we are impressed that a remarkable revolution has been wrought.

“Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and in fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.”

The simplicity of Christianity is one of its attractive and striking peculiarities. The two ordinances, baptism and the Lord’s Supper, are all that we have in the way of specific, external forms in the Church of Christ. And each of these is a beautiful symbol of the great fundamental facts of our holy religion. “We are buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also we are risen with him through faith in the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” And through the bread and the wine of the eucharist we “discern” his broken body and shed blood—the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God. The veil has been taken away. The dominant ritualism of the old national religion of the Jews has been supplanted by the dominant individualism of Christianity.

The growth of religious thought and civilization brought in the "fullness of time," when the spiritual childhood of mankind was to be superseded by a more spiritual manhood; when men could read without spelling their way through the obstructing rites and ordinances of the religious primer; when "that which is within" should be in the ascendancy, and "that which is without" should be subordinate and subservient. Let us not be too sanguine, however. The passage from childhood to manhood has always been beset with weakness and temptations and difficulties. While it is delightful to contemplate the development of Christianity out of Judaism under the divine guidance of the great Master and his inspired apostles, while the transformation is made, not without a struggle for supremacy on both sides, but yet is made and stands conspicuous as the most brilliant achievement in history, still the enraptured vision is scarcely realized until the tide of the world's onward movement is arrested and begins to recede again in the direction of the supremacy of external forms in worship. The spiritual pendulum that swung out from the grosser forms of the Jewish religion into a new-born Christianity now swings back into Roman Catholicism, a form of religious thought and life but little less gross in its outward

formalism and but little more spiritual in its inward nature than Judaism.

These brief sentences cover a period of fifteen hundred years of the world's history. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, inspired chiefly by Martin Luther, was a protest against the corruptions of Romanism. The materialistic, sensualistic and ritualistic elements of religion and of the church had become the dominant power with the people again. Vital Christianity as a spiritual force in the hearts of men had ceased to reign. A fearful moral and religious degeneracy spread over society and covered the world. At this juncture Protestantism was born, and again the pendulum began its slow swing back toward a more spiritual and a less formal Christianity. Lutheranism, Calvinism, Episcopalianism and Methodism mark the progress of its way. With the advent of the Wesleys and Methodism came a high tide of spiritual power. A more intense spiritual life was the one great aim of John Wesley. The cold formalism of the Church of England, in his view, was but a galvanized Christianity. Without intending to cut loose from the church of his childhood, he sought to reform it, to infuse into it a larger measure of spirituality. His efforts and his enthusiasm in this direction found a response in the hearts of



men; and his following became so great and so strong that in spite of himself Methodism became a separate and distinct organization in the religious world. So intent on the one idea of the enlargement of "the kingdom within you," he and his coadjutors failed to give attention to existing errors and partial forms of truth in the external elements of the church he was seeking to reform.

This fervid religious enthusiasm of Methodism diffused itself over other religious bodies in this country, and there followed it the same tendency to neglect the proper scriptural adjustment of "that which is without" and "that which is within," in their administration of the affairs of the kingdom of God. It is thus we find epochs in religious history, epochs of extremes in one direction or the other, extremes in formalities to the neglect of spirituality, extremes in devotion to spirituality to the neglect of the sacred ordinances and appointments of God.

In the early part of the nineteenth century a plea was made before the world for a return to Apostolic Christianity—for the restoration to the Church of Christ of the religion of the New Testament, in letter and in spirit, in form and in substance. Back to Christ and the apostles and primitive Christianity, pure and simple, in

form and in reality, was the unique plea made before the world by the Campbells, Thomas and Alexander. Reconstruction after the divine model, a wise and scriptural adjustment of all the elements of Christianity, the externals without abatement or enlargement, the internals without increase or diminution, was the rallying cry of our fathers.

The work of reconstruction and restoration of primitive Christianity according to the divine pattern meant a mighty battle with the giants of error, and called for great wisdom and strength on the part of those who would achieve such a result. Never were these qualities more happily blended in men than in Thomas and Alexander Campbell. We limit the discussion of this subject, however, for the present, to the topic before us—the outward and the inward elements of religion. What was needed in their view in order to a proper reconstruction? Those familiar with the history and writings of Alexander Campbell know that his chief object was to restore the Word of God to its rightful authority, and to restore the ordinances of religion to their rightful position in the church, and thus lay a foundation for Christian union. This he proposed *without any abatement of spiritual power or vital piety* among Christians. Alexander Campbell was an intensely religious.

man himself. He was well-balanced, self-poised and a good all-round man. He labored to bring the Church of Christ to the same sort of equipoise. Speaking of his own efforts in this direction, in 1842, he says:

“Allow me, then, to say that the three great topics which have occupied public attention for some twenty-five years, so far as our proposed reformation is concerned, are: 1st. The ordinances of Christianity; 2nd. The essential elements of the Gospel itself; 3rd. The influence of human creeds as sources of alienation, schism and partyism in the church.”

And again, in his debate with Rice in 1843, he says:

“The present century is really retrograding in the understanding and veneration of the ordinances, both of the communion and of the rite of initiation. America is behind the age, behind Christendom, on this subject.”

It is plain to see, from his own declarations, what Mr. Campbell was laboring to achieve. But may we not wisely raise the question here, whether in this effort on our part to restore the external elements of Christianity to their proper scriptural position, the pendulum may not have swung *too far* again in that direction? Has history even partially repeated itself here? That in some instances and in some measure this is true, it is probably wise and manly to concede. It is so easy and tempting to unload the heart's responsibilities upon outward acts of

personal obedience, and thus to be satisfied with a superficial religion! And then men are differently organized. While some have a natural tendency to subjective thought, others are decidedly objective in their nature and habits. A preacher with great heart-power will develop his church in that direction, while a preacher of a legalistic cast of mind will have a formal church. There is a necessity for every one to strive for a full, all-round view of Christian life and character.

Even inspiration did not divest the apostles of their idiosyncrasies. Matthew and John present in their Gospels a remarkable contrast in this respect. Matthew is objective. The parables of the Savior, drawn from the material things around him in the natural and social world, are all gathered up and carefully recorded by Matthew, while John passes these all by unnoticed. But those marvelous lessons of the Son of God pertaining to the inner life, which Matthew overlooks, he is careful to record. For example, his conversation with the woman at the well: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life," etc. And again: "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life

unto the world. I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." This same diversity in taste is seen in these two inspired writers in the prayers they are pleased to record and preserve. What is usually called the Lord's Prayer, which looks to the practical things of every-day life, Matthew treasures up, while John gives us the real Lord's Prayer in the 17th chapter of his Gospel, in which we have an unparalleled outpouring of divine thought and feeling from the great, burdened heart of the Savior of men: "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee," etc.

In recording the commission, that great amnesty proclamation, we observe the same difference in style. Matthew gives it thus: "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and disciple all 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 have commanded you." That has a decidedly legalistic ring. It is like Matthew. John, recording the same incident in the life of Christ, breathes it out gently, thus: "Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And he breathed on them and said,

Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whosoever sins you remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins you retain they are retained.”

Even in their introductions to their Gospels they maintain this contrast. Matthew begins: “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,” etc. This is the outward, human genealogy. John begins on this wise: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

Every writer of the New Testament, although inspired by the same Spirit, retains his own individuality, his own mental characteristics. The contrast is perhaps not so apparent between any others as has appeared in the instances cited. The man of broadest views, the one who could see both sides of his religion with quickest perception, and who could estimate their relative and comparative importance with greatest ease, and who presented them in their due proportion in boldest outline, was the Apostle Paul. Without his development of the subject our inspired religious literature would be incomplete, as it appears to me. As a thinker and expounder of religion, Paul stands nearest to the divine Master. And with both of them the life “within” is the great essential, and yet the life “without” is held with due emphasis and importance.

When brethren find themselves differing over matters along the line we are now considering, may they not each conclude that this grows largely out of their own peculiar mental bias, and thus be stimulated to an effort for broader views of the subject?

It was the Savior's chief aim to set men right "within," to "make the tree good," that the "fruit might be good," to cleanse the heart by planting faith in it. All his blessings were conditioned on that. "According to your *faith* so be it unto you." He knew the power of a living faith, an unreserved trust of the soul in Christ, to make a new spiritual creature of man. And the Apostle Paul pleads, evermore, for the same great principle. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." And again he says: "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Rom. 2:28).

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, February, 1851, Mr. Campbell writes an article on "Christianity Experienced and Enjoyed." In this article he labors to lead his brethren away from superficial views of religion, and to open a fountain of spiritual life within them. He quotes from a

contemporary the following sentence: "If I have taken ten thousand dollars of stock in banks, and an equal amount in railroad shares, may I not risk a thousand or two dollars in church rates and my Sundays to meeting, on the more than equal probability that there is a heaven to gain and a hell to escape?" And he then adds: "In some such way as this and upon the same peradventure that it may all be true and right, it is to be feared many make the Christian profession." Mr. Campbell closes his article in these words:

"Advancing in Christian knowledge, faith, hope, love, joy and peace—celestial fruits of the Holy Ghost dwelling in us—we rise in beauty, holiness and happiness. The path of life is, then, the path of peace, holiness and happiness. In this path may the Spirit of God guide us, the hand of Jehovah lead us from glory to glory now, henceforth and forever. Amen!"

While, then, Mr. Campbell saw clearly that the ordinances of Christianity were obscured and had lost their original significance and value in the religious thought and practices of his day; and while he was striving to reinstate them in their true scriptural import and importance, yet he fully understood, justly appreciated and boldly proclaimed the spiritual side of the gospel as essential to Christian life and enjoyment.



### III.

## THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT.

*The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life* (2 Cor. 3:6). What does that mean? It is a strong antithetical sentence, a bold declaration of thought. Whatever differences may obtain among scholars as to the details of their exegeses of that Scripture; however various their critical views of its *letter*, there is a general agreement as to the *spirit* of the passage. On all hands it is held that "the letter *killeth*, but the spirit *giveth life*."

Every law, every ordinance and every institution has its letter and its spirit. Nor may these distinct parts be lost sight of or confused and identified. That they were two separate and distinct things in the mind of Paul is made clear in the fact that he says the one "kills" and the other gives "life." The difference between the form and the substance, the expression and the essence of a thing is generally conceded. A word is said to be the sign of an idea, but are the word and the idea the same thing? Ideas existed before words, and words were formed as a means of transferring ideas from one mind to another. In this case the

*word* is the "letter" and the *idea* is the "spirit." To listen to a flow of words that convey to us no ideas is a punishment, and tends to confusion and mental death; while words that do convey to us thought are a stimulus to the mind, and tend to enlarge its vitality, its capacity and its power. A written law is an assemblage of words, an association of ideas and an expression of thought. The written form is the "letter" of the law, the intention of the lawmaker is the "spirit" of the law. But is the thought of the law-giver always adequately set forth in the written form of the law? If so, why these contests in courts over legal technicalities? And why these appeals to higher courts for a better interpretation and construction of the law? The letter of a law is what it says; the spirit of a law is what it means. But the law does not always mean what it says. "*Six days shalt thou labor.*" Does it mean just what it says, or does it mean that what labor is performed must not be done on the Sabbath, but within the six working days? "*Thou shalt not kill.*" If that means just what it says, then it is wrong to deprive an animal of life, to cut down a living tree or to pluck a flower. The meaning of this law, however, is evidently to interdict murder, as usually defined in our statutes. "*He that believeth not shall be*

*damned.*” Construe that literally and every infant, and idiot and pagan is doomed to endless condemnation. But the law does not always mean what it says.

Nor does it always say what it means: “*Thou shalt make no graven image of anything in heaven or on earth.*” Abide by the letter and this interdicts art, as Mr. Ingersoll contended it does. In spite of this, however, Moses was instructed to make two cherubim and place them on the mercy seat in the tabernacle. While this was a violation of the letter of the law, yet it was not of its spirit. The law was intended as an inhibition of idol images. Hence, when the golden calf was made and set up in the camp of Israel as an object of worship, both the letter and the meaning of the law were infracted, and the divine wrath incurred.

“*Bear ye one another’s burdens.*” “*Every man shall bear his own burden.*” Here are two injunctions of the Apostle Paul, couched close together in the same chapter. Construed literally they are contradictory in their teachings. When we “read between the lines,” however, as we sometimes say, we are brought into touch with the spirit of the two texts and all trace of inconsistency disappears. “Bear ye one another’s burdens,” in Christian sym-

pathy and fellowship; and "every man shall bear his own burden," of responsibility and accountability unto God, are each alike essential and fundamental principles of our holy religion.

What fantastic capers preachers do cut sometimes in their interpretations of Scripture, "playing hide-and-seek" between the letter and the spirit of the Word of God. When it suits a man's preconceived theory of any point in religious doctrine to construe a given text literally, the most easy and natural thing in the world for him to do is to stand by the letter of the law. When, however, the letter makes against his notions, he sees the wisdom of not being a literalist, but rather with a broad and liberal view he seeks to go beyond and behind the letter in quest of the meaning of the passage. And thus often the same text is construed literally by one theologian, and figuratively by another. What battles have been fought, what tournaments, what windmill feats have been exhibited in the valley that lies between the letter and the spirit of God's holy Word! And is there not some reason why this condition of things should obtain? While it is true that the law does not always say what it means, and does not always mean what it says, is it not true that sometimes the letter and the

spirit of the law are commensurate with each other? Are there not instances in which the letter and the spirit, the form and the essence, the expression and the meaning so exactly coincide that there is left no ground for contention, no battlefield for theological pugilists? Possibly so. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." "He commandeth all men everywhere to repent." "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Such declarations as these will perhaps be generally if not universally accepted at their face value. The necessity for penetrating beneath the surface of the outward form to ascertain the inward meaning of such passages of Scripture appears to be well-nigh eliminated—certainly it is reduced to a minimum.

It is safe to say that a habitual tendency to literalism, to literal constructions and interpretations of Scripture, is a dwarfing process; while a habitual tendency to interpret and live according to the spirit of the inspired writings has the effect to enlarge our spiritual nature and enjoyment.

"*Pray without ceasing,*" says the apostle. And yet the Pharisee may stand upon the street corner, or the hermit may kneel in his cave and repeat his prayers until he dies of exhaustion, without understanding or obeying the

injunction, "Pray without ceasing"—cultivate a prayerful spirit; lead a prayerful life.

*"He that confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven."* What a depth of pathos in the true significance of this lesson; but how easy to stand before the great congregation and "confess with the mouth" without any adequate appreciation or appropriation of the mighty truth: "THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD." "In vain do you worship me with your lips when the heart is far from me." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

*"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."* How brief these words; how comprehensive their import; how profound their significance; and yet, how flippant the manner in which they are sometimes preached, accepted and dispensed! Faith, we say, is the "belief of testimony." "If you believe the historical facts that George Washington lived and wrought and died, can you not believe the historical facts that Jesus lived and wrought and died and arose from the dead?" In this superficial way the superficial preacher often proclaims what he calls the gospel. "Yes," says the unsophisticated hearer, "I have always believed those facts of history." "Then," says

the preacher, "you have faith; come along and be baptized, and be saved; the Savior says: '*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;*' take him at his word; obey and claim the promise." "But I don't feel like it now," says the honest man. "Don't *feel* like it!" exclaims the preacher. "You must not be governed by *feelings*—feelings are no evidence of pardon or acceptance with God."

Gentle reader, did you ever hear a preacher talk that way? What a caricature of the gospel! What a travesty on religion! And then again he says: "Repentance simply means a *change of mind*—a reformation of life. You changed your mind once and joined the temperance society and reformed your habits of dissipation; now change your mind about religion and join the church and reform all your bad habits." But the honest sinner replies: "I don't feel like it." What a revelation there is in that honest man's remark: "I don't *feel* like it!" That man understands Christianity better than that preacher. He thinks religion ought, somehow, to embrace the heart, the emotional and affectional nature; that he ought to "feel" on the subject. And he realizes that there is nothing in abstract historical facts to move his soul. He cannot love facts, nor can facts love or save him. He can love a person

and a person can love him; and a person only can save him—can forgive his sins, can guide his life, comfort him in sorrow, raise him from the dead, and show him the way to heaven and crown him with immortality and endless felicity. The man is “feeling after God, if perhaps he may find him;” while the blind preacher is leading him into the ditch of false views of religion into which he himself has fallen. *Salvation is a personal matter, and must be wrought out by a personal Savior through the heart and life of the personal sinner.*

Faith in Christ Jesus as the real, living, thinking, reigning, loving, “strong Son of God,” moves the heart from center to circumference, and stirs the feelings to their profoundest depths. Faith in abstract facts of history has no such power. We love a person and admire things. And “we love him because he first loved us.” Can a man *love* without *feeling*? Can a man *believe* on the blessed Savior of sinners without *feeling*? “With the *heart* man believeth.” “Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.” The facts of history are important, they serve a purpose. They lead us to the “Christ of history,” the mighty Redeemer of men, before whom we bow and worship, and in whom we trust. This is the “faith that work-



eth by love," and that "purifieth the heart." Paul, in his epistle to the Philippians, speaks of the "joy of faith," and we read of the early converts who "rejoiced, *believing* in God." And in his epistle to the saints in Rome, Paul writes: "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace *in believing*;" and the Apostle Peter says: "Yet, believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

And what is repentance? Simply a "change of mind," did you say? A change of mind about what? About yourself as a sinner against the almighty and eternal God. Your view of self has changed. Your view of sin has changed. Your view of God has changed. Your view of the Christ has changed. Your views of life, of responsibility, of duty and destiny—all have changed. No "feeling" in all this? "Repentance from dead works." What does that mean? A "change of mind" from "dead works to serve the living God" certainly dips deep enough to root itself in the emotional nature of man. "Repentance unto life." Does not that imply a moral revolution, a change of the inner man, a change of state, of spiritual condition?

"The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Can a man contemplate the amazing goodness of God as seen in his providences

every day, as set forth in the incarnation of his Son, in his earnest teachings of divine truth, in his submission to human violence and cruelty, in his sorrow and humiliation, in the pathetic and plaintive utterance in Gethsemane, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;" in the wild and piercing agony of the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—can such influences lead him to repentance, and yet his heart not be enlisted, his feelings unmoved?

"Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation," says Paul. Is this possible without the soul's richest libations being poured out before the Heavenly Father?

We hold, then, that "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" are such subjective moral forces as strike their roots into the very innermost vital parts of man's spiritual being. They involve the rarest treasures of feeling known to human experience; the most potent energies and activities within the domain of human consciousness.

We confess to an admiration for the honest sinner when he says: "I don't *feel* like it now." Let him alone; he is not fit for baptism; it would be a solemn mockery in his case. Do you tell me that all he lacks is "obedience"? If you mean obedience to the call, "My son,

give me thy heart," we say, Amen! But if you mean "obedience in baptism" or any other outward act, we protest, and declare such "obedience" impossible. When it is said: "Many of the people believed on Christ, yet they would not confess him for fear of the Pharisees; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God," do you tell me that all they lacked was "obedience"? What they lacked was *faith—the heart's trust* in Jesus Christ; with this, obedience would naturally follow. "The devils believe and tremble." What do they lack? "Obedience"? Away with it! They lack moral character, spiritual discernment and loyalty of heart.

"According to thy *faith*, so be it unto thee," is a principle of universal application in spiritual life. "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Passages like these discover to us the subjective nature and power of faith—a personal faith in a personal Christ. It was views like these that obtruded themselves into the mind of that honest sinner who, when the preacher would have led him into a superficial profession of faith in the gospel, faltered and wisely observed: "I do not *feel* like it now." A heartfelt trust in Christ is one of the condi-

tions of our acceptance with God. Hence, "feeling" may be reckoned one of the conditions of pardon. Even faith and repentance, then, have their "letter and spirit," their technical and scriptural import.

Christianity contemplates a *life* of faith as well as the original converting act of believing. "With the heart man believeth (eis) into righteousness," into Christ, "our righteousness." But this believing heart continues with him. His faith becomes a living faith, and his life a life of faith, a life of feeling. "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me." His repentance, too, is continuous, a constant penitent, feeling life. "I indeed baptize you in water (eis) into repentance"—a life of repentance, said John the Baptist—a life of continual feeling of penitential unworthiness before God. Again, Mark says: "John came, who preached in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance (eis) into remission of sins"—into a state and life where remission is obtained and always obtainable. And it is declared that "God granted to the Gentiles, also, repentance (eis) into life"—into a new moral state and relation-

ship. What a splendid conception, then, that our faith and our repentance—our trust in Christ and our distrust in self—may become a *life*, “a life hid with Christ in God;” and that “when Christ who is our life shall be manifested, then shall we also with him be manifested in glory.”

What a startling contrast these thoughts present with the cold formality of many professing Christians—many church members, churchgoers. The “letter” and the “spirit” are not more manifest anywhere, their difference not more pronounced anywhere, than in the lives of Christian men—their everyday lives as seen socially, commercially, civilly or politically; and their Sunday lives, as they meet and worship in the house of the Lord. As it is the purpose in this volume to set forth the spiritual side of our plea, not only in the light of the New Testament Scriptures, but also in the light of the teachings of our fathers, this chapter on “The Letter and the Spirit” will be closed by some extracts from the gifted pen of our honored and lamented W. K. Pendleton, taken from the *Millennial Harbinger* of January, 1851:

“There is doubtless a great deal of ignorance among professors as to what constitutes a life of faith; and thousands, we fear there are, who have no higher conception of it than

to think that it consists in looking back to the fact that they were, years past, baptized for the remission of sins. But this is almost as great a delusion as that which rests its hope upon the dim recollection of some far-off dream or vision of a distempered brain. There are some who seem to be, indeed, pretty well trained in the catechism on this point, and who will tell us with a great deal of flippancy that it is to believe what God says, and to do what he bids us, yet they give no evidence of a true spiritual life; they have indeed, *the form of godliness without the power thereof*. . . . Their life of faith is the dry bones, the skeleton, of works; the flesh and life of the truly spiritual man are [wanting. Their religion is a task, undertaken, perhaps, with a sense of duty, or it may be only a hope of reward, and prosecuted without one realizing emotion of the presence of the Spirit in the heart. There is no warmth, no fervor, no enjoyment, no responsive inward experience that God is with us and in us, testifying to the consciousness that they are the children of God.

“May we not hope to be understood when we say that no man can enjoy God without knowing it; that in the true and literal sense of the term every real Christian can say: ‘I *know* that my Redeemer liveth;’ that there is with all such a testimony of experience in spiritual union and communion that is as certain knowledge to the consciousness of him who enjoys it as the knowledge which we derive by our senses from contact with material nature; that we do not more surely know that we are in contact with the objects of sense when they impress us through their appropriate organs than we do that we are in union and connection with the great spring and fountain of our spiritual life, when in prayer and devotion fervent the Spirit of God broods upon our spirits, making us feel in harmony with itself, and awaking in us kindred sympathies and emotions? Nor in saying this do we affirm anything more difficult to believe than that God does now and always hold connection with and control our nature.

“We are startled at the bold skepticism that would reduce the universe to the analogy of a clock, wound up for a six thousand years’ run and then left by its Maker to the movements and regulations of its own machinery; we shrink back with a shudder at the atheistic refinement which reduces organization, motion and life to the primordial necessities of nature—the inherent and eternal *laws* of atomic attractions; we revolt at the idea that God is not *in* the universe and preserving it with a prescience that allows not even a sparrow to fall unnoticed—a power that poises in perfect harmony its vast and unnumbered parts, and a ubiquity which baffles even our imagination to conceive of the space where his presence is not always manifest; yet, whilst we are thus enlightened with respect to the material universe, how many there are who are so spiritually dark as to run into a precisely similar skepticism and atheism when the phenomena of the spiritual system are to be accounted for! Here they are willing to concede, indeed, that there is, in fact, no *present* God. Here they can admit that nothing exists but machinery; that in respect to our spiritual nature we are left altogether to the cold appliances of secondary means, and there is around our inner man a material case which is impenetrable, even to the Spirit of God, and which forever isolates us from such spiritual union and communion with that Spirit as may be felt, and become as much the subject of *knowledge* as the presence of the hand we love, or the vibration of the voice we revere.

“Now it is perhaps on this point more than any other in the religious experience of the day that there is a want of faith. . . . It is in this that Christian experience consists, and we may add, this is the highest attainment of Christian enjoyment. But how far short of this does the dry formalist come! He may look to the catalogue of duties, counting over the works of the day, as the papist does his beads, compare his conduct with the standard to which he acknowledges it to be his duty to con-

form. . . . In all this there may have been a total absence of all communion with God; no spiritual interchange between the spirit of the man and the Holy Spirit; no realization of a restored union and harmony between the Creator and the creature; and an absence, altogether, of the *knowledge* of salvation.”

These strong, lucid and eloquent utterances indicate very clearly that our fathers did not, as many of their children do, live in the mere letter of Christianity, but in the spirit as well. A restoration of original, apostolic Christianity, “in letter and in spirit,” was their motto.



## IV.

### THE REAL AND THE FORMAL

COMPACTS and covenants of importance, generally, if not universally, have their real and formal aspects, their essence of meaning and their ritual expression. This fact appears with equal prominence in social, commercial, civil and religious life. The real is essential to the validity of the formal; the formal is useful and helpful to the real, to its practical adaptation and efficiency. The formal is important; the real is always the more important. The thoughts of my mind at present constitute the real; this writing is the formal expression of them. Without the thoughts this writing could not be executed; without this writing the reader would not perceive the thoughts. The thoughts inspire the written expression; the written expression stimulates and intensifies my thoughts.

The real and the formal thus act and react upon each other. There is a sense in which they are supplements, complements and counterparts of each other.

In the marriage compact this principle is seen and felt. It obtains here conspicuously. Through mutual acquaintance, admiration and

affection two hearts are united and cemented together. They plight to each other their faith and love. They assume to each other the solemn vows of agreement and engagement of marriage. This is the real; all else is formal. With this heart-experience there comes a change over the views and feelings of the parties. The world is not now the same to them. They feel differently toward each other. They feel differently toward other people, toward society. They feel differently toward self. There is a transition, a transformation of mind, of heart, of life. They realize that they are, in fact, parts of each other, that they are one. Were it not for others there would be no need of a marriage ceremony. In the case of Adam and Eve I suppose there were no nuptial rites, on necessity for them. When society grew up it became necessary for the protection of society and of the parties to the marriage compact that the law should interpose a ceremony to regulate marriage. The rite of matrimony, however, is only a formal thing. The real marriage is in the heart and must actually exist before the ceremony, or else the ceremony is worse than mere form; it is a sham.

Two men decide to enter into partnership for the transaction of business. They first see eye to eye in the way of a clear understanding

with each other. They repose confidence in one another and come to an agreement concerning the business. This is the real thing. But for mutual protection against untoward accidents and influences they commit this agreement to writing. This is the formal act.

A purchases of B a piece of property valued at \$10,000. Their negotiations are all carefully gone over, every point clearly understood, a full agreement reached. An earnest of \$1,000 is paid down. This is the real transaction. On the morrow they meet for the formal execution of the agreements and contracts of to-day. A deed is drawn up reciting the terms of the contract; it is signed, sealed and delivered, and a check is given for the balance of the purchase money. And as a notice to the public of this change and transfer in the rights of property this deed is filed in the office of record. The formalities answering to the real transaction are now completed.

The American people cast their ballots for president. A B receives a majority of the votes. This is the voice of the people. The vote is counted and the result announced. All understand the question is settled. This is the real thing. At the proper time the president-elect takes the oath of office and enters upon the dis-

charge of his duties. This is the formal part of the proceedings.

America opens wide her portals to immigrants. The worthy foreigner is received with extended arms of national hospitality. He enters at once into the privileges of social and business life. He buys and sells, gets gain and builds him a home. Our courts protect him. Our schools and our churches are open to him and his family. He often outstrips the native in business, in learning and in popularity. In all the essential elements of life and its enjoyments he is really an American citizen. But there are limitations. For wise reasons it has been deemed safe and expedient to hold in abeyance his privileges of voting and holding office until he becomes formally *naturalized*. This is the formal thing. With this exception he has been a full-fledged citizen from the start. He came with his mind and his heart panting after the liberties, the opportunities and the possibilities of America. He found them and entered at once into their possession and enjoyment. This was the real thing.

A man traduces my character, slanders me in a way that demands vindication. I enter complaint and file suit against him in the court having jurisdiction. In the meanwhile the

party becomes sensible of his mistake and the great wrong he has done me. He comes to me with explanations and apologies ample and satisfactory. I accept the amends which he makes and forgive him. This settles the matter between us in a personal way. I am assured of his repentance, which changes his moral state. He is assured of my forgiveness, which changes our moral relations to each other. But this is not all there is of it. We are members of the same society, of the same government. Others know of this matter, and there are relations we both sustain to the public. I have a suit in law pending in court against this man. He has not only wronged me personally, but he has violated the law. And this forgiveness that I have extended to him personally is not the forgiveness of law. I go before the court, make explanations and dismiss the suit. This is my legal, formal forgiveness. Our relations in law are now changed. Moral state and relations are first changed, then the legal state and relations are changed.

Let us now study this lesson in the light of God's nature and character as presented to us by the Savior in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The literature of the world has nothing on this subject equal to this beautiful story. It was given by our Lord purposely to convey to

man an adequate idea of the nature of sin and of repentance, and the forgiveness of our Heavenly Father. The younger son grew wayward and left home, going into a far country, where he spent his substance and came to dire want. In his extremity he "came to himself." Every sinful life has its luminous hours! He remembered the home from which he had wandered. "I will arise," he said, "and go to my father." And he arose and went. What a picture of repentance! "But while he was yet afar off his father saw him and he was moved to compassion and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." Forgiveness, what forgiveness! Oh, what a father! He did not wait for a confession, for baptism, for anything. When he saw the son was returning, was penitent, that was enough. His own heart was "*moved with compassion and he ran and fell on his neck and kissed him.*"

This is the "real" in forgiveness of sin. The "formal" is yet to come. It comes afterwards! "Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight"—the confession. "Bring forth quickly the best robe and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet; and bring the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and make merry." *The formal reinstatement of the son in the family.* He

was already reinstated *in the father's heart*—already forgiven, “really” forgiven. Listen: “This, my son, was dead and *is alive* again; he was lost and *is found*.” This is the gospel. Hear me: “Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ” are the mighty moral forces in the human heart that cause the Heavenly Father to be “moved with compassion and to run and fall on the neck and kiss” the sinner with “real” forgiveness. Then come the formalities of confession and baptism and reinstatement in the family—the church.

Let us now place alongside of this parabolic illustration of the subject a real case of conversion and pardon, the most notable instance in the New Testament record, that of Saul of Tarsus, afterwards the Apostle Paul. Saul was a man of great force, of strong intellectual, moral and religious character, though not a Christian. His mental discipline gave him great intellectual strength; his moral training led him to “live before God in all good conscience,” and his religious education as a Jew led him to be “zealous toward God,” “persecuting the church.” This man, “yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord,” as he went from Jerusalem to Damascus had a remarkable experience,

which resulted in his becoming the Apostle Paul, that mighty man of history.

Let us note carefully the facts in his conversion:

1. "Suddenly there shone round about him a light out of heaven; and he fell upon the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest" (Acts 9:3-5).

Christ, then, first introduces himself to Saul in an intelligent way.

2. "And I said, what shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said, Arise and go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all things appointed for thee to do" (Acts 22:10).

Here is a clear case of self-surrender; of conversion of mind, and of will, and of purpose.

3. "But 'arise and stand upon thy feet; for to this end have I appeared unto thee: to appoint thee a minister and a witness of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear to thee" (Acts 26:16).

Not only is Saul converted, but he is selected and notified of his appointment as an apostle of Jesus Christ: "*He is a chosen vessel unto me*" (Acts 9:15).

4. "But when it was the good pleasure of



God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the Gentiles," etc. (Gal. 1:15).

Not only is Saul converted in an intelligent way—converted in mind and will and purpose, not only is he selected and notified of his appointment as a minister of the gospel, but he says: "It was the good pleasure of God *to reveal his Son in me*"—a clear, inward, spiritual experience.

5. "And Ananias laying his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way, hath sent me that thou mayest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 9:17)

Notice now. Saul is converted, appointed to the ministry, the Holy Spirit is given him, Christ is *revealed in him*. Is he still an unpardoned man? Has there been no adjustment of moral relations between him and God? Is the great heart of the great Father still closed against him? Has not God *really* forgiven Saul? Overcome by the presence of Christ, fallen to the earth, blind, believing, penitent, pleading—"Lord, what shall I do?"—converted, appointed to the ministry, receives the Holy Spirit, has Christ *revealed in him*, and yet unforgiven!

But the record does not say that Saul was really pardoned before his baptism. No, nor does the record say that the baptism of Cornelius was for the remission of his sins, either formal or real. But Peter did say to him: “*Whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins;*” and Cornelius also received the Holy Spirit before his baptism. As it appears to the writer, it is a moral and theological impossibility to believe that Saul and Cornelius were not accepted of God and really forgiven before their baptism. Their moral and spiritual recognition on the part of God precludes the possibility of any other conclusion than that they were really pardoned before baptism, and formally or legally remitted in baptism.

And this is what Alexander Campbell meant when he said in his debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823: “Paul’s sins were *really pardoned* when he believed—*formally pardoned* when he was baptized.” Mr. Campbell makes one statement in his book on baptism that at first glance appears to be inconsistent with this, where, on page 258, he says baptism is “for the true, real and formal remission of sins.” Mr. Campbell said “the blood of Christ *really* cleanses us from sin.” He also said “Paul’s sins were *really* pardoned when he believed;” and here

he says baptism is for the true, real and formal remission of sins. Mr. Campbell is here discussing the legal phase of this subject. When he looks at the divine side of the subject as the matter stands in the mind of God, he says "the blood of Christ really cleanses from sin;" when he views the human side in its relations to the moral condition of the sinner he says, "Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed;" and when he considers the matter in its legal relations to the divine government he says "baptism is for the real, formal remission of sins"—all *real*. But when Mr. Campbell is considering the question in both its moral and its legal phases, and placing these in contrast, he says: "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, *formally* pardoned when he was baptized." That this is the correct interpretation of Mr. Campbell's statement above quoted from his book on baptism is evident from the fact that in this same discussion he says on page 272: "Baptism, according to the Apostolic church is both 'a *sign*' and 'a *seal*' of remission of sins. In this sense only does baptism now save us. . . . Circumcision is said to have been, in one case at least, a *sign* and a *seal*." Here Mr. Campbell refers to the case of Abraham, of whom Paul says, in Rom. 4:11: "He received the sign of circumcision, a

seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision.” Notice carefully, Abraham had “the righteousness of faith,” or remission of sins, *before* he was circumcised. And he *afterwards* received circumcision as a sign and seal of that righteousness. Of this Mr. Campbell on same page says: “Baptism, in the same sense and in a similar case is also both a sign and a seal—the sign, however, at most, is only indicative of what *has been sealed*”—the sins have been really pardoned on the grounds of faith, of which baptism, the sign, “is only indicative,” says Mr. Campbell. Again he says at the bottom of same page: “Baptism is a seal of the righteousness of faith, or the remission of all our past sins, through faith in his blood, then, and in that act publicly expressed and confirmed.” Nothing can be plainer than that Mr. Campbell holds to real remission before baptism, and formal remission in baptism. This, however, will be more fully shown in subsequent pages. Let us now return to the main thread of our argument on the real and the formal.

#### IMPORTANT DISTINCTIONS.

The distinction between the real and the formal in the transactions of life is founded on a difference in the nature of things. The real

lies in the moral sphere, the formal in the material. In the case of marriage, the real is in the affections and agreements of two hearts; the formal in the rites prescribed for the consummation of matrimony. In the transference of property, the real is in the contract made by the parties; the formal in the deed on the recorder's books. In the forgiveness of sins, the real is in the compassionate heart of God caused by the contrition of the penitent sinner; the formal is in the overt act of obedience to the ordinance of baptism.

The real and the formal are both necessary, we might say *equally* necessary to the complete transaction. Without mutual affection and a mutual agreement no formal rites can ever constitute a true matrimonial alliance. And without the ceremonial forms, no union in marriage is competent. Hence, in order to a complete marriage compact, the real and the formal are equally necessary. Without the sympathy and compassionate forgiveness of the Father's heart, no formal obedience in baptism can secure the remission of sins. Nor will the forgiveness of the Father's heart secure for us the end of the commandment: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." This requires an act of obedience to authority on our part. Hence real and formal forgiveness are

equally necessary to remission of sins in the full New Testament sense. The command of Peter on Pentecost, Acts 2:38, "Repent and be baptized," carries along with it both ideas, the real and formal "remission of sins."

But while the real and formal are equally necessary, they are not equally *important*. The real is always more important than the formal. The moral element is more to be prized than the material. In the case of two alienated friends restored to an understanding and a friendly feeling, the union of their hearts is far more important than the union and shake of their hands. To a foreigner coming to our country, the privileges and opportunities which he secures, without naturalization, are more important than those secured by formal naturalization. The privileges of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the opportunity for home, protection and domestic felicity; the possibilities of wealth, education, social and religious enjoyment, are of more value than political privileges and preferment—voting and holding office.

To the returning prodigal the father's recognition, parental embrace and forgiving welcome were more valuable than the "best robe," the "ring" and the "fatted calf." To the penitent sinner the Heavenly Father's sympa-

thy, forgiveness and love, his own spiritual regeneration and God's spiritual recognition, acceptance and favor, are far more important than any consequences that can come from the outward compliance with any prescribed forms. A renewed mind, a spiritual discernment, a clear perception of truth, a subdued will, an understanding of moral relations to the atoning love of Christ, a trustful faith and a loyal heart are more valuable than "confession with the mouth," and "obedience in baptism," though these are important, as are all divine commandments.

The real and the formal are mutually helpful to each other. What would the oath of office signify, administered to a man who had never desired or sought the presidency of the United States, or who had not been chosen by the suffrages of the people for the position? It is the will of the people and the willingness of the man that give significance and authority to the formalities pertaining to his induction into office. And yet, his official vows lend gravity and dignity to his own sense of responsibility, and give to the people an assurance of his fidelity to the interests of the nation.

What would the "robe," the "ring" and the "fatted calf" have indicated to the prodigal son with the father's unforgiving frown resting

upon him? Only a deeper consciousness of his own unworthiness. But with the parental kiss of forgiveness still warm on his cheek, these tokens of affection intensify the feelings of both the father and the son, until the cup of joy runs over. Without previous reconciliation between God and the sinner; without the divine favor and acceptance consequent upon the humiliation and compunction of the sinner; with the stern brow of the offended Lord still knit in unforgiveness, what potency or efficacy is there in being baptized? Do you tell me that the Father of spirits sits unmoved by the sinner's "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ;" that he refuses his gracious forgiveness to a "broken and contrite heart" until the man "toes the mark" in baptism? Believe it who can, not I. "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit." And yet, the most natural thing for the penitent sinner is to cry out, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to *do!*" When the heart is deeply moved, we always feel like *doing* something to give vent to our feelings and expression to our thoughts. Hence for man's own good, and not to influence God, the command is given to "be baptized." His faith stimulates him to seek baptism; his baptism intensifies his faith and



gratifies his heart, and thus the real and the formal are helpful to each other. The real is a personal affair, while the formal is a matter of law.

In the purchase of property by one party from another, the transaction is one of personal interest, of personal judgment, of personal feelings, etc. In their negotiations, from beginning to end, the buyer and the seller are each conscious of his individuality, his personal rights and privileges, his volitions and purposes. Their agreement and contract is purely a personal affair between themselves. When these negotiations are ended, however, and the deed is delivered and placed on record, it becomes a matter of law, of public concern.

In the alienation of two friends, it is an affair of personal feeling. And their reconciliation is brought about by personal explanations, concessions and apologies. After this they shake hands. This is according to the law of custom, and has its significance and authority. In the matter of forgiveness of sins there is a personal relationship between God and the sinner. God thinks and feels, and man thinks and feels. When we sin we do more than transgress a divine law, we sin against the divine Being. "Against thee, thee only have I sinned." The divine government is paternal.

God is our Father, we are his children. Our wrong-doing offends the heart of the Father. We owe it to him to repent and "turn unto the Lord that he may have mercy upon us, and to our God that he may abundantly pardon." This is the real, personal adjustment of the sinner through repentance, and the real, personal adjustment of the Heavenly Father through forgiveness.

Formal remission is a matter of law. "Be baptized for the remission of your sins," is the legal phase of the subject. As there is a sense in which sin is the transgression of law, so there is a sense in which forgiveness is obtained through the observing of law. Personal forgiveness first, and then legal remission. And as sin exists in the human heart before it manifests itself in an overt act of disobedience, so forgiveness exists in the divine heart before it is declared in the act of obedience in baptism.

In the scope of their influence, the real is limited to the subject or subjects of the transaction, while the formal extends to others as well. In the nuptial alliance, the heart exercises and experiences through which a unity of thought and purpose and life is reached, are confined to the parties to the compact. Consciousness, on their part alone, can attest the

mental anxiety, the repose of confidence, the fidelity of faith, and the wealth of affection involved in this transaction, but are confined to the parties themselves. In the formal rites, however, other parties are reached and affected. The license must be procured from the proper official; witnesses must be had; the ceremony must be pronounced by an authorized agent. Why all this? Because other parties are interested. Society at large needs to be protected as well as the parties themselves, and the law interposes for the general good.

God has established a kingdom on earth—the Church of Christ. In this he reigns, and through this he sends out the gospel, and by this he saves sinners. The church is an organized body with Christ our Lord as its head. “And he gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.” The authority and ministry of the apostles and prophets are still exercised and maintained through their writings in the New Testament. The evangelists and pastors and teachers are a perpetuated living ministry. The church has ordinances to formally separate it from the world, and through which to edify itself in love, in efficiency and in power. These ordinances become the “formal” part of the church’s life and existence. Through

these men express their faith and their feelings. The "real" of the heart speaks to the world through the "formal." Let us apply these things now to the subject in hand—the forgiveness of sins. The feelings of the penitent sinner and the feelings of the compassionate Heavenly Father, are, in the nature of the case, limited to the sphere of their own hearts. While God, in answer to the cry of the penitent soul, grants his personal forgiveness,—promptly, cheerfully, gladly grants it,—yet there are other parties interested; every member of the Church of Christ is interested; the whole world is interested. Hence it becomes necessary for a formal, public declaration of the faith of the sinner, and for a formal, public declaration of the forgiveness of God. Hence the command, "Be baptized for the remission of your sins."

#### POINTS GAINED.

Now what points are gained by baptism for the remission of sins—for the formal remission?

1. A rational view of the Divine Nature, and a just estimate of God's character, as presented in the sacred Scriptures, are thus maintained and defended. Reason concurs with the revealed Word of truth that God is infinite in his attributes of intelligence, affection and voli-

tion. God is omniscient, God is love, God can will. The fatherhood of God is the sublime lesson of the ministry of Jesus Christ. That the broken heart of a wayward son finds instant response of sympathy and forgiveness in the parental nature of man, needs not to be argued. Whenever the father is assured that the son is penitent, the son is forgiven. But the Divine Nature is nobler and better than human nature. "If you being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much *more* will your Heavenly Father give," etc. "When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up." As a necessary protection against mistakes and frauds in human governments, man may prescribe formal acts for the offender to observe; but God, knowing the hearts of all men, needs no such protection. A father whose heart has melted into forgiveness over the penitential pleadings of his erring son, may say; "My son, sit down there now, and read a chapter in the Bible, and I will forgive you." But everybody understands that the son is already *really* forgiven; and the father prescribes this formal duty because of some good that may thus come to the boy, or to discipline in the family; and not for any effect it may have on the father's heart. So when the Heavenly Father sees repentance in the sinner's

heart, he forgives, and if he prescribes "baptism for the remission of sins," it is for the sinner's own good, and for the good of the observing church and world, and not in any wise to influence God's own nature or feelings.

2. The sinner is thus favored and gratified in his own feelings through this act of obedience to God. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" cried Saul. When the heart is full it seeks relief in the utterance of action. It wants to do something to show its appreciation of its benefactor. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," is the answer. And to every obedient soul it brings relief and satisfaction.

3. The sinner is thus assured of remission through the promise of God's Word. That forgiveness of sins, in some sense, is promised in baptism, is as clear as any other Bible truth. But, it may be asked, how can a man's own act of obedience in baptism assure him, be evidence to him, of forgiveness in the mind of God? Only because God has promised to forgive him on this condition. Believing God is faithful, when he has obeyed the command, he feels sure that he is forgiven—forgiven in whatever sense the promise was made.

But, it may be further asked, if God has promised to forgive the penitent believer on the

condition of his faith in Christ, is he not already assured by his faith, and before his baptism? Yes, he is already assured, but he needs to be more fully assured. As the sinner, inexperienced in Christian thought and truth, passes from darkness to light, he has doubts and anxieties, fears and hopes. He is not just sure that he has that kind, or that measure of faith; that kind, or that measure of repentance, that meets the requirements of the divine law. He is not sure that he has the necessary internal, moral preparation that God demands. Every preacher of the gospel understands this fact. In his ministry he has often to aid struggling souls by explaining and expounding about mental states and moral; and by encouraging men in their efforts to free themselves from sin, and to lay hold of the promises of God. And when the preacher himself has become assured of the man's spiritual readiness, and has induced him to commit himself in baptism to the Lord, it is a pleasure to witness the relief and satisfaction brought to the earnest soul in this obedience in baptism. He does not doubt his baptism. And his assurance is made more abundant. This assurance, too, strengthens his faith and his hope both in himself and in his God.

4. We are considering the points gained by

the doctrine of baptism for the "formal" remission of sins. And now, in the fourth place, attention is directed to the very important fact, that the church is assured, by this open declaration of faith on the part of the sinner, that he is prepared for, and desires membership in, the body of Christ. Although the penitent believer is brought, by his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, into spiritual fellowship with God, and into the real, personal forgiveness of the Father, yet he is still living under disabilities. He has not been naturalized. He has not conformed to the law of induction into the earthly kingdom, of initiation into the church. He can have no church privileges; he is barred from the Lord's Supper, from church fellowship. He has not been enfranchised in the kingdom. Through baptism and the formal remission of his sins, he must be formally received into the fellowship of saints, and enter formally into his rights and immunities as a citizen of the kingdom. Baptism fills a very important office, then, in the administration of the Church of Christ on earth. Its functions are sufficiently abundant without assuming the impossible task of enlightening the mind of God as to the moral condition of the sinner, and influencing the divine heart to grant real remission of sins.

5. The baptism of the believer for the



formal remission of his sins also serves a notice on the world that he is no longer of it. This is his deed to his moral realty which he secured by his faith at the hands of the atoning Savior. He files it in the court of Christ that it may stand on record as notice to the world of his property rights. But deeds are always evidence of previous moral transactions and agreements, and are never granted without these necessary prerequisites. Formal remission can never be obtained unless preceded by real remission.

6. Another important purpose it serves is of removing from the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ the repulsive aspect of a gross, unchristian legalism. The idea that the moral nature of our Heavenly Father, the spiritual sensibilities of his divine heart remain untouched and unmoved by the sinner's "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ;" and that the Holy One stands as a mere official, stern and all pitiless, waiting for the baptism of the sinner before his soul relaxes with compassion and forgiveness, is so contrary to our better instincts, and so contrary to the teachings of the Bible as to be offensive to enlightened Christian thought, as it appears to the writer. God is represented in the Scriptures of divine truth as seeking and pleading with the

sinner to receive his mercy; as more willing to grant his forgiveness than man is to receive it. He sent his Son into the world "to seek and to save" men. "Behold I stand at the door and knock," expresses the attitude of the Heavenly Father. Now, after all this, when the sinner "turns unto the Lord that he may have mercy upon him, and to God that he may abundantly pardon," does God say, "Wait, not ready yet; you must be baptized before my forgiveness is extended?" Is there not an incompatibility in such teachings?

7. This view of baptism reconciles the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject—their apparently contradictory teachings.

The evangelical scholarship of Christendom by consensus may be said to have settled the two following points of Christian doctrine:

(1) That God grants forgiveness of sins to men *on the moral grounds of the sinner's penitent trust in Christ.*

(2) That baptism, *in some sense*, is for the remission of sins.

Now, that the penitent sinner obtains forgiveness on *the condition* of his faith in the Savior, and yet that he obtains forgiveness as a *sequence of baptism*, has the appearance of a contradiction. But this is precisely the contradictory appearance of Bible teaching on this

subject. And this fact has given rise to much diversity of views and much disputation in the Christian world. Theories on this subject have been held and advocated, gravitating from the extremes of baptismal regeneration on the one hand, to the non-essentiality of baptism on the other. In the same way have the views and teachings of men varied with reference to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, running from the extreme of transubstantiation, through consubstantiation, punctilious weekly observance, monthly, quarterly and annual celebration of the eucharist. These and other diversities in the teachings and practices of different religious bodies, and the consequent contention and alienation among Christian men impressed, painfully impressed, the minds of Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander, and led them finally to determine to study Christianity, *de novo*, for themselves, and in the light of the inspired Word of God. The result is before the world as a part of history. Alexander Campbell was no ordinary man, viewed from any point of observation. He was a theological genius. His intellectual capacities for both analytical and synthetical reasoning were well poised; and his spiritual intuition was of the very highest order. His devotion to the revealed Word of God—the "Living Oracles,"

as he was wont to style the Bible, was unflinching, uncompromising. When he saw, as he clearly did, that the Holy Scriptures teach that the sinner is forgiven, *as a consequence of his faith* in the Lamb of God, he accepted it; and when he saw that the inspired Word commands men to "*be baptized for the remission of their sins,*" he accepted this. He advocated both these points of Christian doctrine as important. He laid greater stress in his writings and teachings upon this latter point—baptism for remission, than he did upon the former; not because he esteemed it more important, or equally important, but because it was less understood and less appreciated by the religious world, and consequently needed to be more emphasized that it might be restored to its proper place in the Church of Christ. And holding to both these doctrines, and advocating both, has placed Mr. Campbell's writings, like those of the Bible, in apparent contradiction, but only apparent, as will be abundantly shown before we are done.

Let us gather up the thread of our argument. We are discussing the real and the formal; and especially baptism for the formal remission of sins, and the points gained by this view of the subject. And we are now considering the fact that this view reconciles the apparent contra-

dictions in those Scriptures which treat of the remission of sins—treat of it directly or by implication.

In the Gospel of John, 5:24, the Savior says, "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." And again he says, "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:18. Now language could hardly be more explicit. If a man believes on Christ he is not condemned. But if he is not condemned, then he is forgiven. Again, if he does not believe on him, then he is condemned; and if he is condemned he is not forgiven. But a man is either forgiven, or he is not forgiven; he is either condemned, or he is not condemned; he either believes, or he does not believe. But why is he "condemned already?" "Because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God," says the Master. Unbelief, then, is the *cause* of condemnation, and belief is the cause of *not* being condemned. In other words, *belief* is the cause of being *forgiven*, and *unbelief* is the cause of *not* being forgiven. We have here, then, clearly the relation of cause

and effect. Belief and unbelief are causes followed by forgiven and unforgiven as effects.

Another declaration of Christ is this: "He that believeth is passed from death unto life." Here is a moral change—a transition from spiritual death unto spiritual life. But this involves remission of sins. When God declares that a man is passed from death unto life, he declares him forgiven. But faith secures this transition, hence faith secures his forgiveness. Such is the teaching of our Lord, unless he used words to conceal ideas. Notwithstanding all this, the Savior said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This is only another form of saying, except a man be baptized he cannot obtain remission of sins. But here is a contradiction on the surface of things. To say that forgiveness is an effect of faith, and yet that it cannot be obtained without baptism, is certainly a contradiction, at least in appearance.

The same thing appears in the preaching of the Apostle Peter to the Jews on Pentecost, Acts 2:38, and to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, Acts 10:43. To the household of Cornelius he says: "To him give all the prophets witness, that in his name, whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins."

This may be plainly stated thus: The prophets testify that, through the atonement of Jesus Christ, God will forgive all who trust in him. "*Whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins.*" Here is a universal proposition, in which remission of sins is promised to all on *the condition* of faith in Christ, And yet, Peter said to the Jews on Pentecost, "*Be baptized for the remission of your sins.*" If Peter uses the expression, "For the remission of sins," *in the same sense* in both these cases, then he is plainly at variance with himself in Christian doctrine.

By way of reconciling this apparent contradiction in Peter, it has been argued that the phrase, "*in his name,*" means here, *by his authority*; and this authority ordained baptism for the remission of sins. This represents Peter as saying, "The prophets all testify that through baptism authorized by Christ, whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." But, as a matter of fact, did the prophets ever testify to any such a thing? They did testify to the ransom of sinners through the atoning Lamb of God, but not to the fact that he would accomplish this through authorized baptism. This species of special pleading to save a religious tenet, is only equaled by a short-sighted pedobaptist who cannot see in-

mersion in the river Jordan, but who can see infants in household baptisms. Peter must be harmonized on some other principle, but of this later on.

With reference to the import and significance of this phrase, "Through his name," the scholarship of Christendom is so uniform and so manifestly against the foregoing interpretation of it, that it appears like trifling to resort to it. On this point, I submit the following from distinguished exegetes:

THROUGH HIS NAME: "Through his person."—*Lange*. "For his sake and on account of his merit."—*Matthew Henry*. "All the attributes and energies of which the name is the symbol."—*Ellicott*. "Not simply upon him, but upon him as possessing the attributes and sustaining the relations of which his name is the index."—*Hovey*. "By means of his name, of the believing confession of it, by which the objectively completed redemption is subjectively appropriated."—*Meyer*.

From this we pass to observe that Paul is also involved in the same sort of contradictory teaching. In his discourse at Antioch in the Jewish synagogue, Acts 13:38, he says: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe



are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." While not in the same words, this is substantially the same declaration that Peter made to Cornelius. Where Peter says, "*Through his name*" God grants forgiveness of sins to the believer, Paul says, "*Through this man*" remission is granted. These two apostles evidently preached the same gospel, though not in just the same terms always. It would seem then that when Peter said remission of sins is obtained by the believer through his *name*, he meant through this *man*—through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, and not through the exercise of his authority in ordaining baptism for remission of sins. But now notice that while Paul here declares, "All who believe are justified from all things"—are freely forgiven, yet in Gal. 3:27, he says they were "baptized into Jesus Christ," which is equivalent to being baptized into remission of sins. That is, according to Paul, forgiveness is consequent upon faith, and yet, consequent upon baptism. Here is need of reconciliation.

Forgiveness, like repentance, implies a change of mind and a change of heart. Repentance of sin we may have committed against another is a personal, subjective experience. We feel it within us as a positive moral force moving us—mov-

ing us, it may be to words, to tears or to actions. Paul speaks of the “motions of sin working in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.” So there are “motions” of repentance “bringing forth fruit meet for repentance.” In the same way forgiveness—real forgiveness—is a subjective moral force, an internal experience, a feeling within, moving the subject of it graciously and compassionately toward the offender. Forgiveness, real forgiveness, consists essentially of this change within, a change of feelings in the offended party, in consequence of a change—of repentance—in the offender. And this real forgiveness moves to action, to formal pardon. This is the case even in the official acts of the governor when he pardons a criminal. He is first made, by representations and by information, to feel that the prisoner, by repentance, has made himself worthy of pardon. This *feeling* is the *real* pardon, all else connected with the prisoner’s release is formal. These facts and principles obtain more manifestly in the paternal government.

Note this fact, that in the New Testament forgiveness of sins is made a *sequence* to the *moral fitness* of man to receive it. “Faith,” “repentance,” “conversion” and “born of God,” are expressive of *moral* elements in the gospel. While these terms do not express the

same shade of thought, philologically or metaphysically considered, yet they mean substantially the same thing in Christianity. They imply each other. They cannot exist alone. The man who has gospel faith, has gospel repentance, is converted and is born of God. The man who has gospel repentance, has gospel faith, is converted and born of God. The man who is converted according to the gospel, has faith and repentance and is born of God. And the man who is born of God is converted, has faith and has repentance. These terms, singly or collectively, applied to the sinner, mean a moral revolution within him—a change of views, a change of heart. Hence, when remission of sins is declared in the New Testament, a *sequence* of faith, or of repentance, or of conversion, or of being born of God, it is declared to be a sequence of all of them. These are all co-ordinate and concordant factors of that renewal, that great moral change wrought in the soul by the gospel of Christ.

Let us now recite a few passages of Scripture illustrating these facts: “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born of God*”—is forgiven. (1 John 5:1).

“With the heart man *believeth* unto righteousness”—into remission of sins. (Rom. 10:10.)

“Whosoever *believeth* on him shall not be ashamed.” (Rom. 9:33). Why not ashamed? Because he is forgiven. Why forgiven? Because he believes on Christ.

“Then to the Gentiles, also, hath God granted *repentance* unto life”—into remission of sins. (Acts 11:18).

“Him hath God exalted to grant to Israel *repentance* and remission of sins.” (Acts 5:31.)

“Lest they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart, and should be *converted*, and I should heal them”—should forgive them. (Acts 28:27.)

Now it is plain to be seen that these texts from the Word of God, which might be multiplied indefinitely, teach that the forgiveness of sins is a *sequence*—a *moral effect*, in the mind of God, resulting from a *moral cause* in the heart of man; and that this cause is variously styled in the Scriptures, “born of God,” “conversion,” “repentance,” “faith,” etc., according to the point of observation of the speaker or writer.

Notwithstanding all this, it is just as plainly a matter of fact that baptism is made a condition of remission of sins, of regeneration and of salvation. “Be baptized for the remission of sins” (Acts 2:38). “Arise and be baptized

and wash away thy sins" (Acts 22:16). "Except a man be born of water he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). "Baptism doth also now save us," etc. (1 Pet. 3:21). Now here is apparent contradiction; and here is need of reconciliation. This contrariety in Christian doctrine is to be found in all Christian literature, in the various creeds and in the critical commentaries on the Scriptures.

The point of this present contention is to affirm that there is a distinction between real and formal remission of sins; and this distinction reconciles this apparent contradiction. Real forgiveness is granted to the sinner on the grounds of his trust in the Lord Jesus Christ; and formal remission on the grounds of his obedience in baptism. Alexander Campbell, observing this distinction, announced it to the world in 1823.

"Paul's sins were *really* pardoned," he said, "when he believed, yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no *formal* acquittal, no *formal* purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism." This, on the part of Mr. Campbell, was simply a new setting of an old truth. He did not claim originality in the truth, but only in the form in which he put it. He claimed, in making this distinction, that he stood with Protestant Christen-

dom; and he proved it by their creeds and authoritative utterances. This strong emphasis placed by him on baptism for the formal remission of sins attracted attention and provoked criticism. And this in turn called for repeated emphasis. Mr. Campbell wrote extensively on this subject, so much so as to mislead many persons with the idea that he held to remission of sins, in *no other sense* than the formal remission in baptism. But Mr. Campbell never recalled his declarations made in 1823 on this subject; and his biographer, Dr. Richardson, clearly holds him to it from beginning to end. No man has ever been more misunderstood, misconstrued and misrepresented, by friends and foes, than Alexander Campbell has been on this subject. This we next engage to make clear to the understanding of every man who will follow us, and who does not belong to that class of whom it has been written: "There are none so blind as those who *will* not see."

## V

### ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON REMISSION OF SINS.

What was Alexander Campbell's position in regard to "baptism for the remission of sins?" The question raised is not whether Mr. Campbell held that baptism is for the remission of sins. Everybody at all acquainted with his writings knows that he did so teach; and that he held and advocated this view with great emphasis. His writings abound in various and strong declarations on this point. Nor is the enquiry here raised as to whether the mind and the heart are associated with the act of baptism in the proper administration of the ordinance. It is clearly understood that in every instance of scriptural baptism the thoughts and feelings accompany the action; and that Mr. Campbell so believed and so taught. Our thoughts and feelings attend all our normal acts. When we kiss a babe our hearts sanction it and co-operate with the body in the act; and so in every other instance. The nature of the act and the nature of the feelings correspond. The direct point in the present inquiry is in what *sense* did Mr. Campbell

hold to and teach "baptism for the remission of sins?" The investigation is one of fact, one of history. Dr. Richardson, in his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," page 20, vol. 2, tells us that in a debate with Mr. Walker, a Secession-~~Presbyterian~~ Presbyterian minister, in 1820, Mr. Campbell declared that, "Baptism is connected with the promise of the remission of sins."

Concerning this declaration Dr. Richardson says:

"This utterance is worthy of notice as his first definite and public recognition of the peculiar office of baptism. While, however, he thus in 1820, distinctly perceived and asserted a scriptural connection between baptism and remission of sins, he seems to have viewed it, at this time, only in the light of an argument, and to have had but a faint appreciation of its great practical importance. A momentary glance only seems as yet to have been directed to the great purpose of baptism, which subsequently assumed so conspicuous a position in the restoration of the primitive gospel."

This debate with Mr. Walker was held in the state of Ohio. In the year 1823 Mr. Campbell held a debate with Mr. McCalla, a Presbyterian minister, in Kentucky. In this debate he set forth extensively and clearly his more matured views on the relation of baptism to the remission of sins. The following extracts from that discussion will enable the



reader to understand Mr. Campbell's position at that time:

“Never was there an ordinance of so great import or design. It is to be but once administered. We are to pray often, praise often, show forth the Lord's death often, commemorate his resurrection every week, but we are to be baptized but *once*. \* \* \* \* I know it will be said that I have affirmed that baptism *saves* us. Well, Peter and Paul have said so before me. If it was not criminal in them to say so, it cannot be criminal in me. When Ananias said unto Paul, ‘Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,’ I suppose Paul believed him and arose and was baptized, and washed away his sins. When he was baptized, he must have believed that his sins were *now* washed away in *some sense* that they were not before. For if his sins had been already, in *every sense*, washed away, Ananias' address would have led him into a mistaken view of himself, both before and after baptism. Now we confess that the blood of Jesus Christ alone *cleanses* us who believe from all sins. Even this, however, is a metaphorical expression. The efficacy of his blood springs from his own dignity and from the appointment of his Father. The blood of Christ, then, *really cleanses us who believe from all sin*. Behold the goodness of God in giving us a formal token of it by ordaining a baptism expressly ‘for the remission of sins.’ The water of baptism, then, *formally* washes away our sins. The blood of Christ *really* washes away our sins. Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed, yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no *formal* purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism. To every believer, therefore, baptism is a *formal* and *personal remission* or purgation of sins. The believer never has his sins formally washed away or remitted until he is baptized.”

Commenting on this position of Mr. Campbell with regard to baptism, in his debate with Mr. McCalla, Dr. Richardson says:

“Thus the design of baptism and its true place in the economy of the gospel had gradually become clearer, and its importance proportionally enhanced in his estimation, since the debate with Walker. Often, during the intervening period, had this particular point been the subject of conversation between him and his father, as well as with Walter Scott, and of careful Scripture examinations, and these utterances in the McCalla debate presented the views they had beforehand agreed upon as the true and obvious teachings of the New Testament. \* \* \* Thus, in 1823, the design of baptism was fully understood and publicly asserted.”

Thus writes Dr. Richardson with regard to Mr. Campbell and his views after Mr. C's death. Dr. Richardson was Mr. Campbell's life long friend and associate. These two men worshiped together in the same church, were both teachers in Bethany College, and were co-editors of the *Millennial Harbinger*. When Mr. Campbell died Dr. Richardson was selected by Mr. Campbell's family to write his biography. That Dr. Richardson understood Mr. Campbell's views on all these questions there can be no doubt. And Dr. Richardson quotes Mr. Campbell's declarations in the McCalla debate, viz.: “Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed, yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no *formal*

purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism." And then adds: "Thus in 1823 the *design of baptism was fully understood and publicly asserted.*" Now if the "design of baptism was *fully understood*" then, there could have been no change in Mr. Campbell's views on this subject afterwards. And this is the precise point of our present inquiry. Did Mr. Campbell change his views on this subject? If he did we have no account of it. Dr. Richardson, his biographer, does not mention the fact, which he certainly would have done had this been the case. Mr. Campbell was an original, independent thinker. He was a man of strong convictions. He was a conscientious man. When he changed his mind in regard to his own baptism, he at once sought immersion at the hands of a Baptist preacher. When he changed his mind in regard to Calvinism he declared it. When he changed in regard to the nature of faith, he proclaimed it. When he changed his views in reference to church order or government or worship he announced it. When he changed in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit he was bold to say so. "Wise men change often, but fools never," he frequently wrote as his motto. But Mr. Campbell never announced to the world any change in his views on the design of baptism as expressed in his

debate with McCalla in 1823. The only evidence adduced to make it appear that he did so change is the fact that he affirmed the proposition that, "Baptism is for the remission of past sins," and that, throughout his life, he wrote and spoke abundantly and emphatically in support of this proposition. But this was his position in the McCalla debate, and he then set himself boldly in its proclamation and defense. Mr. Campbell had no dispute with the Christian world on the position that "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed." This was conceded on all hands. But when he maintained that "the believer never has his sins formally washed away or remitted until he is baptized," then he found opposition. The greater the opposition, the greater the occasion for his emphatic affirmation of the truth.

In his discussions of this question Mr. Campbell did not always choose to make the distinction between "real" and "formal" remission. The Scriptures plainly teach that "baptism is for the remission of sins," and Mr. Campbell affirmed this proposition before the world, and proved it. In doing this he neither affirmed nor denied in regard to "real" and "formal" remission, but only that "baptism is for the remission of sins." To this he held without ever renouncing his position that, "Paul's sins

were *really pardoned* when he believed." He was committed to the restoration of apostolic Christianity in *letter* and in spirit. Hence his earnest contention for the *weekly* observance of the Lord's Supper, and for baptism *for the remission of sins*.

There are two classes of men who have misunderstood and misrepresented Mr. Campbell on this subject, and on the work of the Holy Spirit—his sectarian critics and a school of thinkers in our own ranks that we call, for the want of a better term, *legalists*. And it is a significant fact that both these quote the same passages from Mr. Campbell's writings to make good their contentions that Mr. Campbell repudiated the doctrine of "real" remission on the ground of faith in the blood of Christ, and of a real presence of the Holy Spirit to-day in the work of salvation.

Mr. Campbell held to both the "letter" and the "spirit" of Christianity; he believed firmly in that which is "without" and that which is "within" in our holy religion; and held to the evident scriptural distinction between "real" and "formal" remission of sins. All of which will be made clear as we proceed.

#### HIS EARLIER DECLARATIONS.

Let us bear in mind that in the year 1823, Mr. Campbell, in his debate with McCalla,

declared that "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, and *formally* forgiven when he was baptized." And that Dr. Richardson, in his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," referring to this position says:

"This particular point had *often been the subject of conversation* between him and his father, as well as with Walter Scott, and of *careful Scripture examinations*, and these utterances in the McCalla debate presented the views they had beforehand agreed upon as the *true and obvious teachings* of the New Testament. \* \* \* \* Thus, in 1823, the design of baptism was *fully understood and publicly asserted.*"

Again, Dr. Richardson, referring to Mr. Campbell's growth and confirmation of views, and to the fact that these same views were contained theoretically in all the creeds of Protestant christendom, but were practically unheeded, represents Mr. Campbell as saying some time after this:

"We can sympathize with those who have this doctrine in their own creeds unregarded and unheeded in its import and utility; for we exhibited it fully in our debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823, without feeling its great importance, and without beginning to practice upon its tendencies for some time afterward."—Memoirs, vol. 2, page 217.

In the year 1824, Mr. Campbell, writing in the *Christian Baptist*, page 67, in reference to an old brother always praying to God to "forgive the sins of his youth," says:

“Methinks this aged professor has yet to learn the import of the ‘glad tidings to all people,’ one item of which most certainly assures the believer of the remission of all his sins committed previously to the hour he trusted in the Savior.”

Here is a plain declaration of Mr. Campbell’s view on this subject. He is not now discussing the full gospel plan of remission of sins, but only the “one item” of *real* forgiveness on the moral grounds of *trust* in Christ; “which,” he says, “*most certainly assures the believer of the remission of all his sins committed previously to the hour he trusted in the Savior.*”

Again, in the same article, on page 68, he illustrates and represents God as saying to man, “Know assuredly that whenever you trust in my ability, benevolence, and veracity, you are remitted.” Language could not be more decisive of a point than this—“*whenever you trust you are remitted.*” Mr. Campbell is not now considering the question of the “formal” remission of sins in baptism, but of “real” remission, granted to every believer on the ground of his “trust” in God through Christ Jesus.

It was in the year 1828 that Mr. Campbell began that remarkable series of articles in the *Christian Baptist* on baptism. It is largely from these articles that Mr. Campbell’s oppo-

nents and his misguided friends and brethren draw their weapons of war. That "a man's foes shall be they of his own household" was never more fully exemplified than in that class of preachers among the Disciples who quote Mr. Campbell's strong declarations in favor of baptism as the ordinance through which is granted the formal "remission" of sins, as proof that Mr. Campbell had abandoned his position that "Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed." Mr. Campbell never abandoned that position. This fact of history we are now making clear. In the articles referred to he takes bold ground on baptism for remission of sins, but he is careful, in the very opening sentences, to guard himself against the misunderstandings and misinterpretations to which his writings have been subjected. He refers directly to the position he took in his debate with McCalla, and reaffirms its truth as an introduction to what he intends saying in confirmation of baptism for the "formal" remission of sins, not "real" remission. This is not in dispute. He agreed with the religious world on this point. Hear his introduction:

"Immersion in water into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the fruit of faith in the subject, is the most singular institution that ever appeared in the world. Although very common in practice, and trite in theory,



although the subject of a good many volumes, and of many a conversation, it appears to me that this institution of divine origin, so singular in its nature, and so grand and significant in its design, is understood by comparatively very few.

“In my debate with Mr. McCalla in Kentucky, in 1823, on this topic, I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sins. That to every believing subject it did formally, and in fact, convey to him the forgiveness of sins. It was with much hesitation I presented this view of the subject at that time, because of its perfect novelty. I was then assured of its truth, and I think presented sufficient evidence of its certainty. But having thought still more closely upon the subject, and having been necessarily called to consider it more fully as an essential part of the Christian religion, I am still better prepared to develop its import and to establish its utility and value in the Christian religion.”

Thus wrote Mr. Campbell in 1828. He was then forty years old. He had been before the world as an active, conspicuous innovator, iconoclast and reformer for eighteen years. This was five years after his debate with Mr. McCalla. He says he had now “thought more closely upon the subject,” had been “necessarily called to consider it more fully,” was now “still better prepared to develop its import, and to establish its value and utility.” Does Mr. Campbell recede from his position in the McCalla debate? What was his position in that debate? It was this: “To every believer, therefore, baptism is a *formal* and *personal* remission or pur-

gation of sins. The believer never has his sins *formally* washed away or remitted until he is baptized.”

What is his position now in the above extract? It is this: “In my debate with Mr. McCalla I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sins. That to every believing subject it did *formally* and in fact convey to him the forgiveness of sins.” Thus Mr. Campbell reaffirms precisely his position on this subject. The “real pardon” of Paul “when he believed” cuts no figure in his present discussion. It is not “real pardon” he is considering, but “formal forgiveness” in baptism. Concerning this he says, “It appears to me it is understood by comparatively very few.”

He knew that “real pardon” on the ground of faith in the Savior was well understood, hence he was not called upon to discuss that branch of the subject. To show that I am correctly interpreting Mr. Campbell’s teachings in these articles in the *Christian Baptist* in 1828, and that Mr. Campbell saw both sides of this question, that which is “without” and that which is “within,” its internal, moral phase and its external, legal phase—“real” and “formal” remission of sins—to show these points

clearly I will place side by side a few extracts from these articles.

In his third article, speaking of the eunuch rejoicing on his way after his baptism, he says: "The eunuch had found what thousands before him had experienced, peace with God, from a conviction that his sins had been actually forgiven in the act of immersion."

That Mr. Campbell meant by this simply that the eunuch rejoiced because he had obeyed God in baptism, and had thus received the "assurance" of pardon, "confirmation" of the promise of "real pardon" bestowed on the ground of his "trust" in Christ, is evident from the fact that in the paragraph just preceding this he speaks of Paul's case and says: "When Paul was immersed, it was declared and understood by the parties that all his previous sins were washed away in the act of immersion."

But Mr. Campbell's position in regard to Paul was that he was "really pardoned" when he believed, and "formally" forgiven when he was baptized. Hence it was the same in this case of the eunuch.

This is made clear in his second article on baptism when, speaking of the eunuch rejoicing, he adds: "When Jesus commanded reformation and forgiveness of sins to be announced in his name to all nations, he commanded men to re-

ceive immersion to the confirmation of this promise.” Mark the distinction here made between “forgiveness of sins” on the ground of “reformation,” and “the confirmation of this promise” in “immersion.” This distinction between “real” and “formal” pardon obtains in all Mr. Campbell’s writings.

In his sixth article on baptism he is very clear in this distinction. He says: “That there is a definite instant of time in which all former sins are absolved is generally admitted; but that there is any sensible means ordained by which this blessing is conveyed, is not so generally apprehended.”

Here Mr. Campbell clearly distinguishes between the “*instant of time* in which all former sins are *absolved*,” and the “*sensible means* ordained by which this blessing is *conveyed*.” That is, our sins are “absolved,” “really pardoned” the “instant of time” in which we *believe*. This, Mr. Campbell says, is “generally admitted.” This is the general doctrine of Christendom. But that the “assurance” of this is formally “conveyed” to us through the “sensible means” of baptism “is not so generally apprehended.” Can anybody misunderstand Mr. Campbell?

Again he says in this same article: “Faith, indeed, is the grand medium through which

forgiveness is accessible, but something more is necessary to the actual enjoyment of the blessing than a conviction that it is derived through the blood of Jesus. Hence those who had obtained this belief were commanded to be immersed for the remission of their sins.”

And further on he adds: “So that the instant of time, and the means by which the formal remission is granted, is an object of sense, and a proper subject of remembrance.”

Nothing can be made more evident than the fact that while Mr. Campbell held to the position that the “formal” remission of sins was a matter of law, a legal transaction, materialized to the “*senses*” in the act of baptism; yet back of this he recognized the truth that “real” forgiveness in the Father’s heart was caused by man’s faith in Christ Jesus his Son. But more of this as we proceed.

Mr. Campbell’s utterances on the subject of remission of sins are like those of the New Testament—they appear inconsistent until considered as a whole, and studied in the light of reason, and interpreted according to a sound philosophy. He is sometimes considering the subject of “real” remission on the moral ground of faith—trust in Christ as the Savior of sinners; at other times he is considering it from a legal point of view, as “formal” remission

through the action of baptism; and, again, he views it in the light of both the real and the formal aspects of the subject taken together; the moral and the legal phases combined in one transaction as necessary to a full, complete and practical view of the subject. To show this similarity between Mr. Campbell's method of treating this subject, and that employed in the Scriptures, we now refer to the Savior's teachings.

“He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” (John 5:24).

Here the Son of God is considering the matter of man's personal, moral condition and relation to God his Father. He declares of a certain character that he “is passed from death unto life.” But this, as has been previously shown, implies forgiveness of sins. The moral renovation involved in “passing from death unto life” puts a man where the Savior says further of him, “he shall not come into condemnation,” and still further, “he hath everlasting life.” All this can mean nothing less than that the Heavenly Father looks with favor, compassion and forgiveness on such an one. But what is the moral condition and character of the man of whom all this is said?

Simply this: "He heareth my word and *believeth* on him that sent me." Here the Savior is considering only "real pardon" on the moral ground of faith.

But when Christ insisted that John the Baptist should baptize him, saying, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," he recognizes the legal element in religion, and places the seal of his own obedience on the ordinance of "baptism for the remission of sins"—the legal, formal remission, not the actual, real remission.

Again, the Savior said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now, here he views the subject in its fullness, in both its moral and its legal aspects as involving both real and formal remission of sins.

After the same manner Mr. Campbell treats of the subject of remission of sins in his writings. When his mind is directed to the moral phase of the question, to real pardon, he says, "One item of the gospel most certainly assures the *believer* of the remission of all his sins committed previously to the *hour he trusted* in the Savior. . . . Know assuredly that *whenever you trust* in my ability, benevolence and veracity, *you are remitted.*"

And then, when his mind is turned to the legal phase of the question, he speaks thus:

“The forgiveness of sins, then, becomes ours when we become Christ’s; and if we formally and actually become Christ’s the moment we are immersed into his name, it is as clear as day that the moment a believer is immersed into the name of Christ, he obtains the forgiveness of his sins as actually and as formally as he puts him on in immersion. But as no woman is *legally* or in fact her husband’s property, nor his property hers, until the marriage covenant is ratified and confirmed *according to law*; so no person can *legally* claim the blessings of pardon and acceptance who has not been *according to law* espoused to Jesus Christ. But so soon as the marriage is consummated, that moment the right is established and the blessings secured.”

And then, again, when he contemplates the subject in its *entirety*, and is considering both the moral and legal phases together, when he is, without making the distinction between “real” and “formal” pardon, discussing the general topic of remission of sins, he writes on this wise: “Faith is not more evidently connected with immersion, than is immersion with the forgiveness of sins. In the ancient gospel, it was first a belief in Jesus; next immersion; then forgiveness; then peace with God, and then joy in the Holy Spirit.”

And, still further, we may trace the analogy between Mr. Campbell’s style of treating this subject and that of the Bible, in the way in which they each discriminate occasionally between “real” and “formal” remission. For



example, Mr. Campbell says: "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, *formally* pardoned when he was baptized."

So Paul says (Gal. 3:26), "Ye are all the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been *baptized into* Christ have put on Christ." It would be an easy matter to extend this parallelism between the utterances of the Bible and those of Mr. Campbell, but let us not digress too far from the immediate point of our present investigation, viz., Did Mr. Campbell ever change his position in the McCalla debate in regard to "real" and "formal" remission of sins?

The strongest possible evidence known to me, in his writings, that he did undergo a change of mind on this point, will now be laid before the reader. In the *Christian Baptist*, page 530, he answers a query directly on this point as follows:

"Is a believer in Christ not actually in a pardoned state before he is baptized?"

"*Answer.*—Is not a man clean before he is washed!! When there is only an imaginary or artificial line between Virginia and Pennsylvania, I cannot often tell with ease whether I am in Virginia or in Pennsylvania; but I can always tell when I am in Ohio, however near the line—for I have crossed the Ohio River. And, blessed be God! he has not drawn a mere artificial line between the plantations of nature and of grace. No man has any proof that he is pardoned until he is baptized. And if men are con-

scious that their sins are forgiven, and that they are pardoned before they are immersed, I advise them not to go into the water, for they have no need of it."

This was written in 1829. But just the year before, Mr. Campbell reaffirmed, in the *Christian Baptist*, page 401, his position in the McCalla debate, which was that baptism "*formally* conveyed the forgiveness of sins," while Paul's sins were "*really* pardoned when he believed." It is evident that in the above query and answer, Mr. Campbell is considering remission in its *completion*, and as involving both "real" and "formal" pardon, which he expressed in his debate with Rice as follows:

"Peter inseparably connected repentance and baptism as necessary to a plenary remission of sin." Mark that expression, "*plenary* remission." No man's sins are forgiven in the full scriptural sense until he has believed and been baptized. God knows when man trusts in Christ, and he then "really" forgives; man knows when he is baptized, and thus obeys the law, and is assured of his acceptance through this "formal" forgiveness. It is in this view of the subject that Mr. Campbell says "a believer in Christ is not actually in a pardoned state before he is baptized." "In the pardoned *state*," notice. Mr. Campbell always emphasized the fact that baptism changed a man's "state,"

like the marriage ceremony in law. Before that ceremony he is in the unmarried state; after the ceremony he is in the married state. The change, however, is only a legal one, a formal one. From a moral point of view, the man and woman who have plighted their faith and their affections to each other in conjugal vows, are morally and really changed in state, are really husband and wife. But for their own good and for the good of society in many ways, these vows have been put under legal restrictions; and there is a marriage in *law* as well as in *heart*. In the marriage ceremony there is only a formal declaration of what really existed before. To ask, then, "Is a man married before the ceremony?" is to do precisely what Mr. Campbell has done in his answer to the above query, "Is a man clean before he is washed?" No man knew better than Mr. Campbell that repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ make a man clean "within;" and that baptism could only make him clean in the eye of the law. No man knew better than Mr. Campbell that God knows when he himself forgives the sinner, but that the man himself could best know it when he had "crossed the Ohio River"—been baptized, and thus been made clean in the eye of the divine law. Mr. Campbell's chief object in this answer to the query

was to strike a blow at the popular doctrine that a man is "conscious" that his sins are forgiven. God is "conscious" of forgiving our sins; but man can only be conscious of the internal, moral conditions, and of the external act of obedience which God has made the conditions of his forgiveness, and the assurance to man of the fact. Hence, Mr. Campbell says, "No man has any *proof* that he is pardoned until he is baptized"—no proof of the "*plenary remission of sins*;" of that remission that involves both "real" and "formal," both personal and legal forgiveness. It was in this view of the subject that Peter said to the Pentecostians, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins."

That I have correctly interpreted Mr. Campbell in the above instance will appear further on.

At the expense of being thought redundant and even tedious on this subject, I here submit to the reader additional statements from Mr. Campbell's writings showing that while he contended strongly for baptism as necessary to the remission of sins in a "*plenary*" sense, in its *full* and *complete* significance and comprehension, yet he always recognized the distinction between the moral and the legal relations and states connected with this subject. He held that according to law, according to the

Scriptures, no man had the *full assurance* of the *full remission* of his sins until he was baptized; that having become reconciled to his Heavenly Father, and having established proper moral relations with him by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and having been baptized, he had then assurance of both real and formal remission—forgiveness in the Father's heart and in the eye of the law.

In his article on remission of sins in the *Christian System*, page 181, Mr. Campbell says: "The object of this essay is to open to the consideration of the reader the Christian institution for the remission of sins; to show by what means a person may enjoy the assurance of a personal and plenary remission of all his sins." Notice his language—"To show by what means a person may *enjoy the assurance*"—he may have received the father's forgiveness, but he needs the "assurance" of it. Assurance of what? "Of a *personal* and *plenary* remission of all his sins." Why use that word "plenary?" Because the "personal" forgiveness of the Father needs to be supplemented by a provision or law—by baptism, in order to become "*plenary*."

And then again in the *Christian System*, page 190, Mr. Campbell says:

“A change of heart is the result of a change of views, and whatever can accomplish a change of views may accomplish a change of heart or feeling; but a change of state always calls for something more . . . *State* here has respect to the *whole* person. It may be argued that state is as pertinently applied to the mind or heart as to the whole person; and that when the state of the mind is changed by a belief in God’s testimony, the subject of that change is brought into as near a relation to God as he can be in this life; and as the kingdom of Jesus is a spiritual kingdom, he is as fit for admission into it, and for the enjoyment of its blessings, whenever his heart is changed from enmity to love, as he ever can be; nay, in truth, is actually initiated into the kingdom of Jesus the moment his mind is changed—and to insist upon any personal act as necessary to admission, because such acts are necessary to admission into all the social and political relations in society, is an overstraining the analogies between things earthly and things heavenly. . . . But, without pausing to inquire whether the state of the heart can be perfectly changed from enmity to love, without an assurance of remission on some ground, or in consequence of some *act of the mind*, prerequisite thereunto;—without being at pains to show that the truth of this proposition is not at all essential to our argument, but only illustrative of it; we may say that Christ has redeemed the *whole* man—body, soul and spirit by his obedience even to death—so in coming into his *kingdom on earth*, and in order to the *enjoyment* of all the present salvation, the *state of the whole person* must be changed; and this is what we apprehend Jesus meant by his saying, ‘Unless a *man* is born of *water and the Spirit* he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;’ and what we mean in distinguishing a change of heart, or of views and feelings, from a change of state.”

The reader cannot fail to observe that Mr. Campbell sees clearly through this whole sub-

ject in the light in which we are presenting him. In the above extract he gives only another statement of his declaration made in 1823—“Paul’s sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no *formal* purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism.” He maintains that while faith in Christ Jesus our Lord changes a man’s heart, and establishes moral relations between him and his Heavenly Father, yet he needs to have his “*body* washed with pure water” in baptism that the “*whole man*” may be brought under submission to God. And he holds that in this overt act of obedience the man finds “assurance” that brings him into full “enjoyment” of his hope in the Savior. This idea of the “*whole man*” being brought into Christ in baptism, and the “assurance” being thus made “full and complete” is brought out in another form by Mr. Campbell on page 197, *Christian System*—“No person is *altogether* disciplined to Christ until he is immersed.”

In all this, however, Mr. Campbell, as he always affirmed, was in full accord with the Protestant world. Only he was more emphatic on this point, was more bold to proclaim the Scripture doctrine, and consequently more consistent. On page 225, *Christian System*, he

says: "But even the reformed creeds, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist, substantially avow the same views of immersion, though apparently afraid to carry them out in faith and practice."

His idea was that they were afraid of being thought in sympathy with the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. On this point in the *Christian Baptist*, page 436, he says:

"In shunning one extreme we are apt to run into the contrary. The Papists in former times made the mere act of immersion or sprinkling, irrespective of the sentiments, faith, or feelings of the subject, wash away all sins. . . . Now, methinks we are not to be scared out of our duty or privilege because of the errors or follies of others. Nor do we lose sight of the forgiveness of our sins in immersion, because Papists have made a savior of a mere ceremony."

Mr. Campbell always had the courage of his convictions, whether he antagonized Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or Infidel.

Let it be noted in this connection, also, that while Mr. Campbell always held that every truly godly man, whether immersed or not, was, by virtue of this change of heart and this consequent forgiveness—"real" forgiveness—in favor and fellowship with God; yet the relation was abnormal, incomplete, unscriptural, unconstitutional. Hence he says, on page



208, *Christian System*, “Remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, cannot be *scripturally* enjoyed by any person before immersion. . . . Remission of sins cannot *in this life*, be *constitutionally* enjoyed previous to immersion.”

That is, the regular, normal, scriptural, constitutional way to a full, a “plenary” remission of sins, and admission into the kingdom of God, is through the commission, “He that believeth in me and is baptized shall be saved.” Mr. Campbell makes this exceedingly clear in the preceding extract made from the *Christian System*, thus:

“So in coming into his kingdom on earth, and in order to the *enjoyment* of all the present salvation, the *state of the whole person* must be changed; and this is what we apprehend Jesus meant by his saying, ‘Unless a *man* is born of *water and spirit* he cannot enter the kingdom of God;’ and what we mean in distinguishing a change of heart, or views and feelings, from a change of state.”

Notice here his peculiar, guarded way of saying this—“coming into his kingdom *on earth*,” not into his spiritual, heavenly kingdom; this was entered by his “change of heart”—“in order to the *enjoyment of all the present salvation*”—not the *future* salvation—“the state of the *whole person*”—not the moral state of the soul.

That we may see clearly Mr. Campbell's views on the "change of state" produced by the act of baptism, the following quotation is made from his *Christianity Restored*, page 196:

"A thousand analogies might be adduced to show that, though a change of state often, nay, generally results from a change of feelings, and this from a change of views; yet a change of state does not necessarily follow, and is something quite different from, and cannot be identified with, a change of heart. So in religion, a man may change his views of Jesus, and his heart may also be changed towards him; but unless a change of state ensues, he is still unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all Christian life and enjoyment. For it has been proved that these terms represent states and not feelings, condition and not character; and that a change of views, or of heart, is not a change of state. To change a state is to pass into a new relation, and relation is not sentiment nor feeling. Some *act*, then, constitutional, by stipulation proposed, *sensible* and *manifest*, must be performed by one or both the parties before such a change can be accomplished."

Thus Mr. Campbell illustrates, emphasizes and enforces the legal phase of this subject—the formal, outward act by which our relation in law is changed. Now to show that he just as clearly understood and taught the other side of this subject; that he believed in a moral "relation" and moral "state," distinct from, and independent of, that to which the act of baptism introduces us, we submit the following extracts from his writings:

“I cannot make any one duty the standard of Christian *state* or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”—*Mill. Harbinger*, 1837, page 411.

Again, in the same number of the *Harbinger*, page 507, he says:

“We have, in Paul’s style, the inward and the outward Jews; and may we not have the inward and the outward Christians? for true it is that he is not always a Christian who is one outwardly, but all agree that he is, in the full sense of the word, a Christian who is one outwardly and inwardly. As the same apostle reasons on circumcision, so we could reason on baptism: ‘Circumcision is not that which is outward in the flesh but circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter (only), whose praise is of God, and not of man.’ So is baptism. It is not outward in the flesh only, but in the spirit also. We argue for the ‘outward’ and for the ‘inward’—the outward for men, including ourselves, the inward for God; but both the outward and the inward for the praise both of God and of men.”

And, again, in his debate with Mr. Rice in 1843, page 493, Mr. Campbell says:

“The outward act, then, is but the symbol of the transition, *inward and spiritual*, by which our souls are bathed in that ocean of love, which purifies our persons, and makes them one with the Lord. . . . The kingdom of God is no party, no one party on earth. It is a spiritual kingdom, and is in the hearts of men.”

Let us notice some of the foregoing declarations of Mr. Campbell. They are very explicit. Baptism he says “is not outward in the flesh

only, but in the spirit also. We argue for the 'outward' and for the 'inward'—*the outward for men, including ourselves—the inward for God*; but both the outward and the inward for the praise both of God and of men."

Here Mr. Campbell plainly states that the act of baptism was not designed to influence God, but to influence the man who submits to it, and those who witness it—"the *outward* for men, including ourselves." And yet he says there is a baptism that affects God—"the *inward* for God." This thought he extends from the individual to the whole body of believers. Hence, in the last paragraph quoted above from his debate with Rice, he says, "The kingdom of God is no one party on earth. It is a *spiritual* kingdom, and is in the *hearts* of men."

Dr. Robert Richardson, in his "Memoirs of A. Campbell," vol. 2, page 408, gives us an account of an interchange of views between Mr. Campbell and a Baptist minister and editor, a Mr. Meredith of North Carolina, on the subject of remission of sins. In this we have a photograph of Mr. Campbell's views on this subject that can not well be misunderstood. This was in 1840. It will be seen in Mr. Campbell's utterances here that he still adhered to his position taken in 1823 in his debate with McCalla—that baptism is for the remission of sins only "*in a*

*sense*”—for the “formal” remission, and not for the “real” remission.

Mr. Meredith, in speaking of his discussion with Mr. Campbell, and in reply to a correspondent who charged him with agreeing with Mr. Campbell, says:

“That the Scriptures have connected baptism and remission in some sense, it is worse than useless to deny. We are aware that attempts have been made to destroy the force of the passages referred to; but always with such success as to betray the nakedness of the land, and at the same time to illustrate the deplorable effects of partisan prejudice. On this point Mr. Campbell has always had the advantage of his opponents. He has triumphantly quoted such passages as Acts 2:38, against which nothing has ever been offered better than a flimsy criticism or a palpable perversion of apostolic teaching. Here we have taken different ground from the rest of our brethren. We have promptly conceded to Mr. Campbell everything which candor seemed to demand. We have conceded that the evangelists and apostles, in the places referred to, meant what they said. We have conceded that, in a given sense, and under certain limitations and for certain ends, remission has been connected with baptism.”

Dr. Richardson tells us that Mr. Campbell replied to that as follows:

“The above concessions contain all that we are anxious to maintain. If the evangelists and the apostles ‘meant what they said’ in the places referred to for proof by us, we ask no more; for it was always alleged by us that in a ‘given sense’ and under ‘certain limitations’ and for ‘certain ends,’ remission has been connected with baptism. He never went further than this; our opponents said we

did, but no man can show by our own language that we have ever transcended the words above quoted from Mr. Meredith.”

This quotation from Mr. Campbell places the question of his true attitude on this subject beyond all cavil or doubt. *“We never went further than this; our opponents said we did, but no man can show from our language that we have ever transcended the words above quoted from Mr. Meredith.”*

Now, what are the words quoted from Mr. Meredith? Simply these: That the apostles in speaking of baptism in connection with the remission of sins “meant what they said;” that these statements, however, are to be taken “in a given sense,” and “under certain limitations ” and “for certain ends.”

Alexander Campbell never taught that baptism is for that real forgiveness which in the Father’s heart is granted to the penitent sinner; but only for that legal, formal remission, extended as a governmental measure for man’s good; as an assurance to him, that in this act of obedience to the divine law, and of submission to the divine government, he receives formal remission and formal admission into the kingdom of God “on earth.” Real remission and real admission into the spiritual kingdom

being attained on the ground of faith in Christ as the Son of the living God.

Yes, the apostles “meant what they said”—baptism is for the remission of sins; this “in a given sense”—legal remission through the established ordinance of the established church; with the “limitation”—formal and not real pardon; and for “certain ends”—a pledge and assurance that can come only through what Mr. Campbell styles, “sensible and manifest evidence.”

In commenting further on this article of Mr. Meredith, in the *Harbinger* for 1840, page 543, Mr. Campbell says:

“When I speak of a change of state I contemplate the whole man, not a part of him. I teach, however, that a change of heart is a change of its state towards God; and without this change of heart a change of state and character is impossible.”

And, again, on pages 544, 545 he says:

“I have from the first day in which I preached baptism for remission of sins, taught that without previous faith and repentance, baptism availed nothing—that a man was virtually, or in heart, in the new covenant and entitled to its blessings, when he believed and repented; but not formally nor in fact justified or forgiven till he put on Christ in baptism. . . . That some of my brethren, with too much ardor, through the force of strong feeling, and without all the premises before them, have transcended this view and these bounds, and given to baptism an undue

eminence—a sort of pardon-procuring, rather than a pardon-certifying and enjoying efficacy, I frankly admit; but such has never been my reasoning nor my course. I appeal to my speeches in the McCalla debate in proof of this; and these contain the first promulgation of these views in America, or anywhere else known to me in the present century.”

Mr. Campbell here makes direct “appeal” to his debate with Mr. McCalla “in proof” of his true position on this subject. What was his position in that debate? It was this: “Paul’s sins were really pardoned when he believed, and formally pardoned when he was baptized”—pardoned in the Father’s heart when Paul’s heart changed through faith and repentance; pardoned in law when he was baptized. And, by way of further explanation, Mr. Campbell adds: “A man is *virtually, or in heart, in the new covenant and entitled to its blessings when he believes and repents*; but not formally nor in fact justified or forgiven till he puts on Christ in baptism.”

He then further adds: “That some of my brethren, with too much ardor, through the force of strong feeling, and without all the premises before them, have transcended this view and these bounds, and given to baptism an undue eminence—a sort of pardon-procuring, rather than a pardon-certifying and enjoying



efficacy, I frankly admit; but such has never been my reasoning nor my course."

It is to enter a protest against this tendency to give to baptism "*a sort of pardon-procuring rather than a pardon-certifying and enjoying efficacy,*" that this and the next preceding chapters are written.

Two years later, in the *Harbinger* for 1842, beginning with page 145, is to be found an interchange of views on this subject between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Broadus, a distinguished Baptist minister of Virginia. This correspondence serves to throw much light upon the question of Mr. Campbell's views, at that time, concerning the distinction he made in 1823 between real and formal remission of sins; and as to whether his mind had undergone any change on this subject. We quote a paragraph from each bearing directly on this point. Mr. Broadus says:

"It behooves me, in defining my position, to state my own view of baptism for remission of sins; for surely *there is a sense* in which remission of sins is connected with baptism. (Acts 2:38 and 22:16.) Well, then, I first prove that the sins of a believer—of every true believer, are actually remitted. I do not here go into the argument; but only refer to the testimony of our Lord, before quoted—'*he is passed* from death unto life.' Now, this being the case, the actual remission of sins cannot be suspended on the performance of a subsequent act—*baptism*, for instance; and in whatever sense remission of sins is to be considered as

connected with this act, that sense, of course, must be such as will not conflict with the fact already established—actual remission through faith in Christ. Is there then a sense in which it may be taken in accordance with this fact? There is such a sense; and that is, to consider baptism as the *visible certificate*—the *sensible pledge* of remission—the *formal* washing away of sins. And thus, that which had invisibly taken place, is now visibly declared or manifested.”

In a paragraph on pages 148, 149, Mr. Campbell makes direct reply to this as follows:

“We agree that there is an ‘ACTUAL and a *formal* remission of sins.’ This is the doctrine contended for in the first promulgation of baptism for the remission of sins made in the current reformation. See my debate with Mr. McCalla on that subject in 1823. It is there, perhaps, where this distinction is expressly stated, and formally drawn out for the first time in the pending controversy. It is true I never altogether liked the phraseology. It was the best I could then think of; and if properly defined, is, in my judgment, admissible. But I have seen it much abused, and perhaps a term less liable to abuse might be preferred to it.”

Let us now note some points in these statements of Mr. Campbell:

1. He declares himself in accord with Mr. Broadus—“that there is an actual and a formal remission of sins.” And he does this in a very emphatic and significant way—capitalizing the word ACTUAL as the more important, and italicising the word *formal*. He not only adheres to this distinction between real and formal re-

mission, but he claims to be the originator of this distinction, and refers to the McCalla debate in 1823 as the time when it was "first promulgated in the current reformation." He thus seeks to defend and maintain his consistency and his persistency in this distinction.

2. He says that while he "never altogether liked the phraseology" employed, yet if "properly defined" the distinction is "admissible."

No receding then from the *distinction* between "real" remission of sins before baptism and "formal" remission in baptism. These declarations were made, bear in mind, in 1842, just one year preceding his famous debate with Mr. Rice.

3. Mr. Campbell gives as the reason why a different "phraseology" might be preferred that he had "seen it much abused." Just what abuse he refers to here I am not sure; but I suppose it is to the same abuse Mr. Rice made of it in his debate with Mr. Campbell, claiming that inasmuch as there was conceded a real forgiveness in the mind of God, on the grounds of the sinner's penitent trust in Christ, therefore there was no value or necessity to be attached to a formal forgiveness in law. It was this very neglect and abuse of the "ordinances of Christianity" that Mr. Campbell had committed himself to reform. The abuse, by Mr. Rice, of

Mr. Campbell's "phraseology," employed in making this important and scriptural distinction, will appear for consideration in another section.

4. Mr. Campbell suggests that "perhaps a term less liable to abuse might be preferred to it." He is not sure of this—"perhaps," he says, and further on, in the same article suggests the term "provisional" instead of actual. This would give us the terms PROVISIONAL and *formal* remission, which still maintains the distinction between that favor that comes to the sinner prior to baptism, and that which comes to him in baptism.

Of course all God's promises are provisional. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved"—*provisionally*; yet when he believes, he is morally in a saved state, though he may forfeit it by subsequent disobedience. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," *provisionally*; yet when he is baptized he is legally in a saved state, though he may forfeit it by subsequent disobedience. To be in a saved state is to be forgiven in some sense. "He that believeth not is condemned already"—is not in a saved state, either morally or legally. The reader may agree with Mr. Campbell that the term "provisional" is "per-

haps less liable to abuse” than the term actual, or he may not.

The writer of these lines could suggest a different “phraseology” himself to express this distinction. Instead of saying, “Paul’s sins were really pardoned when he believed, and formally pardoned when he was baptized,” it might be said, Paul’s faith placed him in a *moral state of acceptance* with God, and his baptism placed him in a *legal state of acceptance*, and that “*plenary remission of sins*,” as Mr. Campbell elsewhere expresses it, was the result? Is there anyone who will deny this?

We thus find that Mr. Campbell’s attitude in 1842, the year prior to his debate with Mr. Rice, was the same on this question that it was in 1823. The time for any change in his views on this subject before that event is growing very short. But let us now hear from him again even later on and only a few months before the Rice debate. That debate occurred in November, 1843. In the June number of the *Harbinger* for that year, beginning with page 265, Mr. Campbell publishes another article from Mr. Meredith, the Baptist minister and editor of North Carolina, with the utterances of which Mr. Campbell declares himself to be in full accord. In the article referred to Mr. Meredith makes a very strong and scriptural argument for

the place of baptism in its relation to salvation in the Christian system. He contends earnestly that according to the gospel of Christ remission of sins is connected with and incomplete without baptism. Here him:

“We are, therefore, unauthorized to say that any one is forgiven, or even that he is a true believer, until he has yielded a voluntary and sincere compliance with the provisions of the gospel, by putting on his Lord in baptism. That a person may not be forgiven, in some sense of the expression, before this final and sealing act of compliance, we do not affirm. But that he cannot justly apply the promise to himself, as a Christian man, and on Christian principles, is a position which, in our view, cannot be fairly disputed.”

This is found on page 267. Again on page 268 he writes:

“That a person may not believe before baptism we do not affirm, of course, because a presumable faith is required to precede baptism, in the order of time. Nor do we affirm that a believer may not be, *de facto*, forgiven before baptism. But we say that the sinner can constitutionally lay claim to neither faith nor remission, until he has taken the oath of allegiance which is implied in the great sealing ordinance of the New Testament.”

And then after quoting a number of Scripture texts connecting faith and baptism with remission and salvation, Mr. Meredith says of them:

“The meaning, we apprehend, was this—that faith and baptism were prominent and indispensable parts of the

Christian system—that both were enjoined by the highest authority—that both were indispensable to remission on gospel principles, and in conformity to gospel provisions—that he who complied in full had right to appropriate to himself the promise of salvation—and that he who did not thus comply, could be entitled to no such privilege.”

Let us now gather up the points in these extracts:

1. A man cannot *claim* forgiveness until he is baptized.

2. A man cannot *claim* to be a “true believer” until he is baptized.

3. A man may be forgiven *before* he is baptized in some sense.

4. A man may have faith in some sense *before* he is baptized.

5. A man is not a “Christian man on Christian principles,” until he is baptized.

6. A man who “complies *in full* has a right to appropriate the promise.”

In short, baptism is necessary before a man can “claim” to be a believer, before he can “claim” to be forgiven, before he can “claim” to be a Christian “in full;” although he may be a believer in his own heart, although he may be forgiven in God’s heart, and although he may be a Christian, both in his own heart and in God’s heart before baptism.

These are identically the views of Alexander

Campbell as has been repeatedly and variously shown throughout this discussion. Now hear Mr. Campbell's cordial endorsement of these sentiments, *Harbinger* for June 1843, page 265:

“I have no exception to take to the view of baptism given in this essay. It fully delineates our views. We have never gone further on this subject than he has gone in this essay and in the one that precedes it. . . . I again say that I *ex animo* subscribe to the doctrine of baptism as now set forth by our friend Meredith.”

Thus stood Mr. Campbell in June, 1843.

#### IN HIS DEBATE WITH RICE.

The debate between Alexander Campbell and N. L. Rice was held in Lexington, Ky., in the autumn of 1843. Mr. Campbell was then fifty-five years old. He had been a conspicuous figure in religious society as preacher, writer and reformer for twenty-five or thirty years. His views on all important points of Christian doctrine were, it is to be presumed, thoroughly established. The discussion was entered into with great caution and deliberation on both sides. One whole year was consumed in arranging propositions and preliminaries for the debate. The correspondence that brought about the debate was all published with the debate. This correspondence serves to throw



much light on the attitude of the disputants toward the topics discussed. There were six propositions considered in the debate. We are at present to deal with but one of these, and that is the following: "*Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins.*" The question is now and here raised, in as emphatic a form as we can make it—What did Mr. Campbell mean when he affirmed that proposition? Did he mean, in the broad, unlimited, unqualified sense, as a certain school of thinkers in our own ranks now teach, that baptism is for both the real and formal remission of sins? Did he mean that there is no remission of sins, *in any sense*, before baptism; or did he mean that baptism is the outward, formal, legal act of obedience that completes the process of our transition from the world, and our induction into the kingdom of Christ? Did he mean anything different from his declaration on this subject in his debate with Mr. McCalla, twenty years before, in which he held that "Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed—*formally pardoned* when he was baptized?"

Did he mean anything different from his utterances just the year before, in his answer to Mr. Broadus, referred to in the next preceding section, where he said:

"We are agreed that there is an 'ACTUAL

and a *formal* remission of sins' ”—placing the word actual in capitals and the word formal in italics, quoting the phrase “*actual and formal remission of sins*” from Mr. Broadus—and then adding, “This is the doctrine contended for in the first promulgation of baptism for the remission of sins made in the current reformation. See my debate with Mr. McCalla on that subject in 1823”—did he mean anything different from this?

In direct and unequivocal answer to all these questions it is here affirmed that Mr. Campbell's position on this subject in his debate with Mr. Rice, in 1843, was precisely the same that it was in 1823.

We now undertake to make good this assertion. Let it be understood, however, that while Mr. Campbell always held to the idea that baptism is for the “formal” remission of sins, he held and taught that this was a very important point in Christian doctrine and practice. A capital point he made before the world in his plea for reformation was that the “ordinances” of Christianity were neglected; that they had been relegated to an unimportance wholly incompatible with the sacred Scriptures. In the correspondence preliminary to his debate with Mr. Rice Mr. Campbell says, page 17:

“Allow me, then, to say that the three great topics which have occupied public attention for some twenty-five years, so far as our purposed reformation is concerned, are:

- “1. The ordinances of Christianity.
- “2. The essential elements of the gospel itself.
- “3. The influence of human creeds as sources of alienation, schism and partyism in the church.”

The correspondence prior to this debate shows that Mr. Campbell was anxious to make an issue with Mr. Rice on the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper, but failed to do so, the Presbyterians conceding that the weekly observance was legitimate and not unscriptural.

But let us direct our attention now to the single point of Mr. Campbell's attitude on the design of baptism in this debate.

The simple fact that Mr. Campbell affirmed that “*Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins*” proves nothing on the special point of the present investigation, for the reason that whenever it was proved by the Scriptures that baptism was for either real or formal remission, the proposition was sustained. Mr. Campbell did not choose at that time to make the distinction. It was not important for him to do so. He affirmed that baptism was for the remission of sins; and he proved it clearly by scriptural arguments that have never been answered. In the meanwhile, his opponent proved just as clearly from the Scriptures that sins are re-

mitted without and independent of baptism. Mr. Campbell complained that Mr. Rice did not follow him and answer his arguments. Mr. Rice could not do it. Nor could Mr. Campbell answer Mr. Rice's arguments. His failure here is as patent as Mr. Rice's failure. When Mr. Campbell quoted the Scripture, "be baptized for the remission of sins," Mr. Rice could not answer; and when Mr. Rice quoted the Scripture, "he that believeth is not condemned," Mr. Campbell could make no reply. And all this for the simple reason that one passage refers to formal remission and the other to real remission.

Did Mr. Campbell have any mental reservations on this subject in his discussion of this question? Did he understand that there was a real pardon on the ground of faith in Christ, and yet that there was a formal remission in law, that was of vital importance; and that it was to make this appear that he affirmed that "baptism is for the remission of sins?" We assert that he did; and trust to the debate for the proof of the facts. The preliminary correspondence shows that they had much difficulty in formulating the propositions to the satisfaction of both parties. It looked several times during the year's correspondence that the debate would fail because of their inability to

agree on the exact wording of the propositions. The first proposition which Mr. Campbell submitted on the design of baptism was as follows: "You affirm that there is no indispensable connection between baptism and the remission of sins, in any case; we affirm that there is."

Notice the careful, cautious wording of the proposition—"We affirm that there is an indispensable *connection* between baptism and the remission of sins"—simply a "*connection.*" This verbiage indicates a mental reservation, beyond doubt. And then, on page 15, he submits another proposition on the same subject, still more thoughtfully and cautiously worded: "There is a scriptural connection of some sort between baptism and the remission of sins of a believing penitent"—"scriptural connection *of some sort.*" This guarded, limited way of speaking of the design of baptism is characteristic of Mr. Campbell's writings; but not characteristic of the writings of some other men, who have very inadequate and superficial views of Mr. Campbell's teachings on this subject, and of scriptural teaching as well.

In this correspondence prior to the debate Mr. Campbell distinctly states that he stands ready to defend what he teaches and practices. "I will defend what I teach and practice, in

plain and definite propositions," is his language.

The eyes of our understanding will be still further opened on this subject by the third proposition he offers on the design of baptism, which is as follows: "Personal assurance of the remission of past sins, to a believing penitent, is the chief design of baptism; or, if you prefer it, *baptism is for the remission of sins.*"

It is impossible to mistake the meaning of Mr. Campbell here. When he says "baptism is for the remission of sins" he means, "the chief design of baptism is personal *assurance* of the remission of past sins." If I buy a piece of property by positive contract and stipulations it is mine in equity, and the deed, which is executed to me afterwards, is the formal "assurance" in law of my ownership. So Mr. Campbell held that baptism is the "assurance" *in law* of that "*real pardon*" granted to every "believing penitent"—*baptism is the deed to his remission of sins.*

And that Mr. Campbell was clear in his own mind, and bold and confident in taking this position, is made most manifest in the following paragraph of this correspondence, page 28: "Christian baptism is designed to confer personal assurance of the remission of sins on every legitimate subject; or, *Christian baptism is for*

*the remission of past sins.* This is my doctrine on the subject, and this I will defend. You may use all that I have written upon the subject, if you please; but such is the concentrated view which I propose.”

Here Mr. Campbell not only makes it clear that he holds to the doctrine of “baptism for remission” *in a sense* only, in a *limited way*, but he opens wide the door of investigation into all his writings, for his opponents to prove the contrary. And yet, we have preachers by the score in our own ranks who stand side by side with our religious opponents and quote the same passages from Mr. Campbell’s writings to prove that he held to “baptism for the remission of sins” in an *unlimited sense*, Mr. Campbell’s protests to the contrary notwithstanding!

Additional light may yet be thrown on Mr. Campbell’s idea of the design of baptism by still another form in which he presents his proposition in this correspondence, page 39: “That to a proper subject, baptism is for induction into the Christian covenant, or for the remission of sins.” It will be seen that all along Mr. Campbell wanted an *explanatory clause* connected with the statement, “baptism for the remission of sins.” Why did he want this? Because he held to “baptism for the remission of sins” only in a qualified way. As

he expressed it in 1840, in his allusions to Mr. Meredith: "It was always alleged by us that *'in a given sense, and under certain limitations, and for certain ends,* remission has been connected with baptism.' We never went further than this; our opponents said we did, but no man can show from our own language that we have ever transcended the words above quoted from Mr. Meredith."

We are now prepared to consider this subject in the light of Mr. Campbell's utterances during his debate with Mr. Rice.

It has already been made clear, beyond controversy, that, up to his opening speech, in his debate with Mr. Rice in 1843, Alexander Campbell held to the doctrine of "baptism for the remission of sins" only "in a sense," "with limitations" and for "certain ends." These are his own expressions. It now remains for us to look into that debate and ascertain whether Mr. Campbell maintained that same attitude then and there. When he stood up before the public to affirm and to prove by the Scriptures that "*Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins,*" did he mean that it is for the "formal remission" of sins? Without hesitation it is affirmed that he did. Did he still adhere to the position he took, twenty years before, in his debate with Mr. McCalla, that "Paul's



sins were *really* pardoned when he believed?" We affirm that he did. To the task of making good these declarations let us now look.

On page 439 Mr. Campbell says:

"Our sixth argument is drawn from the words uttered in the ears of Paul by a messenger specially called and sent to him from the Lord. . . . Paul had inquired of the Lord what he should do. The Lord commissioned Ananias to inform him. He went to Paul's room and commanded him to rise, be baptized and wash away his sins. Now the washing away of his sins was certainly to be accomplished through the water of baptism, according to the language of the highest authority in the universe. Jesus Christ had so commanded. Neither his faith nor his repentance had washed away his sins, in the sense of the precept of the Messiah."

To a man seeking honestly and fearlessly after truth there can be no difficulty in understanding this argument of Mr. Campbell. He says:

"Neither Paul's faith nor his repentance had washed away his sins in the sense of the *precept of the Messiah*." What precept of the Messiah? Hear Mr. Campbell: "Now the washing away of his sins was certainly to be accomplished through the water of baptism, according to the language of the highest authority in the universe. Jesus Christ had *so commanded*." Commanded what? Commanded him to *rise, be baptized and wash away his sins*."

There is "the precept of the Messiah," given

through Ananias. This, says Mr. Campbell, is "the language of the highest authority in the universe." Again he says, "Jesus Christ had so commanded."

But, again, when Mr. Campbell says, "Neither his faith nor his repentance had washed away his sins *in the sense* of the precept of the Messiah," he implies that Paul's faith and repentance *had* washed away his sins *in some other sense*. If not why should he say "*in the sense* of the precept of the Messiah?" Why not say, in the style of some preachers, "Paul's sins were not washed away *in any sense* until he was baptized." Simply because Mr. Campbell held now, in this debate with Mr. Rice, just as he did in his debate twenty years before with Mr. McCalla that "Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed; yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no *formal* acquittal, no *formal* purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism."

And, again, he says, "When Ananias said to Paul, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord,' I suppose Paul believed him and arose and was baptized, and washed away his sins. When he was baptized he must have believed that his sins were *now* washed away *in some sense* that they were not before. For if his sins had been

already *in every sense* washed away, Ananias' address would have led him into a mistaken view of himself both before and after baptism." Mr. Campbell can never be understood or correctly represented as to the design of baptism without that phrase, "*in a sense.*"

We do not forget his declaration in his correspondence with Mr. Meredith, in 1840,—“We never went further than this. Our opponents said we did; but no man can show from our own language that we have,” etc.

The way is now clear for another quotation from Mr. Campbell, in his debate with Mr. Rice, in which he positively reaffirms his position in the McCalla debate. Let us hear him. Page 472:

“Some twenty years ago, when preparing for a debate with Mr. McCalla, I put myself under the special instruction of four evangelists, and one Paul, of apostolic rank and dignity. I had for some time before that discussion been often impressed with such passages as Acts 2:38; and that providential call to discuss the subject with Mr. McCalla compelled me to decide the matter to my entire satisfaction. Believe me, Sir, then I had forgotten my earlier readings upon the subject; and upon the simple testimony of the Book itself, I came to a conclusion alleged in that debate, and proved only by the Bible, which now appears from a thousand sources to have been the catholic and truly ancient and primitive faith of the whole church.”

Attention is called to some explicit state-

ments of Mr. Campbell in this quotation. He says this call to debate with Mr. McCalla, "*compelled me to decide the matter to my entire satisfaction.*" What matter? The design of baptism. And how did he decide it? "*I came to a conclusion alleged in that debate.*" What was that conclusion? That "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed and *formally* remitted when he was baptized."

If there is any meaning in words, evidently Mr. Campbell now advocates the same views on the design of baptism that he promulgated in his debate with McCalla in 1823. As additional proof of this the following paragraph on page 508, of his debate with Rice, is submitted: "In answer to some things said here and elsewhere, against our connecting baptism and salvation, in almost any sense, and on the supposed interference between this doctrine of the assurance of remission through baptism and justification by faith, I shall read," etc.

Two points stand out clearly in this paragraph:

1. That he connects baptism and salvation only "*in a sense*"—the same cautious manner of limiting his meaning as observed elsewhere.

2. That, taken in this "sense," there is no "interference between this doctrine of the *assurance of remission through baptism*, and *justi-*

*fication by faith*”—no interference between the ideas of “real” forgiveness on the moral grounds of faith, and “formal” pardon on the grounds of a legal act of obedience.

In this debate Mr. Campbell quotes extensively from Calvin and then declares himself in accord with Calvin on the relation of baptism and the remission of sins. He gives this from Calvin. Page 521.

“Why then did Ananias say to Paul, ‘Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sin,’ if sins are not washed away by the efficacy of baptism itself? I answer, we are said to receive or obtain that which our faith apprehends as presented to us by the Lord, whether at the time that he first declares it to us, or when by any subsequent testimony he affords us a more certain confirmation of it. Ananias, therefore, only intended to say to Paul, ‘That thou mayest be assured that thy sins are forgiven, be baptized: for in baptism the Lord promises remission of sins; receive this and be secure.’”

Then Mr. Campbell says: “I agree with Calvin, as I understand him. We receive remission of sins in anticipation through faith, as Cornelius did; and with a clear assurance and solemn pledge through baptism.” And after quoting still further from Calvin—“By baptism God promises remission of sins, and will certainly fulfill the promise to all believers,” etc., he again says:

“I believe that when a person apprehends the gospel and embraces the Messiah in his soul, he has in anticipa-

tion received the blessing. His mind finds peace in the Lord. 'He rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' He anticipates the end of his faith—his actual emancipation from sin. In his heart he dies unto sin, and by his burial and resurrection with the Lord, he *formally* receives what was at first received by faith in anticipation."

Now Mr. Campbell knew very well that Calvin, like himself, held to the idea of "real" remission on the ground of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And the gist of this whole matter of his agreement with Calvin he expresses in the following sentence which he quotes and italicizes:

"Through baptism we are said to receive that which our faith apprehends as presented to us by the Lord, *'whether at the time that he first declares it to us, or when by any subsequent testimony he affords us a more certain confirmation of it.'*"

Plainly, then, they both maintain that sins are "first declared" forgiven when we believe, but by the "subsequent testimony" of baptism we receive "more certain confirmation of it." Baptism is the completion of the process, the fulfillment of the law of pardon begun in faith, and perfected in the overt act of obedience to the forms of law.

These facts serve to give a clear and satisfactory interpretation of Mr. Campbell, on page 557, where he says, "Peter inseparably con-

nected repentance and baptism as necessary to a plenary remission of sins.”

Why did he say “*plenary* remission”? Simply because that, while he held that a man’s sins are “really pardoned when he believes,” yet it had been appointed that baptism should be observed as an “assurance” of “formal” remission; and this “formal” and “real” pardon, in his view taken together, constituted “*plenary remission of sins.*” No other explanation of his use of this term, in this connection, appears possible to us.

But there are yet some other points to be noticed before we are done with this debate with Mr. Rice.

The immediate point of investigation now before us is to determine whether Mr. Campbell maintained the same position in his discussion with Mr. Rice that he assumed in his debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823, in regard to remission of sins. In further proof of the fact that he did, attention is called to Mr. Campbell’s bold announcement, made and repeated over and over again, that he stood on this subject side by side with all the great Protestant teachers and leaders. As an example of his repeated utterances on this point the following is given

“Let it be remembered then, that in addition to the arguments offered from the Scriptures, we have all the Greek and Latin fathers, without one exception the two great founders of Protestantism, the Westminster divines, and the Scotch Confession of Faith, down to the present century. The present century is really retrograding in the understanding and veneration of the ordinances, both of the communion and of the rite of initiation. America is behind the age, behind Christendom, on this subject.” Page 471.

With reference to this extract we note, 1. That Mr. Campbell claims to have all the Greek and Latin fathers, and all the great authorities of Protestantism with him in affirming that “baptism is for the remission of sins.” Now no man knew better than Mr. Campbell that the “Greek and Latin fathers,” and the “great founders of Protestantism” did not hold to “baptism for remission of sins,” in precisely the same “sense.” Yet he says they both sustain him. Sustain him in what? Why, simply in affirming that “baptism is for the remission of sins.” In what “sense” they each hold to this is another question. This shows clearly that when Mr. Campbell affirmed in that debate that “baptism is for the remission of sins,” he affirmed it in a *general way* as the Scriptures affirm it, as the fathers affirm it, and as the founders of Protestantism affirm it. The “sense” in which each of these parties holds to it is another question to be deter-



mined on other grounds than the simple affirmation of the proposition. Hence, when Mr. Campbell introduced the declaration of Peter, "be baptized for the remission of sins," the question immediately arose, in what "sense" does the apostle hold to this, in what "sense" does Mr. Campbell hold to it, and in what "sense" does Mr. Rice hold to it? The fact, however, that Peter's command, "be baptized for the remission of your sins," is in the same words as Mr. Campbell's affirmative proposition, "baptism is for the remission of sins," gave direct support to Mr. Campbell, and gave him an immense advantage in the discussion. Mr. Campbell was wise enough to foresee all this; and he was wise enough also to foresee that all the Greek and Latin fathers, and all the great founders of Protestantism used the identical language of his proposition, and that this gave strength to his position. All this, too, regardless of the question, in what "sense" did these several parties hold to "baptism for the remission of sins"? The question then of Mr. Campbell's meaning here has to be determined by other considerations.

The second item noteworthy in the foregoing quotation from Mr. Campbell's speech is that he says, "America is behind the age, behind Christendom," and that "the present

century is really retrograding in the understanding and veneration of the ordinances, both of the communion and of the rite of initiation." From this it is plain to be seen that Mr. Campbell is aiming at a "restoration" of Christianity in "*letter* and spirit" as he was wont to put it. He repeatedly said to Mr. Rice that he (Mr. Rice) was not in harmony with his own creed on this subject, while he, Mr. Campbell, was in harmony with it. And he made many quotations from various Protestant authorities explaining *specifically this limited* "sense" in which "baptism is for the remission of sins," and declared himself in harmony with this view of the subject. It is by gathering up these various and numerous declarations of Mr. Campbell that we are made to understand him on this question. And this is our present task.

Some facts may here be noted with propriety:

1. Mr. Campbell was never slow to change his mind on any important question when valid reasons existed for such change.

2. He was not reluctant to proclaim to the world his change of position and to defend his attitude at any time.

3. He did declare in unmistakable terms, in 1823, in his debate with Mr. McCalla that, "Paul's sins were *really* pardoned when he be-

lieved, and *formally* remitted when he was baptized.”

4. He never announced to the world any change of his position on that subject.

5. He did declare in his debate with Mr. Rice, impliedly, that he had not changed. Hear him:

“The gentleman has sought to entangle this subject by making out inconsistencies between my present views and my former writings. Whenever the time comes that it becomes my duty to defend myself on that account, I shall be forthcoming, I hope. One thing I can say, in all conscience, that I feel myself prepared to sustain every prominent view that I ever published on the subject of the Christian religion.”

6. That Mr. Campbell’s position on remission of sins was among his prominent issues, if not the most prominent issue he made with the religious world of his day, is a well known fact.

7. Mr. Campbell frequently, as has been shown, referred to his position taken in 1823, in his McCalla debate, always reaffirming his position there taken.

8. Mr. Rice made the square issue with him of inconsistency or of change of position, by reading from the McCalla debate Mr. Campbell’s declaration, “Paul’s sins were really pardoned when he believed and formally remitted when he was baptized.” He emphasized this in such a way as to make the occasion

imperative for Mr. Campbell to state that his views on this point had undergone a change, if such was the fact.

Referring to Mr. Campbell he said: "He declared his belief that Paul's sins were *really pardoned when he believed*. He does not profess to have changed his views on this subject." And among other impertinences he offered to "shake hands" with Mr. Campbell over this sentiment, and have "something like Christian union."

Why did Mr. Campbell not stop all this *ad captandum* by saying, "That was twenty years ago, Mr. Rice, and my views have changed on that subject?" Simply because his views had not changed. Why did he not shake hands with Mr. Rice on the proposition that, "Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed?" Because he held that in addition to that, "baptism was for the remission of sins"—the "formal" remission; and was there to affirm that, and to make it good. "The present century," he says, "is really retrograding in the understanding and veneration of the *ordinances*." And he had said in the preliminary correspondence of the debate, "The three great topics which have occupied public attention for some twenty-five years, so far as our proposed re-

formation is concerned, are the *ordinances* of Christianity," etc.

To this task he had committed himself, and to this purpose he held himself steadily, throughout the discussion of this proposition without being diverted by Mr. Rice's imaginary inconsistencies.

We are to bear in mind, in connection with all this, that it was distinctly understood, in the preliminary arrangements for this debate, that Mr. Rice was to use Mr. Campbell's writings, and to hold him responsible for his previous utterances. On the part of Mr. Rice it had been said, "We reserve, of course, the right to explain the meaning of the questions by your publications." And Mr. Campbell had said, "You may use all that I have written upon the subject, if you please." Could Mr. Campbell have said that, if he knew his mind had undergone a change on the subject of "baptism for the remission of sins?"

With considerable care we have examined Mr. Campbell's utterances in the Rice debate, in order to determine his real attitude on the design of baptism. If there is any reliance to be placed on language, and any on logic, we certainly have found him, throughout that discussion, precisely where he stood in 1823—"Paul's sins were really pardoned when

he believed, and formally pardoned when he was baptized.”

We now raise the question pointedly,—What reasons have ever been adduced to prove that Mr. Campbell changed his mind on this subject and abandoned that position?

In making answer to that question, attention is called to the following facts:

1. As mentioned before, Mr. Campbell never *avowed* any change of views on this subject. But he did avow himself ready to defend and maintain “every prominent view” he “ever published on the Christian religion.” And this was said in reply to Mr. Rice’s charge of “inconsistency” or “change” of views on this very subject.

2. The fact that Mr. Campbell *did* give great emphasis to the idea of remission in baptism, while he did *not* thus emphasize the idea of forgiveness on the ground of faith, does not prove that he abandoned the latter. The reason for his course in this is evident, as before stated. There was no necessity for his contending for “real pardon.” The religious world generally accepted that doctrine. But there was necessity that the doctrine of “formal pardon” in baptism should be advocated, explained and defended: that “baptism for the

remission of sins" should be set before the world in its true light and importance.

3. But the fact that Mr. Campbell used such *strong language* in advocating "baptism for remission;" that he dwelt upon it with such *great emphasis*, is held to show that he had abandoned the idea of "real pardon" prior to baptism. To put this whole thing in a nutshell, and expose the futility of that argument, we here place two declarations of Mr. Campbell side by side—two declarations made in the McCalla debate—made at the same time and place, as follows:

"The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. *Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed; yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no formal acquittal, no formal purgation of his sins until he washed them away in the water of baptism.*"—*McCalla Debate*, Page 135.

"He appointed baptism to be, to every one that believed the record given of his Son, a formal pledge on his part of that believer's personal acquittal or pardon: *so significant and so expressive*, that when the baptized believer rises out of the water, is born of water, enters the world a second time, he enters it *as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel*. His conscience is purged from guilt, his body is washed with pure water, even the washing of regeneration."—*McCalla Debate*, Page 137.

Now, if the strong expressions of Mr. Campbell, in favor of "baptism for remission," uttered in after years, prove that he had abandoned the

idea of "real pardon" prior to baptism, then the strong expressions above (and he never uttered any stronger) prove that he did not hold it *in the very hour in which he uttered it*.

Along this line of thought and immediately connected with it, we now refer to an ingenious effort of Mr. Rice to make it appear that Mr. Campbell had either contradicted himself, or that he had changed on the subject. On page 524 he makes a quotation from Mr. Campbell's writings in the *Christian Baptist*—a paragraph I have before noticed—as follows: "In the ancient gospel, it was first belief in Jesus; next, immersion; then, forgiveness; then, peace with God; then, joy in the Holy Spirit."

And on this Mr. Rice comments thus:

"Now observe, in the ancient gospel, we are told, it was first belief, then immersion, then forgiveness; but, in the debate with McCalla, Mr. Campbell tells us, in the case of Paul it was first faith, then real pardon, then immersion, then *formal* pardon! I leave those who can to reconcile these contradictory views."

It is remarkable that any intelligent man, any man familiar with Mr. Campbell's writings, should not be able to "reconcile" those two statements, and to see that there is nothing "contradictory" in them. And it is all the more remarkable that any intelligent man, familiar with Mr. Campbell's writings, among



the Disciples, should be under the necessity of concluding that, in this instance, Mr. Campbell had either changed his mind or was "contradictory."

In the case where he says, "It was first belief; then, immersion; then, forgiveness, Mr. Campbell was generalizing and considering forgiveness of sins in its final, full, completed sense, in its "plenary" sense, as he elsewhere expressed it; but, in the latter case, he was analyzing and separating "real" and "formal" remission. It is a fact that Mr. Campbell generally spoke of remission of sins in its "plenary" sense, when legally completed and made full in the act of baptism. But that he held to "real" remission before baptism, and to the idea that "formal" remission, in baptism, inducted into a fuller enjoyment of spiritual life is just as clear. To make this evident the reader is cited to a statement of Mr. Campbell in this debate with Rice, page 494, where, in speaking of the force of such expressions as baptized "*into* Moses," "*into* Christ," "*into* remission," "*into* one body," etc., he says, "In every instance there is a *transition* from one state, profession or place into another. The person has suffered an immersion for something into the possession or enjoyment of which he now enters, or enters *more fully than before.*" Here he repeats, in

another form, his "plenary" remission of sins.

When Mr. Campbell said, "In the ancient gospel it was first belief in Jesus, then immersion, then remission," he was speaking of remission in its comprehensive sense, as involving both "real" and "formal" remission. A case similar and parallel to this is found in his reasoning about *conversion*. It is well known to those familiar with his writings that he held that, in many instances of New Testament usage, the term conversion comprehended baptism. Where, for instance, in Acts 3:19, Peter says, "Repent therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out," Mr. Campbell contended that convert here involved baptism. And in such passages as Acts 15:19, where it reads: "My sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned (converted) unto God," he held that the whole process—faith, repentance and baptism—was comprehended.

Now, if Mr. Campbell had said, "In the ancient gospel it was first *hearing* the gospel, then *conversion*, then *remission* of sins," and afterwards in a more analytical way said, "It was first hearing the gospel, then conversion of the heart to the Lord, then real pardon, then conversion in baptism, then 'formal' and 'plenary' remission," would there be anything con-

tradictory in his two declarations? Would it prove that he had changed his mind on this subject? This is precisely the way Mr. Rice reasoned with regard to Mr. Campbell's position on "real" and "formal" remission.

In discussions Christian men sometimes seem to be striving to make the differences between opponents as great as possible, whereas they should rather seek to reduce them to as small a degree as possible. We do not hesitate to say that, in the whole range of English literature, there cannot be found better examples of mere logomachy than there is in the debate between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice on the design of baptism, and the operation of the Holy Spirit. If you eliminate from their speeches all their readings of and references to Mr. Campbell's writings, and the writings of John Calvin and a few others there will be but little left. And the differences between them appear very small. As an illustration and verification of this fact, before closing this investigation of that debate, attention is directed to a condensed and clear statement of each on the immediate point before them—the nature and design of baptism. Mr. Rice says, pages 465 and 468:

“Faith unites us spiritually to Christ, and gives us an interest in the plan of salvation; baptism is the external ordinance by which we become visibly united to him, and

bound to devote ourselves to his service. Baptism is the external sign, faith is the internal grace. The latter unites us to Christ really, the former connects with him formally; but the piety of the heart is, in the Word of God, always represented as the *great matter*. . . . There is a vast difference between the sign and seal of regeneration and regeneration itself; and between the sign and seal of remission and remission itself. The believer is first pardoned, and then receives the sign and seal. Baptism is a pledge, so to speak, that God will forgive the sins of those who comply with the conditions set forth in his Word. But the sign or seal is not the thing or document, nor essential to it."

And then on page 493 Mr. Campbell says:

"The outward act, then, is but the symbol of the transition, *inward and spiritual*, by which our souls are bathed in that ocean of love, which purifies our persons, and makes them one with the Lord. . . . All outward ordinances (*and all ordinances are outward*), prayer, praise, the Lord's Day, the breaking of the loaf, fasting, etc., have each a peculiar grace or intercommunion with Christ in them. . . . Each of these is a symbol of something more spiritual than itself. Prayer is but the embodiment of something more inward than the heart. But without these symbols spiritual life, health, comfort, can never be enjoyed. Hence, to enter into the sanctum sanctorum, the inner temple of spiritual enjoyment and Christian life, baptism is essentially necessary, preceded by a vigorous faith and genuine repentance, and fixed resolves of obeying from the heart the mandates of the Great King."

It will require both a logical and a theological genius to so diagram the foregoing sentiments of these two disputants as to make their vital differences manifest.

Nothing is more evident, we have repeatedly said, in the writings of Alexander Campbell than the fact that he believed that baptism was for the remission of sins. His deliverances on this subject are numerous and strong. He believed that the normal, scriptural way to the full and complete, or as he expressed it, "*plenary*" remission of sins, was through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and baptism into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. He held, as he said, that faith and baptism are "equally necessary" to this regular, normal induction into the kingdom of God. But did he hold that they are of equal *importance*? No man understood more clearly that there is a difference between the outward, sensible act of immersion in water, and the inward, moral, and spiritual condition of the heart that symbolizes itself in this outward act. No man understood better than Mr. Campbell the essential difference between the intrinsic value and importance of "that which is within," and "that which is without." The strong, bold declarations of Mr. Campbell in his previous writings on the design of baptism were seized upon by Mr. Rice in their debate to discount Mr. Campbell as a spiritual teacher. His religious opponents and critics have habitually done the same thing.

And in many instances his own brethren have used these same passages in his writings to support a mistaken view of his teachings, and have thus presented to the world in many cases a grotesque caricature of both Mr. Campbell's ideas and of the Christianity of the New Testament. And the persistent, dogmatic spirit which both these friends and foes have exhibited in this work of misapprehension and misrepresentation is remarkable. It is yet to be explained how these parties—these friendly and unfriendly critics—could all overlook and ignore the clear, distinct, anti-legalistic, and spiritual views that abound in his writings.

To gather together the severe denunciations of our Savior, such as “ye generation of vipers,” “whited sepulchers,” “ye hypocrites,” “how shall you escape the damnation of hell,” “ye devour widows' houses,” “the blind lead the blind;” etc.,—to array all such utterances together and overlook the other side of his teachings—his tears, his sympathy; his “Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered you;” his “Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass;” his “Father, forgive them, they know not what they do,” etc.,—to view the former without the latter would give us the legal side of Christ's nature, and a view of his righteous indignation toward sin; but upon

the whole it would be a gross perversion of truth and of character. We must take everything involved into the account for a just estimate of men. And the fact that Mr. Campbell was strong and positive in his teachings on "baptism for remission of sins" does not do away with the other fact that he held to forgiveness of sins in another sense, a moral forgiveness on the ground of the heart's penitence and trust in God. That this is so will appear in the fact that, in his debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823, while he distinctly declared that "Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed," yet at the same time and in the same connection, as before shown, he said, "Baptism is an ordinance of the greatest importance and of momentous significance. Never was there an ordinance of so great import or design. . . . The Lord said, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Again, he tells Nicodemus, 'Unless a man is born of water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Peter places baptism in the same exalted place, 'Repent,' says he, 'and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins.' Ananias said to Paul, 'Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins.' . . . Peter finishes the grand climax in praise of baptism: 'Baptism doth also now save us.' . . . I know it will be

said that I have affirmed that baptism *saves* us. Well, Peter and Paul have said so before me," etc. Now, did Mr. Campbell ever utter anything more emphatic on this topic than the above? And yet in this very same speech he says: "Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed, and formally pardoned when he was baptized." This shows that Mr. Campbell regarded this "formal" remission, obtained in the act of baptism, as a *very important* item in the Christian system; and this again explains the reason of his earnest contention over the design of Christian baptism, without renouncing his belief in the "real pardon" before baptism.

To emphasize this truth, attention is now called to a bold, clear statement of Mr. Campbell in his debate with Mr. Rice, page 519: "*I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*"

That sentence throws much light on the present inquiry we are making after Mr. Campbell's true position on the design of baptism; and especially as to whether his views had undergone any change.

Now, that Mr. Campbell held, in common with all intelligent Christian men, that real remission of sins was absolutely essential to salvation in every case, does not need to be



argued. When, then, he said, "I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case," he said, "I do not make baptism absolutely essential to real remission of sins in any case." This is the inevitable, logical conclusion. Mr. Campbell was a logician. His logical power was both intense and immense.

No baptism no remission.

No remission no salvation.

*Therefore, no baptism no salvation.*

Where is the fallacy, Mr. Campbell? "In the major premise"—"No baptism no remission?"—"*I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*"

Again, remission of sins is essential to salvation.

Baptism is essential to remission of sins.

*Therefore, baptism is essential to salvation.*

Where is the fallacy, Mr. Campbell?

"In the minor premise"—"Baptism is essential to remission of sins"—"*I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*"

Again, real remission of sins is absolutely essential to salvation in every case.

Baptism is not absolutely essential to real remission of sins in any case.

*Therefore, baptism is not absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*

Where is the fallacy, Mr. Campbell?

“No fallacy there, the premises are both true and the conclusion correctly drawn”—“*I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*”

But, Mr. Campbell, did you not teach that baptism is essential to the remission of sins, *in some sense?* “Certainly I did. Baptism is essential to the ‘*formal*’ remission of sins; and to the full and complete Scriptural idea of remission; to ‘*plenary*’ remission, as I expressed it in my debate with Mr. Rice, and in the *Christian System.*”

No “real” remission of sins, no salvation.

No “formal” remission, no real remission.

*Therefore*, no “formal” remission, no salvation.

Where is the fallacy there, Mr. Campbell? “In the minor premise—‘No formal remission no real remission.’ While baptism is essential to ‘formal’ remission, it is not essential to ‘real’ remission, and consequently not essential to salvation”—“*I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case.*”

Another question, Mr. Campbell, if you please. When you said in your *Christianity Restored*: “A man may change his views of Jesus, and his heart may also be changed towards him, but unless a change of *state* ensues,

he is still unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all Christian life and enjoyment," what did you mean? "I was emphasizing the importance of baptism for the '*formal remission of sins.*' Without this no man can become a member of the church of Jesus Christ; nor exercise any rights or privileges as such. While he is married to Christ in heart, and Christ is married to him in heart; yet, he is *legally* unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all Christian life and enjoyment.

"See my explanation of this in my reply to Mr. Broadus' criticism of that passage, in *Harbinger* for 1842, page 149, as follows:

"I have said that the unbaptized is still in an unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost state. Well, when we hear your interpretation of the matter, this formidable proposition has lost almost all its terror. For you admit that the unbaptized is formally unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, etc; for he has not a "sensible pledge" a "visible certificate," nor a "formal remission" until baptized. Now, unless a person can be formally justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, etc., when he is not formally pardoned, we are both of the same opinion on this point also, viz.—that *formally, sensibly, and visibly* the unbaptized is unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, etc., etc.' "

Then, Mr. Campbell, you always held to "baptism for the remission of sins," as you expressed it in your correspondence with Mr.

Meredith in 1840, only “in a given sense, and with certain limitations and for certain ends?”

“We never went further than this; our opponents said we did, but no man can show from our own language that we have ever transcended these words above quoted.”—*Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Page 408.

One more question, Mr. Campbell. Have not your own brethren, in some instances, misapprehended and perverted your views on this subject?

“That some of my brethren, with too much ardor, through the force of strong feeling, and without all the premises before them, have transcended this view and these bounds, and given to baptism an undue eminence—a sort of pardon-procuring, rather than a pardon-certifying and enjoying efficacy, I frankly admit; but such has never been my reasoning nor my course.”—*Harbinger*, 1840, Page 545.

“These have been most prejudicial to the cause of truth, and have given a pretext to the opposition for their hard speeches against the pleadings of reformers. . . . When any doctrine is professed and taught by many, when any matter gets into many hands, some will misuse, abuse and pervert it. This is unavoidable. We have always feared abuses and extremes.”—*Memoirs*, Page 288.

#### HIS LATER EXPRESSIONS.

In 1852 Alexander Campbell published his book on Baptism. He was then sixty-four years old. That he was, at that time, thoroughly matured and settled in his religious

views will be conceded by all. This book is a strong, condensed statement and presentation of his views on all the important issues he had made with the religious world. "CHRISTIAN BAPTISM WITH ITS ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENTS," is the title of the book.

We invite attention to some of Mr. Campbell's utterances, in this, his last work of making books, in order to show that he here expresses himself in the same general way as to the design of baptism, and its relation to remission of sins, that he did in the debate with McCalla in 1823, and continuously on down through the intervening years.

Mr. Campbell was a born theologian. His acuteness to perceive and to discriminate, and his power to grasp and to formulate thought, were of a very high order. He was strong, original and striking in his deliverances of both tongue and pen. Nor was he ever more supremely regnant, in the conscious exercise of his noble gifts, than when he recognized the distinction, so plainly set forth in the New Testament and in all authoritative Protestant literature—the distinction between that forgiveness which flows from the Heavenly Father's heart toward the returning prodigal, on the moral grounds of his repentance, and that legal remission promised, in the overt act of obedience in bap-

tism; and especially when he labeled and designated that distinction by the terms "real" and "formal" remission of sins. Mr. Campbell never let go that expression—"formal remission of sins in baptism." While the world around him would simply speak of "forgiveness of sins;" and while many of his own brethren would speak in a flippant, unqualified way of "baptism for the remission of sins," he habitually spoke of it as "baptism for the *formal* remission of sins." Let us not forget that fact; there is light here.

There is another phrase peculiar to Mr. Campbell in his writings on this subject. This has been frequently referred to before. It is the phrase, "*in some sense.*" This cautious, qualifying expression was used by him in the McCalla debate in 1823, and is current throughout his later writings. It is very significant, and marks a striking contrast between Mr. Campbell's style of handling this subject, and that of some of his own brethren.

Let us now look at some of Mr. Campbell's declarations in his book on baptism. In speaking of the phrase, "For the remission of sins," as connected with the blood of Christ, and with baptism, he says, on page 250: "It does not, however, follow that they are *in the same sense* 'for the remission of sins.' But that they are,

*in some sense*, for remission of sins, can be denied by no man," etc.

And then, on page 256, he explains in what "sense" baptism is related to remission, as follows:

"The influence which baptism may have upon our spiritual relations is, therefore, not because of any merit in the act as our own; not as a procuring cause, but merely as an instrumental and concurring cause, by which we 'put on Christ,' and are united to him *formally*, as well as in heart," etc.

The "sense," then, in which "baptism is for remission" is still, with Mr. Campbell, the "formal remission." This is precisely as he put it in 1823.

Again, on same page he says:

"Baptism is a solemn pledge and a *formal* assurance on the part of our Father, that he has forgiven all our offenses—a positive, sensible, solemn seal and pledge that, through faith in the blood of the slain Lamb of God, and through repentance, or a heartfelt sorrow for the past, and a firm purpose of reformation of life, by virtues of the great Mediator, we are thus publicly declared forgiven, and *formally* obtain assurance of our acceptance and pardon," etc.

Notice carefully Mr. Campbell's expressions, showing the "sense" in which he holds to baptism for remission—"a *formal* assurance"—"thus publicly declared forgiven, and *formally* obtain assurance."

Then on page 258 he is very definite and pointed. Hear him:

“By universal consent, baptism was understood to be a symbol of moral purification—a washing away of sin in a figure, declarative of a true and real remission—a formal and definite release of the conscience from the feeling of guilt and all its condemnatory power.”

What does he say baptism is? “A symbol of moral purification.” But what is “moral purification?” It is the remission of sins on account of faith in Christ. This “moral purification,” this “real pardon” exists first, and is then “symbolized” in baptism. Or, as Mr. Campbell expresses it in the same paragraph—“declarative of a true and real remission.” “True and real” remission first, and then “formally declared” in baptism. Hence, when Mr. Campbell says, in this same discussion, “Baptism is for the true, real and formal remission of sins,” he can only mean, baptism being the *final* act, *completes* the whole process of remission; and, as he says in another sentence, is “*declarative* of a true and real remission”—the “*formal*” is declarative of the “*real*,” or baptism is, in this “sense,” “for the true, real and formal remission of sins.”

Hence, on same page, he refers to the case of Saul thus: “Ananias said to Saul, ‘Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins.’ A most



unguarded and unjustifiable form of address, if baptism had not for its design the *formal and definite* remission of sins.”

Thus we see that Mr. Campbell began with this “formal remission” as the “sense” of baptism in 1823, and is still clinging to it in 1852.

Turn now to page 272 and read as follows:

“Baptism, according to the Apostolic Church, is both a ‘sign’ and a ‘seal’ of remission of all former sins. *In this ‘sense’ only* does ‘baptism now save us.’ ”

In a still stronger way Mr. Campbell puts this case, on same page 272, thus:

“Circumcision is said to have been, in one case at least, a *sign* and a *seal*. Baptism, *in the same sense*, and in a similar case, is also both a sign and a seal.”

What “case” was this? “And Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised” (Rom. 4:11). How is this? Abraham was first accounted justified—forgiven on the ground of faith. He then “received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith.” *First forgiven, then circumcised.*

What does Mr. Campbell say about this? “Baptism, *in the same sense*, and in a similar case, is also both a sign and a seal.” That is,

we are first really pardoned and then baptized. And our baptism is to us for the “formal” remission of sins; and is a “sign and a seal of the righteousness of faith”—the forgiveness on account of our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Or, to express it in Mr. Campbell’s own language at the bottom of page 272:

“A seal of the righteousness of faith, or the remission of all our past sins, through faith in his blood, then, and in that act, publicly expressed and confirmed.”

Now, we affirm that Mr. Campbell never more plainly and explicitly expressed himself on this distinction between real and formal remission, even in the McCalla debate.

The last public utterance of Mr. Campbell on this subject, so far as his biographer, Dr. Richardson, gives any account, was in an address Mr. Campbell made in New Orleans in 1857—an “address delivered by special request on Christian Baptism,” he says. Mr. Campbell, in writing afterwards concerning that address, says that he maintained the position, “that a *formal* remission of sins was and is the end and design of baptism.”—*Memoirs* Vol. 2, page 629.

Thus we see that it was in the end as it was in the beginning with Mr. Campbell. In 1823 he said, “Paul’s sins were *really pardoned*

when he believed, yet he had no *formal* acquittal, no *formal* purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in the water of baptism.” And in 1857 he said, “A *formal* remission of sins was and is the end and design of baptism.”

This topic will receive further elucidation under another phase of it in Chapter VII.

## VI.

### THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT.

WORDS are signs of ideas—symbols of thought. Language, oral or written, is a medium through which one intelligent being holds communion with another. Spirit is conscious, intelligent personality. The Bible contains the ideas, thoughts and will of God conveyed in written characters to man. The Holy Spirit inspired prophets, apostles and evangelists to thus communicate the divine will to human understanding. “No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” (2 Peter 1:21.) “God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son.” (Heb. 1:1.) “Which things also we speak, not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth, combining spiritual things with spiritual words.” (1 Cor. 2:13.)

We have here, then, the clear and important distinction between the “things” of the Spirit and the Holy Spirit himself. The Savior says: “The words which I speak unto you are

spirit and are life.” (John 6:63.) But this is metaphorical language. Words are not spirit, nor are words life. As signs of ideas they have an influence on spirit and they have an effect on life. One spirit through the medium of language can arouse another spirit to feeling and move another life to action. And the degree of this influence depends on the nature of the subject treated, and the force with which it is presented to the receiving mind. Christ “spoke as one having authority.” “No man ever spake like this man.” His themes of life and immortality, of duty and destiny, of time and eternity, being of transcendent importance, and he being master of his themes, no wonder that he should say: “The words which I speak unto you are spirit and life”—they are *potent*. And yet the great Teacher never committed his lessons to writing. He left no record of his words. He was a peripatetic, a teacher by the wayside. The task of formulating and recording his lessons of wisdom was left to his successor, the Holy Spirit.

And this brings us back to our theme—“The Word and the Spirit.” The word is a thing, the Spirit is a person. The word is material, the Spirit is immaterial. The word is the sign of ideas, the Spirit is the author of them. The word symbolizes thought, the Spirit thinks.

The word expresses feeling, the Spirit feels. The word reveals, the Spirit is the revelator. The word is the passive means, the Spirit is the active agent.

The distinction, then, between the word and the Spirit is, from every point of view, radical and vital. The Holy Spirit is a *divine* personality. The ineffable glory of the Godhead manifesting itself as Father, Son and Holy Spirit transcends our powers of comprehension, but not our powers of faith. We can apprehend and believe the sublime truth that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are the "one God," and yet officially operating and manifesting himself differently in the creation, the redemption and the glorification of man. We can apprehend what we cannot comprehend and believe what we cannot understand.

Religion, in its higher forms of thought and experience, eludes the grasp of the logical vise. Syllogisms are not to be formed and applied to matters that lie wholly in the sphere of faith. In mute reverence but implicit confidence we accept some things that we can neither measure nor weigh, neither analyze nor classify. The beauty and sweetness of childhood are seen in its unfaltering trust in its mother in all that she says and does. And the Christian's faith in God, and those spiritual verities that lie beyond

the reach of sense and demonstrative knowledge are the chief elements and adornments of his spiritual life. "Seeing him who is invisible;" "looking at the things which are not seen;" "seeing not, yet believing"—here is the beauty and the strength of our holy religion.

The development of the "one God" into Father, Son and Holy Spirit was a matter of time, of ages, of intelligence and experience on the human side. Jehovah, God, Almighty, etc., were the names applied to the Supreme Being in the earlier history of mankind. The ideas or the designations of "Father," "Son" and "Holy Spirit" rarely occur in the Old Testament Scriptures. Occasionally they are thrown out as a flash of lightning upon the dark pathway of the untutored race—untutored in spiritual ideas—and as hints of a better covenant and a brighter day. It is in the New Testament that the ideas of Father, Son and Holy Spirit are revealed in their sublime and unspeakable mysteries and glories. We are chiefly dependent upon the Bible for our knowledge upon this subject.

The Holy Spirit *operates*—operates on *matter*, operates on *mind*, operates on the *heart*. Designating his energy from the nature of the object upon which it is expended, we may say the Holy Spirit exerts a physical, an intellectual

and a moral power. Viewing the subject from the nature of the Holy Spirit himself, the energy which he expends, the power exerted in every instance is the same; it is *spiritual* power. Since he himself is spirit his power is essentially spiritual. Nor are we able to understand and explain the difference in the nature of the power put forth by the Spirit in his operations on matter and his operations on mind and on hearts. While we accept the plain Scriptural teaching on this subject, it is unwise and unprofitable to engage in speculation, for who "by searching can find out God?"

#### THE SPIRIT OPERATES ON MATTER.

In the history of creation written by Moses, in the first chapter of Genesis, we read, "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." And Job 26:13 declares, "By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens." Are these the expressions of a poetic fancy, or are they to be taken as statements of facts? If the latter, then the Spirit operated on matter. By his plastic power the primordial creation was transformed from chaos to order and beauty.

Just what kind of energy was employed by the divine Artizan and Artist we are not informed, and we presume not to say.



In Job 33:4 we read, "The Spirit of God hath made me; and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life." That power then that creates matter and imparts to it life, is here assigned to the Spirit of God.

The Holy Spirit not only gives life, but he destroys it. In Acts 5:3 we read, "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, and to keep back part of the price of the land? . . . Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God. And Ananias hearing these words fell down and gave up the ghost." Afterwards Peter said to Sapphira his wife, "How is it that you have agreed together to try the Spirit of the Lord? . . . And she fell down immediately at his feet, and gave up the ghost." We learn from this Scripture that to "lie unto the Holy Spirit," is to "try the Spirit of the Lord," and to "lie unto God." And the remarkable death of these two dissimulators was effected through this divine power—the Spirit.

The blasted fig tree is another instance of life blighted by the same Spirit of the Lord. "Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward forever. And immediately the fig tree withered away" (Matt. 21:19).

In the account of the conversion of the eunuch given by Luke, we are told that after

Philip had baptized the eunuch "The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more" (Acts 8:39). Evidently in removing Philip from the presence of his new convert to the gospel, the Spirit operated on the body of the preacher—"caught away Philip." When a child is kidnapped—"caught away" from its home and its parents, there is the exercise of physical power; and to distinguish such energy of the Spirit of God as we have been considering from that employed by him in influencing the thoughts, or the feelings of men, we call it physical power, although it is put forth by a being that is himself pure spirit—the Holy Spirit.

The translation of the bodies of Enoch and Elijah from earth to heaven would seem to belong to the same category of things. So with the healing of diseases of the body by Christ and the apostles; and the restoring to life of dead bodies. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:11). This is a crucial passage. The language is so clear and explicit as to admit of no doubt. The Spirit "dwells" in the Christian. This same Spirit shall "quicken"—make alive—our

“mortal bodies.” The same thought is again laid before us by Paul in 1 Cor. 15:51, “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, incorruptible, and we shall be changed,” the living shall be “changed,” the “dead shall be raised incorruptible.” What a mighty work! What a mighty Spirit! Spirit operating on matter—creating it, transforming it, transmuting it, translating it, animating it, and de-animating it!

Is all this difficult of belief? Why should it be? Why should it be thought an incredible thing that the “eternal Spirit” of God can operate on matter? The human spirit operates on matter. Our bodies are subject to our spirits. We command and they obey. My hand writes these lines because my spirit orders it so to do. And all our movements, all locomotion is the result of will power. Breathing is a natural, involuntary act, yet the mind orders it to stop, and it stops. The flow of saliva can be increased or decreased by concentrating the mind on that point. Digestion may be promoted or retarded, and so of the organic functions generally, by a mental effort on the part of the subject, to facilitate or obstruct the course of

nature. All intelligent physicians seek to secure the co-operation of the patient's mind with their material remedies. A pill is given to produce a certain effect. The patient earnestly desires the result, and concentrates the thoughts upon it; and this aids the material organ to respond to the material remedy. Physicians sometimes relieve patients by giving nothing but *bread* pills, relying wholly upon the operation of the patient's own mind upon his own body. So well established are the foregoing facts that there has arisen recently a school of physicians who practice medicine upon the principle of "Suggestive Therapeutics," relying largely, if not chiefly, upon the patient's own mind to so operate on his own physical constitution as to secure relief from disease. And it is this same principle extended in various directions, and to still further degree, that is employed in all these modern schools of "Divine Healing," "Faith Cure," "Mind Cure," "Christian Science," etc. That there is a residuum of truth in all of them, and a fundamental law of nature to which they must all be referred, and by which they must all be explained, no longer admits of doubt.

This power of the human spirit to operate upon material substances, and to modify the

conditions of matter, is not limited to self, to its own physical nature, its own body; but that it can thus operate upon other material substances and modify their existence is equally evident. The writer has seen his own dining table, a heavy oak structure weighing perhaps a hundred and fifty or two hundred pounds, rise bodily into the air at the bidding of six persons—my own family and two guests, and under circumstances where fraud was impossible. This levitation of matter through the influence of mind is known and practiced even by school children in many cases.

Thomas J. Hudson has written a book, "The Law of Psychic Phenomena," a book every man intelligent enough to think along these lines ought to read. It is especially commended to preachers. It is an honest and a very masterly effort made by Mr. Hudson to establish the fundamental law underlying all these modern "divine healing" fads. In doing this he has availed himself of the results, not only of his own personal experience and observation, and extensive general reading of the literature of the various subjects discussed, but of the results of scientific investigation on the part of the several organized societies of Europe and America especially bent on discovering the truth in reference to all psychic phenomena.

Without accepting all his views, it may be said that Mr. Hudson has rendered a service to the world by publishing this strong, manly, original and independent treatise, which he calls, "A Working Hypothesis for the Study of Hypnotism, Spiritism, Mental Therapeutics, etc." A few sentences from this book will occasionally be quoted in this investigation. As bearing on topics already introduced in this article, the following quotations are made:

"That there resides in mankind a psychic power over the functions and sensations of the body, and that that power can be invoked at will, under certain conditions, and applied to the alleviation of human suffering, no longer admits of a rational doubt. The history of all nations presents an unbroken line of testimony of the truth of this proposition." (Page 144.)

"The subjective mind, or entity, possesses physical power; that is, the power to make itself heard and felt, and to move ponderable objects." (Page 208.)

"The man who denies the phenomena of spiritism to-day is not entitled to be called a skeptic, he is simply ignorant; and it would be a hopeless task to attempt to enlighten him. I shall indulge in the hope, however, that by explaining the origin of the phenomena on rational principles, and thus removing them from the realm of the supernatural, those who now assume to be skeptical may be induced to investigate for themselves." (Page 206.)

In Chapter 19 of his book, Mr. Hudson gives us an account of a test he personally made in company with a friend—a test of what was called spirit phenomena, but which he

claimed could be explained upon ordinary principles of mind, force and action without the agency of disembodied spirits. On page 275 he says:

“A few years ago, a conversation which the writer had with a celebrated Union general, led to an agreement to visit a prominent slate-writing medium, then sojourning in the city of Washington. Among other things it was agreed that the general should be the sitter, and that he should be guided entirely by my suggestions relative to the course which he should pursue before and during the seance. My object, which he fully understood and appreciated, was, first, to convince him of the genuineness of the physical phenomena,—that is, that the slate-writing was performed without corporeal contact of the medium with the pencil, and without the shadow of a possibility of the employment of legerdemain; and, secondly, to demonstrate the utter impossibility of the phenomena being attributable to disembodied spirits.”

In giving a detailed account of this experiment, he says on page 279:

“The medium seized two slates, washed them, submitted them for inspection, and placed them upon the center of the table before us, with a bit of black pencil between them. He then invited us to place our hands upon the slate with him. This we did, whereupon the writing began. We could distinctly hear the pencil move with a gentle, but rapid, scratching sound. In a few minutes three raps were heard, apparently made by the pencil between the slates. This was said to be the signal announcing the completion of the message. The slates were then separated, and several messages were found inside.

“Two more slates were then seized by the medium,

washed, submitted for inspection, and placed upon the table as before. Our hands were again placed upon the slates, and the writing began. After it had progressed for a few moments, the medium announced that the spirits wanted to write in colors. He thereupon arose, walked to the mantelpiece, and produced a box of colored crayons, all in small bits, about the size of the piece of black slate pencil with which the writing had been done. We were about to open the slates to allow the insertion of the crayons, when the medium said that it was unnecessary, as 'the colors could be 'got from the outside just as well.' The box of crayons was accordingly placed beside the slate, and the writing was resumed. After a short interval the signal was given that the messages were finished. The General thereupon very carefully separated the slates, to see if there were any colored crayons concealed therein. Only the bit of black slate pencil was there, but four or five different colors had been used in writing the messages."

Concerning this test, Mr. Hudson, on page 281, writes thus:

"The conclusions which are inevitable may be summed up as follows:—The slate writing was done without physical contact with the pencil, either by the medium or any one else. It all occurred in broad daylight. The slates were not handled by the medium, except to wash them and to place his hands upon them (in all cases but one) while the writing was going on. The slates were not for an instant out of sight of the sitter during the whole seance, nor were they out of his custody during that time, after they were washed by the medium. They were then carefully inspected by the sitter, the pencil was placed between them by the sitter, they were tied together by the sitter, and opened by him after the writing was finished. In short, there was no chance for fraud or legerdemain, and there was none."



This careful experiment, Mr. Hudson says, was made for the double purpose of demonstrating the *reality* of these remarkable psychico-mental phenomena, and that they were *not produced by disembodied spirits*. The case has been introduced here to exemplify the truth that there is an occult power of the human mind which enables it to operate on material substances. Additional examples, without number, and well attested, could be gathered from the abundant literature on this subject. But this would be a superfluous task.

Now, if the spirit of man has this power, may we not easily believe the Spirit of God has it, and that my proposition is true—*The Holy Spirit operates on matter?*

#### THE SPIRIT OPERATES ON MIND.

Why not? Are not two spirits more closely allied by nature than are spirit and matter? The differences—the inherent differences between matter and spirit—create a chasm between them that cannot exist between two spirits. These differences are radical. The one is material, the other is not material; the one thinks, the other does not think; the one feels, the other does not feel; the one is self-conscious, the other is not self-conscious. If “kindred

drops mingle into one," and if "one touch of nature makes all the world akin," then we would expect two spirits to come into touch with each other, into sympathy and fellowship with each other, by a law of congeniality, with much greater facility than is possible between matter and spirit. God is the Creator of matter, but he is the "Father of spirits." And by the force of parental and filial ties of relationship; by all the tendencies of intelligent and sympathetic unity in rational and moral beings, we would expect bonds of union and communion between the Holy Spirit and the human spirit.

The Spirit of God operates on human minds—operates on them through the medium of words, of spoken and written language, and operates on them without this medium. The Holy Scriptures, the written Word of God, through which the Spirit operates on our minds, were written by men upon whose minds the Spirit operated without the medium of words. It was necessary for the Holy Spirit to touch the human mind in some way, to impart to it inspiration and thought, in order to enable it to write the Bible. Cannot the infinite Spirit of God communicate with the spirit of man without the medium of language, spoken or written? That one human mind can oper-

ate on another without the medium of words is a well established fact. To deny this is to appear ignorant. It may help us in our present investigations to consider this fact a moment. The technical term employed to designate this department of scientific thought is *telepathy*. The Standard Dictionary thus defines telepathy: "The sympathetic affection of one mind or person by another at a distance, through a supposed emotional influence and without any direct communication by the senses; thought-transference."

Mr. Hudson, after giving this subject much careful thought and patient investigation, lays down this proposition, on page 191 of his book: "There is inherent in man a power which enables him to communicate his thoughts to others, independently of objective means of communication."

And again, on page 120, he speaks plainly thus: "Suggestion is not necessarily limited to oral communication. Nor is it necessarily a communication which can be taken cognizance of by means of any of the objective senses. Telepathic communication is just as much a suggestion to the subjective mind as is oral speech. Indeed, telepathic suggestion is often far more effective than objective language."

On page 177 he continues the same subject in the following manner:

“There is inherent in mankind the power to communicate thoughts to others independently of objective means of communication. The truth of this general proposition has been so thoroughly demonstrated by the experiments of members of the London Society for Psychical Research that time and space will not be wasted in its further elucidation. For a full treatment of the subject the reader is referred to ‘Phantasms of the Living,’ in which the results of the researches of that Society are ably set forth by Messrs. Edmond Gurney, F. W. H. Meyers and Frank Podmore. It is hardly necessary to remind the intelligent reader that the methods of investigation employed by these able and indefatigable laborers in the field of psychical research are purely scientific, and their works are singularly free from manifestations of prejudice or of unreasoning skepticism on the one hand, and of credulity on the other. It is confidently assumed, therefore, that the power of telepathic communication is as thoroughly established as any fact in nature. Now, telepathy is primarily the communication of subjective minds, or rather it is the normal means of communication between subjective minds. The reason of the apparent rarity of its manifestation is that it requires exceptional conditions to bring its results above the threshold of consciousness.”

We pause here in this quotation to call attention to this last statement—“It requires exceptional conditions to bring its results *above the threshold of consciousness.*” Two human spirits then may really hold communion with each other without being conscious of the fact. The spirit of A may influence the spirit of B

without B's knowing it. May not the Holy Spirit then influence the spirit of man without man's knowing it? But we proceed with the quotation from Mr. Hudson:

“There is every reason to believe that the souls, or subjective minds, of men can and do habitually hold communion with one another when not the remotest perception of the fact is communicated to the objective intelligence. It may be that such communion is not general among men; but it is certain that it is held between those who, from any cause, are *en rapport*.”

And is it not just as certain, and just as reasonable that there will be communion between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man when they are *en rapport*—when the human spirit so adjusts itself morally to the divine government that the highways of this spiritual commerce will be open and free for the “communion of the Holy Spirit?” (2 Cor. 13:14.)

But let us hear Mr. Hudson further:

“The facts recorded by the Society for Psychical Research demonstrate that proposition. Thus, near relatives are oftenest found to be in communion, as is shown by the comparative frequency of telepathic communications between relatives, giving warning of sickness or of death. Next in frequency are communications between intimate friends. Communications of this character between comparative strangers are apparently rare.”

Numerous examples, culled from the literature of this subject, are given us in Mr. Hud-

son's book. We reproduce here only two or three to illustrate the topic we are now discussing. On page 182, Mr. Hudson says:

“There are not wanting facts to show clearly that the power exists to convey telepathic messages to sleeping persons, causing them to dream of the things that the agent desires. As long ago as 1819, Councilor H. M. Wesermann, of Dusseldorf, recorded a few experiments of his own which show this to be true. The following items are reproduced in ‘Phantasms of the Living,’ from the original article.

“*First Experiment, at a Distance of Five Miles.*—I endeavored to acquaint my friend, the Hofkammerath G. (whom I had not seen, with whom I had not spoken, and to whom I had not written for thirteen years), with the fact of my intended visit, by presenting my form to him in his sleep, through the force of my will. When I unexpectedly went to him on the following evening, he evinced his astonishment at having seen me in a dream on the preceding night.’ ”

Then follow several other similar experiments which we omit, and pass on to others of messages communicated to parties while awake. On page 185 this instance is given:

“The Rev. W. Stainton Moses was the percipient, and he corroborates the following account, written by the agent:

“‘One evening I resolved to appear to Z at some miles’ distance. I did not inform him beforehand of the intended experiment, but retired to rest shortly before midnight with thoughts intently fixed on Z, with whose room and surroundings I was quite unacquainted. I soon fell asleep, and awoke next morning unconscious of anything having taken place. On seeing Z, a few days after-

wards, I enquired, "Did anything happen at your rooms on Saturday night?" "Yes," replied he, "a great deal happened. I had been sitting over the fire with M, smoking and chatting. About 12:30 he rose to leave, and I let him out myself. I returned to the fire to finish my pipe, when I saw you sitting in the chair just vacated by him. I looked intently at you, and then took up a newspaper to assure myself I was not dreaming; but on laying it down I saw you still there. While I gazed without speaking, you faded away.'"

Two examples of this power of the human mind, culled from the circle of the writer's own personal acquaintances, will be added to the foregoing. T. R. H., a minister of the gospel, a very intelligent, cultured, Christian gentleman, now residing in the state of Iowa, and who was formerly a citizen of England, related to me the following experience in his own family. Himself, wife and one child, a grown son, constituted the family. The son had preceded the parents to America, and was residing in New York. The father and mother were still in England. After months of separation, and without any communications from the son at all calculated to awaken the mother's heart with unusual solicitude, she strangely felt that her son needed financial assistance, and insisted on her husband's sending him some money. But he, feeling that it was all a mere fancy on the part of the mother, and it not being very convenient at that time to do so, he

was inclined to waive the matter. The mother, however, was not to be put off. She insisted and persisted until the father secured a draft and enclosed it to the son. On comparing notes afterwards it was found that the son, having been disappointed in some business ventures, was in great financial straits, and was thinking of writing to his parents for assistance, and subsequently did write such a letter and took it with him to the post-office to mail. Before mailing it, however, he enquired for a letter for himself, and received his father's letter enclosing the draft. In relating the case to me the father said: "I don't know how to explain that except on the ground of mental telepathy." Were this an isolated case, we might dismiss it easily by saying it was a mere coincidence. But in the presence of so many similar, and even more pointed and remarkable instances of the transmission of thought, we incline to believe that in this case the son's intense mental anxiety and homeward thoughts were, in some way, impressed on the mother's mind, even while one was in America and the other in England.

The other case was related to me by Mrs. J. M. V., the wife of a well known preacher now residing in Missouri, and relates to her own father, to her husband and herself. At my re-



quest Mrs. V. gave to me the following written account of the incident:

“Some years ago the wonderful work of the clairvoyant was brought to my notice by the following incident. An officer was engaged in the finding of a stolen horse. After a few days of fruitless search it happened that a clairvoyant came to the town. The friends of this man jokingly suggested that he consult this noted woman as to the whereabouts of the stolen horse. Simply for the amusement there might be in it, the officer went to the clairvoyant and she located the horse for him; and as he afterwards learned, correctly too. After this was told she asked if she might not tell him something of his own life. The officer consented, and she proceeded to tell many things of his past life as accurately as though she had known him personally. Possibly what astonished the man most of all, and what seemed very remarkable, was what she told him concerning his daughter’s marriage. This man was a widower and had an only daughter on whom he had depended very much ever since his wife’s death. This daughter had lately become engaged to be married; and the father’s heart was sad at the thought of losing her. Now this wonderful mind reader told him that he was very sad and the reason was that he was about to lose his daughter. She told him how many years since his wife had died and how much this girl was to him. She told him that he was perfectly willing that she should marry, and was pleased with her choice, but the thought of giving her up made him very sad.

“She accurately described the man the daughter was to marry, telling that it would be his second marriage, giving his age, his profession, and even the date of the prospective wedding. The surprise of this officer was indeed great. Not a soul knew of this engagement save the contracting parties and the father; and lo, he found one who could read the secret from his mind.”

While it would be an easy task to multiply examples of this power of the mind; and while it would probably be interesting and instructive to at least some readers, yet these are deemed sufficient for our purpose to make it appear that there is inherent in the human mind such power. All minds do not possess it to the same degree; nor can they always exert it to the same extent. Some conditions are more favorable for its exercise than others.

Now if the finite human spirit, without understanding the philosophy of these phenomena, without being able to recognize and reduce to scientific classification the principles and laws underlying and governing them, can yet exert such power—can operate on other spirits, cannot the Holy Spirit, infinite in his understanding of the subject, operate on the minds of men? That the Holy Spirit has both the wisdom and the power adequate to such a work will not be denied.

#### HOW THE SPIRIT OPERATES ON MIND.

We have said and repeat here that the Holy Spirit operates on the mind both through the medium of words and without such medium. This subject is not without its difficulties, its obscurities and even its mysteries. How impressions made by oral words upon the

ear or by written characters upon the eye are transmitted along the auditory and the optical nerves to the brain and leap off its grayish matter into the mind—how they bridge this chasm between the material and the immaterial—how physical impressions on the brain are transmuted into thought during this leap from matter to mind—is mysterious if not mystical. The fact, however, is so obvious and so general that we do not hesitate to believe it. Is it any more difficult to believe that mental impressions and suggestions may be transmitted by the Spirit of God to the human mind—transmitted directly and without the aid of the physical nerves? A few years ago men would not have believed it possible to transmit a message in an instant across the continent by a wire. Now messages are being sent without the aid of wire.

That the Holy Spirit directly, without the intervention of words, illuminated and inspired the prophets and apostles to speak and to write the will of God concerning human affairs is accepted by all believers in the Bible. And that this influence of the Spirit in no way impaired the individual freedom and responsibility of the person inspired is equally evident.

Moving upon a lower plane than that of inspiration in its supernatural sense, may not the

Spirit operate upon the minds of men without interfering with their personal freedom and responsibility?

Are not all men conscious at times of suggestions and mental impressions pointing toward the right and inclining them toward God?—impressions which they entertain, it may be, with hospitality and to their salvation in some instances, while in other cases the suggestions are resisted and repelled without permanent good results to the subject? What grounds in reason or in revelation are there for declaring such things wholly of time and sense?—for excluding all divine agency in human affairs? Does this render the revealed word unnecessary? A man can see reasonably well without glasses, but glasses help him to see. Are we to conclude, therefore, that glasses are unnecessary because he can see without them?

Man lives in two worlds, the physical and the spiritual. He needs the Bible, the revealed, written Word of God. In this he can read the mind of God through his physical senses. He needs this as an individual by which he may measure and weigh and properly estimate all his spiritual suggestions and impressions. Men associated together in society, in religious fellowship, need the written Word through which they may find common ground for affiliation and

Christian intercourse. The unconverted world needs it. They are dominated by sense and sensible influences, and the Holy Spirit in seeking to convert and save men avails himself of the Word as the means of reaching their souls through their physical senses. All spiritual thoughts, impressions and tendencies may thus be compared with the revealed Word of God, that in the mouth of two witnesses the truth may be confirmed. He who cuts loose from the Bible and trusts only to mental impressions and his own spiritual tendencies is like a ship tossed upon the waves with uncertain port. And he who stifles and repudiates the indications and monitions of all spiritual impressions that come to him, he knows not how, and waits for the written Word in everything, will dwarf his spiritual life into the merest religious formalism. "Comparing spiritual *things* with spiritual *words*," is the only safe rule in religion.

### CONVERSION.

Let us now consider the subject of conversion. Are sinners converted by the agency of the Holy Spirit without the Word of God, without a knowledge of the gospel of salvation, as revealed in that Word? To so teach is

to release men of all moral responsibility, and to place the responsibility of non-conversion of sinners on God. To so teach is to open the way for the wildest vagaries of mysticism, superstition and fanaticism. To so teach is to reduce religion to a system of mere fatalism.

Are sinners converted by the Word of the gospel without the personal presence and agency of the Holy Spirit operating and co-operating with the Word of Truth? To so teach is to emasculate the gospel, and to propagate the most superficial theological *rot* in its stead. No man who advocates such a theory of religion can ever be respectable among Christian scholars and thinkers. To proclaim such a theory of Christianity is a libel on the New Testament and a libel on the teachings of our fathers, and the promoters of such a monstrous perversion and deformity of truth can only bring reproach and discredit upon what is otherwise the most important and the most potent religious movement since the days of Martin Luther.

The Word alone! Law alone! Nature alone! God excluded from his own government! The divine immanence lost in the divine transcendence! What a caricature of both philosophy and religion, of reason and revelation! What great Christian philosopher ever committed himself to such theological twaddle? What

great thinker or writer ever uttered such religious gibberish? Hear the Apostle Paul: "Our gospel came *not* unto you in *word only*, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance. . . . And ye became imitators of us and of the Lord, having received the Word in much affliction, with joy in the Holy Spirit." (1 Thes. 1:5, 6.)

Hear Alexander Campbell:

"I do not maintain that a person is converted by the *Word only*. I say that in conversion and sanctification the Spirit operates only through the Word, and not that a person is converted by the Word only. . . . I have, indeed, no faith in conversion by the Word without the Spirit, nor by the Spirit without the Word. The Spirit is ever present with the Word in conversion and in sanctification. . . . The legitimate point of discussion in this proposition is *not* whether the *Word operates*, but whether the instrumentality of the Word be necessary. . . . It affirms that the *Spirit of God operates*."

The foregoing extracts are taken from Mr. Campbell's speeches in the debate with N. L. Rice.

In the *Millennial Harbinger* for January, 1852, page 47, we find this language of Mr. Campbell: "I have no doubt that some of our brethren may have so expressed themselves, as if in the conversion of sinners it was all *Word* and no *Spirit*; nay, indeed, that the *Word* and *Spirit* are identical. I have on various occasions had to repudiate such an idea."

Men advocating such a sterile form of Christianity as Mr. Campbell here “repudiates” impoverish their own souls, and to the extent of their influence blight the spiritual life of all others who look to them for religious instruction. And in addition to this they bring discredit upon the brethren with whom they are ecclesiastically affiliated and upon the Church of Christ at large. If every such Apollos, “mighty in the Scriptures,” “instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the Spirit,” speaking and teaching “carefully the things concerning Jesus,” but “knowing only baptism” for remission of sins, and the Word-alone theory of conversion and sanctification; and who “speak boldly in the synagogue” their shallow views on these subjects, could providentially have some “Priscilla and Aquila hear him,” and then “take him unto them and expound unto him the way of God more perfectly,” it would be a great blessing both to him and to the world that he is to the extent of his influence so fatally misleading.

*The Holy Spirit converts sinners, and not the Word, except in a secondary and subordinate sense, as an instrument in the hands of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the agent; the Word is the instrument. “The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God” (Eph. 6:17). The sword*



does not leap out of the scabbard and do execution of itself. A thousand Bibles thrown out in heathen lands, in the language of the people, would not convert them to Christ. It requires a living ministry—a ministry *in* whom the Holy Spirit operates, and *with* whom he co-operates, in order to carry the truth along the spiritual avenues to the spiritual understanding of man. Before the Spirit was sent as the great “gift” of God to man, the Savior said to his disciples—“He abideth *with* you and shall be *in* you” (John 14:17). The Holy Spirit had been “with” men, in all ages, as had the revealed Word, *in a measure*—to the extent that their moral and spiritual civilization would admit; but he had not come as the divine guest to dwell “in” men, and to “be with them forever.” Hear the Master on this subject: “He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive; for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified” (John 7:38, 39). Not until after the resurrection and ascension of Christ, his coronation and glorification in heaven—not until the day of Pentecost did the Holy Spirit, the heavenly Guest, descend to earth in his full and final mission, to illuminate, to convert, to

sanctify and to glorify humanity. Notice that in the above Scripture there are two promises—the Spirit was to be “given” to men who “believed on Christ,” and then “from within them [the believers] shall flow rivers of living water.” The Holy Spirit, in Christian men, is to send forth his power for the conversion of others.

In the Gospel of John (16:7, 8), the Savior, speaking to his disciples concerning his ascension soon to take place, says: “It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but, if I go, I will send him unto you. And, when he is come, he will convict the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.”

In what court is this conviction to take place—the divine or human? Sinners are already convicted in the divine view. God understands fully their situation—their guilt. The conviction is evidently to take place in human *consciousness*—in the sinner’s own mind. This is conversion. By what agency is this accomplished? By the Holy Spirit. “*He will convict the world.*” This mighty agency and this mighty work began on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem, an account of which is given us in the second chapter of Acts. Pentecost was the introduction of a new era. Nothing like it had

ever transpired in the history of the world. Let us read a few verses: "And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit."

Let us now note with some care the points of interest and information in this paragraph.

1. We are made to recall the promise of the Son of God concerning the Spirit—"He is *with* you and shall be *in* you." The Holy Spirit had been "with" the disciples from the time of their call by the Savior—*with* them and working on their minds from *without*; but now they are "filled with the Holy Spirit," and he works on them from *within*. These methods of operation by the Spirit obtain universally. They are indicated all through the Scriptures. He operates from without through words, spoken or written, and by suggestions and impressions, or such other providential ways as may aid the Word in the work of "conviction." And when the sinner is converted, and his heart is opened, then the Spirit operates within him, he is "filled" with the Spirit. Hence, Paul,

(Eph. 5:18) exhorts his brethren, "Be filled with the Spirit; speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." Also in Eph. 3:14, he says, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the *inward* man."

2. We raise the question here as to the *extent* of the Savior's promises. When for example he said to the apostles concerning the Holy Spirit, "he is with *you* and shall be in *you*;" "he shall guide *you* into all truth;" "he shall declare unto *you* the things that are to come;" "he shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto *you*"—does he intend to limit these spiritual blessings to "you," the *apostles*; or is the promise, thus primarily addressed to the apostles, intended to be of a general character, and applicable to Christians as such? When the Son of God says, "Blessed are *you* when men shall reproach *you*;" "go *you* into all the world and preach the gospel;" "I will be with *you* always, even unto the end of the world," etc., he does not mean to limit these duties, privileges and bless-

ings to the parties addressed. They are the utterances of great general laws and truths for the observance and comfort of all Christians in all times. It is not meant here to deny that there were given to the apostles special prerogatives as the ambassadors of Christ; but only to suggest that these are not so numerous as some men seem to think and to teach, much to their own spiritual hurt, and to the detriment of Christianity generally. The metes and boundaries of all Christ's teachings are to be determined by the nature of the case, by the philosophy of the subject, and by the whole scope of New Testament doctrine concerning the matter in hand.

When, then, the Savior said to his disciples, "The Spirit is with you and shall be in you," he declared to them, as representatives of all disciples, a general fact of spiritual life, a fundamental truth in Christian experience, which is made clear in the general drift of Scripture teaching.

3. This pentecostal scene recalls another promise of the Lord. "Being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which ye heard from me; for John indeed baptized in water; but you shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence. . . .

You shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and all Judea and Samaria, and to the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:4-8.) In short, two things are promised—baptism of the Holy Spirit, and power of the Holy Spirit. What is the difference between being baptized in the Spirit and receiving power of the Spirit? About the same difference, I suppose, that there is between being baptized in water and receiving a wetting of the water, the one is the natural consequence of the other. Baptism is the action of the agent, and power in the subject is the result of the action. This action of the Holy Spirit is called "baptism" because of its copiousness, its abundance. It is called "power" because it enables the subject to experience and to achieve what would be impossible without this added power. The "sound" that came from heaven as a "rushing, mighty wind," and the fiery "tongues," were outward physical manifestations addressing the physical senses of hearing and seeing. These were only symbols of the divine presence, intended evidently to fix the attention of the people, and to impress them with the importance of the occasion. Whether these are to be considered as any part of the "baptism" is an open question; they certainly

constituted no part of the "power." The baptism was "*in* the Holy Spirit," and the power was *of* the Holy Spirit. The human spirit, then, is baptized *in* the divine Spirit, and the human spirit "receives power" *from* the divine Spirit.

What sort of "power" was this? It was spiritual power. It emanated from the Holy Spirit, and was imparted to the human spirit, and, as we shall see, it enabled the human spirit to impart it to other human spirits. What was the medium through which this power passed from one spirit to another? So far as we know there was no medium. If one physical body can kiss, shake hands with, and embrace another physical body without a medium, may not one spirit touch and affect another spirit without a medium? If not, why not? If this "power" was spiritual power for the reasons assigned, may we not say that the baptism was a spiritual baptism for the same reasons? One spirit is immersed in another spirit—is brought so thoroughly under the influence of another spirit—so copious is the presence and the dominating power of that other spirit that it is said to be baptized *in* that spirit. Is it not then in keeping with scriptural phraseology to say when *any* human spirit is influenced and dominated by the Holy Spirit, that it is baptized in the

Spirit? And is not this the evident meaning of John the Baptist when he said to the multitudes concerning Christ, "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit"? Notice: "He shall baptize *you*." To whom does that "you" refer? Not to the apostles; there were no apostles at that time. "You" is employed in a general sense, referring primarily to the multitudes he was addressing, and in a general way to all men over whom Christ, through the Holy Spirit, should reign. And is this not plainly the meaning of Paul in 1 Cor. 12: 13: "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit"?

We have said that this "power" promised by the Son of God was *spiritual* power; but let us get a little closer to the subject. The Holy Spirit descending on the day of Pentecost "filled" the apostles, as before observed. In the light of all the facts in the case, what does this imply?

a. The Spirit touched—inspired their minds with knowledge. See the record: "And they began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance"—direct impartation of knowledge to the mind—knowledge of other languages, and readiness to comprehend and express, for the first time, the full significance



of the gospel of Christ! Peter's sermon upon that occasion shows him to be intellectually a newborn man. He moves upon a mental plane hitherto unknown to him. This transformation of the apostles' minds was wrought suddenly, openly, powerfully, miraculously. Now if the Holy Spirit can thus immediately illuminate the human mind, and give to it a supernatural perception and expression of truth, can he not, immediately, aid the human mind to the *natural* perception of truth? And is not this the meaning of the Savior when he speaks of the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit of truth," and when he says to his disciples, "he shall guide you into all truth"? And is not this what James means when he says: "If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God who giveth to *all* liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him"? (James 1:5;) and what the Scriptures mean by the Spirit being "poured out upon *all* flesh"? Is it not in accord with general Christian experience that the nearer we get to God, the more earnestly we seek him in prayer and supplication, the clearer the way of truth and duty becomes? Is there any intelligent Christian man who will answer all these questions in the negative? If so, the world will be curious to know what manner of spirit he is of, and what sort of religion is his.

b. But we come now to another most important point in our investigations of this pentecostal scene. Do the mental illuminations, the supernatural enduement of knowledge to understand and speak the gospel truths in all languages, in short, the *miraculous* phenomena of this occasion, exhaust the meaning of the word "power" as here employed? Is there any other essential element of spiritual life included in this promised "power"?

The *moral* transformation of the apostles was quite as great and as notable as was their mental. And that this moral power came of their being "filled with the Holy Spirit," is in evidence upon the very face of things. Indeed, it is here contended that this moral transfiguration of these men was more notable and more important than their miraculous gifts. They had, in a measure, the power to work miracles before this, and had exercised it. The discussion of this moral phase of the subject properly belongs to that section in which we are to treat of the Spirit operating on the heart; but the matter necessarily claims some notice here. Before they were "filled with the Holy Spirit" on Pentecost, the apostles were timid, shrinking, cowardly men. There was apparent a lack of moral force in their characters as well as in their understanding. After this, however, they

appear invested with a heroism that is as marvelous as is their increased understanding of the gospel. They faced danger with courage; they proclaimed the word boldly; they denounced sin in high places. Instead of denying the Lord with a time-serving spirit, and returning to their old occupations, they proclaimed fearlessly that "Jesus is Lord and Christ," whom the authorities, "with wicked hands, had crucified and slain." When they were "threatened," and ordered to "speak henceforth no more in this name," the apostles replied, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard." And in reciting these things the Scriptures tell us: "When they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spake the word of God with boldness." And their spontaneous selling of their property, and making "distribution to every man as he had need," no man claiming that "aught that he had was his own," etc.,—all indicate a new, internal, moral force that had revolutionized these men. Nor was this moral power confined, like inspiration, to the few, but diffused itself generally among the disciples.

Let us pause here now long enough to note carefully an important distinction between the “*gift* of the Holy Spirit,” and the “*gifts*” of the Holy Spirit. This distinction marks a real difference, and is vital to a clear understanding of the subject. The “*gift*” of the Holy Spirit is the Spirit himself, freely given to all men who are willing to avail themselves of it. This “*gift*” is represented in the Greek New Testament by the term, *dorea*—“And you shall receive the gift [*dorea*] of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:38.)

The “*gifts*” of the Spirit, as a word, is presented in the Greek by the term, *Karisma*—“There are diversities of gifts [*Karisma*] but the same spirit.” (1 Cor. 12:4). “The gift of the Spirit” (*dorea*), then, is, like the air, God’s *free favor* to *all* men who will accept it; while the “*gifts of the Spirit*” (*Karisma*) are *special favors* granted to a *limited number* of persons. Again, “the gift of the Spirit” is granted to every obedient believer for his own personal benefit, as indispensable to his spiritual life and Christian character; while the “*gifts of the Spirit*” are granted to a few individuals, not for their own personal aggrandizement or enjoyment, but for the good of others—“To each one is given the manifestation of the

Spirit to profit *withal*” (1 Cor. 12:7)—“for the benefit of all,” as one translator puts it.

Now it is clear from the facts recorded in the Bible that this “gift of the Spirit” (*dorea*) was received by many disciples, and by the majority, who never received any of the “gifts” (*Karisma*) of the Spirit; just as every American enjoys the privileges of citizenship, but only the favored few enjoy the privileges of holding office. And the office is bestowed on these, not for their own benefit, but for the general good. And it is equally clear that, in some instances, men received the “gifts” (*Karisma*) without ever receiving the “gift” (*dorea*) of the Spirit. As already observed, the disciples, before Pentecost, had the “gifts”—*Karisma*—to work miracles. When the twelve apostles were first called and commissioned and sent abroad they were equipped for their work by these “gifts.” Matthew (10:1) tells us: “And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness.”

The Master then assured them that they would be arrested and brought before the authorities and persecuted, and then says: “Be not anxious how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that hour what ye

shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." The seventy were afterwards called and sent forth with like "gifts" and similar assurances. (See Luke, chap. 10.)

As further examples of this we mention the gifts of the prophets. The apostle Peter says: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (1 Pet. 1:21.) And he gives us further assurance on this point when he says, "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ that was in them did point unto, when it testified before the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them." (1 Pet. 1:10.) There is an intimation here that the prophets had to study their own predictions. And this leaves us to infer that these "gifts" were not only not backed up by the moral power of the indwelling *dorea*, but they were not, in all instances, even supported by the prophets' own mental perception and understanding of truth. This view of the subject is still more clearly brought out in the fact that unworthy men, for certain providential reasons, were sometimes made the recipients of

these "gifts," this *Karisma*. The reader will readily recall the case of Balaam, and even Balaam's ass that was especially endowed to speak. Concerning these the apostle Peter thus writes: "Forsaking the right way, they went astray, having followed the way of Balaam the son of Beor, who loved the hire of wrong-doing; but he was rebuked for his own transgression; a dumb ass spake with man's voice and stayed the madness of the prophet." (2 Pet. 2:15-16.) But no one will suppose that these received the "gift" (*dorea*) of the Holy Spirit.

There is yet one other fact to be noticed; and let it be noted with emphasis. When the Spirit came to the Jews, the apostles, on the day of Pentecost, and to the Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius, he came in the *double* capacity of "gift" (*dorea*) and "gifts" (*Karisma*). All the facts in the case warrant this conclusion. That his endowments were received, the record plainly states. That the Spirit was given to them as the "*dorea*," the Paraclete, the Comforter, to "abide with them forever," is evident in the fact of their moral fitness and readiness to receive him; and from the fact that they needed a further reinforcement of spiritual strength, and in the assurance

given us in their subsequent history of this increased moral power.

This same inference is legitimate in the case of the twelve disciples of John the Baptist whom Paul found at Ephesus, an account of which we find in the nineteenth chapter of Acts. Paul enquired of them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" They reply, "Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given." Then Paul answers, "Into what then were you baptized?" They reply, "Into John's baptism." The result was, after further explanation, that "they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." Now, after this, we are told, "Paul laid his hands on them, and the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." Here the record plainly states that they received the "gifts" of the Spirit. But no one will for a moment doubt that, at the same time, they received the "gift"—*dorea*—of the Holy Spirit.

It is not claimed here that these two Greek words, *dorea* and *Karisma*, are so essentially different as never to overlap each other, never to be used interchangeably, as synonyms; but that in New Testament usage, as applied to the Holy Spirit, the distinctions we have made clearly obtain, and are important.



Before closing our studies of this pentecostal occasion, there is another important point to be considered with reference to the presence and the operations of the Holy Spirit. We are told that there were about three thousand persons converted and added to the body of believers in Jerusalem at this time. What part did the Holy Spirit take in their conversion? We are to bear in mind, too, that the general topic under discussion at present is, "The Word and the Spirit;" while the special point being now considered is that "*The Spirit Operates on Mind.*" Now the question arises, In the conversion of these people on the day of Pentecost, what part did the Holy Spirit perform, and what part did the Word perform? To get still closer to the subject, let us ask, Did the Holy Spirit do anything more than inspire the mind of Peter to speak the word of Truth to the people, and produce the physical phenomena of the "sound as of a mighty wind," and the "tongues as of fire"? The account of the pentecostal scene given in the second chapter of Acts does not specifically mention any other thing done by the Holy Spirit. But if the Spirit did nothing more on that memorable occasion than produce the remarkable physical phenomena referred to, and inspire the mind of the preacher to proclaim the truth to

the people, he did much more to secure their conversion than he ordinarily does on the word-alone theory, in converting men. That the gospel preached by a man inspired by the Holy Spirit and confirmed by a present, sensible miracle, is more powerful than when preached without such supernatural attestations, will be admitted without argument. But does the fact that no mention is made of any other work wrought by the Holy Spirit upon this occasion than that spoken of, prove that nothing else was done by him? To so conclude is to affirm that in every case of conversion no influence was present except such as is distinctly named by the writer. And, if we can reason thus in regard to conversion, may we not so reason in regard to any other event? The writers of the New Testament are brief in their historical sketches. They usually give only the outlines of events. The details are to be supplied by comparing different similar occurrences, and by a study of the general Scripture doctrine of the subject in hand.

In viewing the subject in this light, we unhesitatingly say that the Holy Spirit was as certainly present with the Word, and cooperating with it, in the minds of the hearers on the day of Pentecost, as he was with the preachers in proclaiming that Word of Truth.

Just *how* the Spirit of God operated on the minds of the apostles to make them understand and preach the gospel truth, we know not; nor do we know just *how* he operated on the minds of the hearers, and co-operated with the Word in producing their conversion. We do know, however, that the Savior said when he gave the commission to the apostles, "I will be with you alway, even unto the end of the world." We do know that he said, speaking of the Holy Spirit, "And he, when he is come, will convict the world of sin," and that James says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth," and that the Scriptures say, "Paul planted and Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." And in the case of Lydia it is plainly stated, "Whose heart the Lord opened." Of these pentecostal believers, also, it is said, "And the Lord added to them day by day those that were saved." Note particularly these declarations:

*"I will be with you"*—*"The Spirit will convict"*—*"God begat us"*—*"God gave the increase"*—*"The Lord opened her heart"*—*"The Lord added to them."*

We have here, and generally throughout the Scriptures, the assurance of the divine presence and agency in man's conversion. Hence, where it is said concerning the three thousand

converted on the day of Pentecost, "When they heard these things they were pricked in their hearts," it is as scriptural and as logical to conclude that the Holy Spirit was actively present in their conversion as that the Word was present.

That the Holy Spirit has the power to operate on the human mind otherwise than in audible or written words will not be denied. That the Scriptures ascribe to him this power and this agency is one of the plainest facts of revelation. Just how much of our mental make-up to-day, just what influences and factors in determining our present mental condition and status are to be ascribed to the direct and immediate operations of other spirits, human, demoniacal and divine, we know not. Man is a spiritual being, and a part of a spiritual universe. And to shut him up to a sphere of life limited and determined wholly by his physical senses, is to do violence to both reason and revelation.

To maintain, then, that in the conversion of sinners there are no influences to be expected or desired or prayed for, other than the Word faithfully preached, is to paralyze the spiritual side of Christian life. The Word and the Spirit are not to be separated. The Word does not convert without the Spirit; the Spirit does

not convert without the Word. This view gives full scope for the exercise of all our energies and the employment of all our resources in proclaiming the gospel to the world; and this gives full scope for the exercise of all our faith in God, and the employment of all our spiritual resources in prayer. And nothing short of this meets the demands of man's rational and spiritual nature. Nothing short of this meets the demands of sound Scripture doctrine. Nothing short of this meets the demands of the plea made by our fathers before the world in the opening of the nineteenth century. That form of religious thought which eliminates from the church and from the gospel the ever-present and active personal agency of the Holy Spirit, is a spurious thing, a galvanized corpse. It is a travesty on the Bible and a "comedy of errors" on the teachings of Alexander Campbell and his coadjutors.

In his debate with Mr. Rice, page 678, Mr. Campbell says:

"I have no faith in conversion by the Word without the Spirit; nor by the Spirit without the Word. The Spirit is ever present with the Word in conversion and in sanctification."

And on page 708 he says:

"It is not possible for a man to conceive of spiritual operations. The fact of the operation is as evident as

gravity, but who can explain it? \* \* \* \* That the Spirit of God operates on the human understanding and heart is just as certain as that man has an understanding and affections. Our spirit is allied to the spiritual system, to the Great Spirit. God can commune and does commune with man, and man with God."

Again on page 731 he says further:

"I believe in a substantive influence of the Spirit of God through the truth upon the conscience, the understanding and the affections."

To maintain that the Holy Spirit operates on the mind in conversion, does not imply any infringement of the freedom of the human will, or any of the mental powers. That Almighty Power is competent to move with irresistible coercive force upon the human mind, is not to be denied, but Christianity is not constructed on this principle. All service, to be worthy and acceptable and profitable, must be voluntary. "Whosoever will let him come." And yet, it is neither unreasonable nor unscriptural to believe that the Spirit of God brings to bear on the mind of man thoughts, motives, influences calculated to move it to action, to direct the will and to control the mental energies. All this may be done strictly in harmony with the nature of spiritual life, of individual responsibility and personal freedom. "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his

good pleasure.” (Phil. 2:13.) If thoughts and impressions, coming through words, may affect and change the mind without impairing its free volitional nature, why may not thoughts and impressions, coming otherwise, so operate?

Nor are we to conclude that this direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind is, in its nature, essentially different from that exerted by the word of truth. Certainly we are not to suppose it to be in any wise antagonistic to the word. The Spirit re-enforces the word. They both operate and co-operate along the lines of spiritual natures, and in harmony with the laws of spiritual life and activity. It is the light of truth and the love of God as embodied in the gospel of Jesus Christ that are to convert the soul. And it is the office of the Holy Spirit to get that light and that love so impressed on the soul as to secure its conversion. All of which is to be achieved without infracting the established laws of man's spiritual nature or personal liberty and responsibility.

Let us hear Alexander Campbell on this subject:

“God's power is omnipotent, but it is consistent with himself and with itself. The gospel, Paul says, is the power of God unto salvation. Hence the moral omnipotence of God is in the document called the gospel. God's moral power is infinitely superior to ours. Yet all that power is in the gospel, and this is all we mean by the con-

verting power being in the Word of God. God may employ other means, other power, if you please, in converting men, but nothing finally converts them but the light and love of God in the gospel." (Debate with Rice, page 643.)

And again, on page 701, he speaks very plainly on this subject thus:

"I do, Sir, most sincerely regard the Holy Spirit as the author of every spiritual and noble desire in the human heart; the author of every pious affection, of every holy aspiration of our souls. His mysterious but certain power is in and with the gospel, and he makes it the power of God to salvation to every one that believes it. He sanctifies us through the truth. He works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure."

And then further, by way of making himself understood on this point, he boldly declares on page 722 as follows:

"I said in the commencement of this discussion that I did not affirm nor deny as to any other operations of the Spirit save in conversion and sanctification. What he may do in the way of suggestions or impressions, by direct communication of original ideas, or in bringing things to remembrance long since forgotten, I presume not to discuss. I believe he has exerted, and can exert, such influences. Nor do I say what influence he may exert, or cause to be exerted, in bringing men's minds to consider these matters; but I confine my reasonings and proofs to conversion and sanctification."

No man can read these declarations of Mr. Campbell—and much more of the same import might be submitted—without seeing his sublime



faith in the Holy Spirit as a divine personality, and as an ever-present and active agent in the conversion and salvation of mankind. The idea of a religion sustained and propagated by the revealed Word of God, without the personal, active ministration of the Holy Spirit attending it, he repudiated with the full force of his whole nature. He little dreamed that it was possible for a class of superficial philosophers, and still more superficial theologians, to arise among his own brethren to advocate such a barren theory of religion; and that, too, in the very face of his own earnest and repeated protests, and with the whole drift of plain Bible teaching to the contrary, and with the consensus of Christian scholarship against them as well.

#### THE SPIRIT OPERATES ON HEARTS.

There is nothing more clearly disclosed in the New Testament doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit than the fact of a difference in his relation to the converted and the unconverted man—a difference in the method of his operation upon the sinner and upon the Christian—upon the believer and the unbeliever. It is not meant to affirm that the Scriptures make plain a *philosophical* difference here. We make no effort to understand or to discuss the philosophy

of spiritual influences. The *modus operandi* by which one spirit touches and affects another has never yet been made clear. Both in the realm of psychology and of theology spiritual phenomena are recognized; but the laws or principles underlying these have not yet been placed upon a scientific basis, and brought within the domain of positive and well-defined knowledge. What the future may have in store for us in the way of a better understanding of this subject we know not; but we are sure that, to our finite minds, the matter has not yet passed beyond the tentative and empirical stages of its development. That God understands all these laws of the spiritual world which he himself has established, is not to be doubted; and that the Holy Spirit operates according to them is to be taken for granted. In treating of the subject, therefore, we deal with its facts and not with their philosophical interpretation.

The Holy Spirit is not given to all persons in the same measure, nor to the same person, at all times, in the same degree. It is said of Christ that, "God giveth the Spirit not by measure unto him." (John 3:34.) And in another place it is said that, "It pleased the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell." (Col. 1:19). This fulness of the Spirit

was granted to our Lord because of his moral competency to receive the gift "without measure." It is not thus granted to us because of our moral incompetency to receive it. Men differ in their moral stature, as they do in their mental calibre, or in their physical proportions. "According to thy faith so be it unto thee," is a law that obtains here in full force. We receive of this grace, not by arbitrary measure, but according to our moral fitness for the blessing. The man who earnestly seeks to adjust himself to the divine methods, who conforms to the will of God conscientiously and continuously, in his private devotions and his public ministrations among men, will open the channels of spiritual commerce between himself and God, and thus receive larger measures of the Spirit than the man who fails of these efforts and neglects these appliances. It is not to be denied that some men have greater difficulties to overcome, greater obstacles to surmount in the way of social environment and inherited natural organization, than have others. Even among the apostles there appear these differences in spiritual attainments and excellence, quite as much as in their mental endowments and their official prominence.

The same differences that are here observed as existing between individual Christians, are to

be noted as obtaining, in a collective way, among the different churches of the New Testament history. The casual reader cannot fail to be impressed with this fact. Men associated together in a corporate way in church work and church life may jointly and concertedly open the way or blockade the way of the Holy Spirit in his gracious ministrations. Hence, Paul writing to the church at Corinth says: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." (1 Cor. 3:16.) And, addressing them again as individuals, on this same subject he says: "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit that is in you, which ye have from God?" (1 Cor. 6:19.)

This phase of the subject is finely exemplified in the addresses to the seven churches of Asia, as recorded in the second and third chapters of Revelation. The moral status of each church, as depicted there, illustrates clearly the difference in the spiritual conditions and attainments in the congregational life of disciples. The hindering causes, too, which prevent a larger development of spiritual infilling and enjoyment are here plainly indicated; while the possibility of a fuller and holier Christian life,

to every individual and to every church, through this divine agency, is portrayed, in strong and definite assurance, in the close of these addresses to the Asiatic churches, in the following language: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him and he with me."

Nothing could well be more instructive or more beautiful, on the subject in hand, than these words. God is not only willing to enter the human soul with larger measures of spiritual life, but is persistent—"Behold, I stand at the door and knock." His entrance and divine blessing is made to depend on man's moral condition and volitional attitude—"If any man hear my voice and open the door." The reality and personal nature of that larger Christian life that comes of this energizing power and reinforcement of the Spirit of God, is here manifested—"I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me."

If such Scriptures do not teach us the reality of a fellowship between the Holy Spirit and the human spirit—a divine, personal, intelligent fellowship between rational, moral and spiritual natures, then they but mock us with meaningless and misleading words and promises.

This idea of degrees in the measure of the Holy Spirit in the minds and hearts of men is conspicuously illustrated in the case of the first disciples and the apostles. When they were first called from their vocations in life to follow Jesus, they were very crude men, from a spiritual point of view. The Master began with oral instructions to educate them. His appeals were to the mind through lessons addressed to the ear and the eye. After this he bestows on them gifts of a supernatural order. This enabled them to work miracles, and in this way he won upon their confidence, and expanded their faith in him and in themselves as his disciples. Still later on John tells us, "he breathed on them and said unto them, receive ye the Holy Spirit." This was after his resurrection and before his ascension. The miracle of his resurrection had added still greater strength to their faith, and opened the way for a larger measure of spiritual life, which was imparted to them by this inbreathing of the Holy Spirit from the blessed Master. He was soon to leave them and return to his Father. That they might be strengthened for the ordeal through which they were to pass in the time intervening between this and the day of final promise—the baptism of the Holy Spirit—when they were to be brought to the

climax of their spiritual inheritance and enjoyment, this benediction and impartation of a further "measure" of the Spirit was given. We have noted these epochs in their spiritual development, because they are mentioned by the sacred historians, and appear as prominent facts. At what other times, and in what other ways, these men may have been enlarged, by the Spirit, in their understanding and enjoyment of this newborn religion, we presume not to say. Our point has been made sufficiently clear,—that the Holy Spirit comes to men by measure and in different degrees, according to human conditions—as we make it possible for his holy ministry, by our own moral attitudes.

We are now prepared to recur to the statement made in the opening of the present, immediate discussion, viz.: "There is nothing more clearly disclosed in the New Testament doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit than the fact of a difference in his relation to the converted and the unconverted man—a difference in the method of his operation upon the sinner and upon the Christian, upon the believer and the unbeliever."

The Savior's declaration, "He is *with* you, and shall be *in* you," has already been noted. The Spirit was at that time operating from *with-*

*out* upon the minds of the disciples. When he came in his fullness on the day of Pentecost, we read, "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." He now enters *within*, as their Guest, to "abide with them forever." He comes in the double capacity of *dorea* and *Karisma*, and in fuller measure than they had ever before experienced. They were better prepared for this fuller measure than ever before. Their minds and hearts had been expanded by previous experiences. They were vessels fitted for the Master's use, and ready "to receive of his fulness, grace for grace."

It will be in place here now to refer to another statement of Christ concerning the promised Spirit. In John 14:16, he says: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth: *whom the world cannot receive*; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him." Attention is called to the above italicized clause, "whom the world cannot receive." This is the statement of a fact. But this statement is immediately followed by an explanation of the fact—"for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him." The Holy Spirit does not and cannot consistently break in upon the human soul in the absence of intelligence, of thought, of reason, of knowledge. The



idea of an "irresistible" influence of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification and salvation of men, is alike subversive of Scripture and of reason. The Holy Spirit cannot come as the "gift" of God to the impenitent sinner. His heart is not a fit "temple of the Holy Spirit." He needs to be changed, morally changed, before he can enjoy this divine fellowship. Hence Peter said to the people on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit had been operating from without upon their minds, seeking to "convict them of sin." He had brought them to the point where, we are told, "they were pricked in their hearts." He now leads them still further on in this moral preparation—"Repent and be baptized, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And the record proceeds to tell us that "they received his word and were baptized," and that these Jerusalem converts "were all filled with the Holy Spirit."

This distinction and difference in the *modus operandi* of the Holy Spirit toward the believer and the unbeliever, is apparent throughout the New Testament. The Son of God makes clear

this distinction. He says concerning the Holy Spirit, as already noted:

“When he is come, he shall convict the world of sin, because they believe not.” Note carefully the expression, “*convict because they believe not.*” Unbelief is a sin. To convict a man of this sin is to make him a believer.

Now let us compare this with another declaration of Christ as follows:

“He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive; for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified.” (John 7: 38, 39.) It is evident from this passage that the Holy Spirit was to be given as a source of spiritual power *within* men—that this was to be done *after* Christ was “glorified”—and that he was to be given to *believers*. Notice—“*Which they that believed on him were to receive.*” Concerning the Holy Spirit, then, we have two plain lessons here from the great Teacher. He is to “convict” men of the sin of unbelief, and thus make them believers. After this the believers are to “receive” the Spirit. That is, the Holy Spirit operates from without on the minds of men, in order to convict them and

give them faith; and when he has thus cleared the way and prepared the soul as a fit "temple" for himself, he enters within to begin his constructive work of building up a moral character and a spiritual life.

We recall, in connection with this, the incident already mentioned of Paul asking "certain disciples" found at Ephesus, "Received ye the Holy Spirit *since* ye believed?" This same idea is further illustrated also in Paul's declaration (Eph. 1:13), "*After* that ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

This principle of operation and co-operation on the part of God is no arbitrary law. It accords with the experience of every preacher of the gospel that, in his own ministrations, he has first to operate on men from without, and prepare for himself a place in their hearts before he can, in a secondary sense, enter within them to aid in building up their spiritual lives.

Another fact worthy of some attention in this connection is that the gift of the Holy Spirit is usually promised in the New Testament as a subsequent, not only of faith, but also of baptism. This, be it observed, is generally the case, not uniformly the rule. Why is this so? Not because the Heavenly Father has established baptism as an arbitrary barrier between himself

and the human soul, and waits with stoical indifference until the last exaction of law is complied with before he smiles in favor upon the returning prodigal. This would not be in accord with the divine nature, nor even with human nature, except in some abnormal, Shylock form of degeneracy. Baptism is the appointed overt act of self-surrender to Christ. Baptism is contemplated in the Scriptures as an expression of faith, and as immediately following faith. As an act of intelligent, trustful obedience to God it brings to the human soul a sense of submission and relief, of gratification and satisfaction which, like repentance and faith, serve to induce in the soul a moral condition preparing it for the reception and fellowship of the Holy Spirit. But in cases where this moral condition obtains prior to baptism, God recognizes it, and enters into sympathy and communion with the parties. Hence in the case of Cornelius, "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway," the Holy Spirit was given in advance of baptism. Also in the case of Paul, to whom the Lord had appeared. He was thoroughly turned from his purpose of persecuting the saints, and had surrendered to the Lord with his whole heart. Hear him: "*What shall I do,*

*Lord?*” After Paul had spent “three days” in prayer and fasting, Ananias, the Lord’s minister, comes to him. Now hear Ananias: “Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared to thee in the way, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be *filled with the Holy Spirit.*” After this he was baptized. The Spirit is first given because Paul was morally prepared for him. And in the case of thousands of godly people to-day who fail to understand this subject, and who have never been really baptized, the Divine Father is blessing them “with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ.” And with reference to such persons all truly loyal Christian hearts will join with Paul, Col. 1:9, in saying: “For this cause we also do not cease to pray and make request for you, that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding, to walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God.” And yet, as far as practicable, they will strive to teach all such “the way of the Lord more perfectly.” We strive to adjust ourselves to God individually and collectively; and God seeks to adjust himself to us, individually and collectively. This adjustment is always effected along moral lines, and all legal

provisions and requirements are only intended to superinduce the necessary moral conditions of our spiritual blessings.

This principle, whereby the Holy Spirit is given to men, whenever and wherever they are found in the moral condition to receive and enjoy the divine favor and fellowship, and given in different degrees, according to the measure of their moral fitness, is only "natural law in the spiritual world." We live and operate every day by that law, in our social relations with society, in our moral relations with the church, and in our spiritual relations with God. And, although it is said that Paul was "filled with the Holy Spirit" in the beginning of his Christian career, yet are we not to believe that his capacity to receive and enjoy this divine fellowship was afterwards enlarged, and that he subsequently received the Spirit in still larger measure? His life and his writings indicate this fact. We may easily suppose that Paul reached the climax of his spiritual evolution when "he was caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for man to utter;" and when, lest he "should be exalted over much, there was given to him a thorn in the flesh," and he heard in answer to his supplication for its removal,— "My grace is sufficient for thee;" and then

was brought to a personal realization of that great spiritual truth so hard for us all to learn—"When I am weak, then am I strong;" and that the Apostle John found the culmination of his spiritual experience when he was on the "isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus, and was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." It is not to be supposed that all Christians can rise to the heights of these specially afflicted, and yet specially favored, sons of God. But let us believe that there are measures of enlargement along the ordinary ways of spiritual evolution as well as along the extraordinary ways. The Scriptures plainly teach this doctrine. Paul, in Eph. 5:18, exhorts his brethren to be "filled with the Spirit." It is to be taken for granted that these Christians received the Holy Spirit when they first submitted to the gospel; but now, having had time to grow and to increase their capacity for still larger measures of spiritual life, they are exhorted to be still further "filled with the Spirit." And the Scriptures frequently speak of the same persons being "filled with the Spirit" at different times. This is done evidently for the reason that both their internal and external conditions demand, from time to time, a reinforcement of spiritual power. And it is for this reason evidently that the Sav-

ior taught the disciples to expect this divine blessing in installments and according to their necessities. He represents the Heavenly Father, in measuring out the gift of the Spirit, as proceeding as a wise earthly parent does in granting favors to his children. He grants them, at different times and in different measures, according to the necessity and readiness of the children to receive and appropriate his favor. Hear the Savior: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"

We are discussing the question of the Spirit's operations on the heart, on the inner man, the emotional and affectional nature; operations whereby the moral character is transformed and the spiritual life transfigured, more and more, into the image of Christ Jesus our Lord.

#### WHAT THE SPIRIT DOES IN THE HEART.

Let us now give attention to some special scriptural teachings on this subject:

1. He *dwells* in the Christian. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of



righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. 8:9-11.)

Observe carefully Paul's declarations. He speaks of the Holy Spirit as both the "Spirit of God" and the "Spirit of Christ." This is New Testament doctrine. "If I go away, I will send him unto you," said Christ. And, again, he says: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." (John 15:26.) This Spirit sent by Christ and from the Father "dwells" in the Christian as the representative of the Father and the Son. Hence the apostle says, "If Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." And other Scriptures speak of God and of Christ dwelling in us. "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14:23.) God and Christ then dwell in the Christian through the Holy Spirit. "He shall abide with you forever," was the Savior's comforting promise to the disciples. This is a pleasing view of the subject to the Apostle Paul. Hear

him on this point again: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God *dwelleth* in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17.)

It is impossible for us to understand just how the Holy Spirit "dwells" in us. Nor is it a matter of vital importance that we should understand this. But it is a matter of vital importance that the fact becomes a matter of personal faith and experience with every man for the avowed reason that, "If a man hath not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." And when it is said that the Spirit of God "dwells" in us, no one supposes that he dwells there passively, but actively. He is there to do something. "If Christ is in you, the body"—the carnal nature—"is dead because of sin, but the spirit"—the spiritual nature—"is life because of righteousness." The Holy Spirit then, dwelling in us, both kills and makes alive. He destroys the life of "sin," and gives a life of "righteousness"—subdues the passions of the "body," and stimulates and energizes the powers of the "spirit." "The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the Spirit that quickeneth." He quickens our spirits now, with thought and truth and love; and shall hereafter quicken "our mortal bodies," even as he quick-

ened the body of Jesus, and "raised him from the dead." But this active ministry of the Spirit, as he "dwells" in us, will be made still more apparent as we proceed.

2. He *communes* with us. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." (2 Cor. 13:14.) This "grace" of Christ and "love" of God come to us from without, and do not necessarily imply a responsive appreciation and joint participation on our part. Thus it is said, "The grace of God hath appeared unto *all* men," and "God so loved the *world*." Yet it is a fact that many men have no appreciation of this "grace," and make no response to this "love." But with the "communion" of the Holy Spirit it is otherwise. Communion implies a sympathetic exchange, a spiritual commerce between intelligent beings. And in the case of the communion of the Holy Spirit it implies a sympathetic, spiritual, joint participation of the very highest conceivable character this side of heaven itself. Paul speaks of it tenderly in Phil. 2:1 after this manner: "If there is, therefore, any exhortation in Christ, if any consolation of love, if any *fellowship of the Spirit*, if any tender mercies and compassions, make ye full my joy," etc. "Any fellowship of the Spirit!" When two men are

in "fellowship," that means an intelligent, mutual understanding and fraternal co-operation in some common interest, some common good, or some common pleasure. It means all this and more when applied to the fellowship of the human spirit and the Holy Spirit. Notice, too, what a rich cluster of spiritual conceptions are here presented to us along with this "fellowship of the Spirit," each of which has its own peculiar grace and merit—"exhortation in Christ," "consolation of love," "fellowship of the Spirit," "tender mercies and compassions." The rose, the lily, the hyacinth, the jessamine and the carnation, all blended together in one effect, without the loss of individuality or identity in any. And a similar cluster of spiritual ideas is presented to us in the Epistle to the Hebrews (6:4, 5): "As touching those who were once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come;" etc. While all these privileges and attainments are related and associated together in Christian life and experience, yet they are distinct and separate elements in thought and in reality—"enlightened," "tasted the heavenly gift," "partakers of the Holy Spirit," "tasted the good word of God," "tasted the powers of the world

to come”—are each invested with an individuality of its own, and are not to be considered as synonymous expressions, or a mere play of rhetoric. In this connection, let it be especially noted that the two phrases, “*partakers of the Holy Spirit,*” and “*tasted the good word of God,*” stand side by side, as distinct expressions of different realities; and this fact is a death blow to that shallow conceit—the word-alone theory of religion.

3. He *guides* and *leads* us into the truth. We have before referred to the promise of our Lord made to his disciples concerning the Spirit—“When he is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.” It is here again referred to, as falling in the line of our present investigation and for further elucidation. After the same manner and on the same subject, the Savior further taught them, thus: “The Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.” (John 14:26.) And the Apostle Paul speaking of the official work of the Spirit (Rom. 8:13, 14) says: “If by the Spirit ye put to death the doings of the body ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God.” Again to the same effect, in Gal. 5:18-25, he says: “If

ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law. . . . If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk.”

The Apostle John also leads us into the same path of reflections when he, after his own peculiar style, reasons thus: “And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . And as for you, the anointing which ye received of him abideth with you, and ye need not that any one teach you, but his anointing teacheth you concerning all things.” (1 John 2:20-27.) Now we have in these Scriptures before us much food for thought and for our moral and spiritual assimilation. When the Son of God said to these first disciples that the Holy Spirit should “teach” them, and should bring to their “remembrance” all his lessons, and should “guide them into all the truth,” he, no doubt, referred primarily to the inspiration, the miraculous inspiration, of these men; but does this exhaust his meaning? Is it not just as clear and conclusive that the Apostle John, in the passage cited, applies the same thought, in a secondary sense, to all Christians? Hear him: “*Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . Ye need not that any one teach you, but his anointing teacheth you concerning all things.*” This language is as strong

and comprehensive as that of the Savior, and authorizes the conclusion that the Holy Spirit, as the gift and the guest of *all* Christians, aids them as certainly in their understanding and enjoyment of truth, though through the ordinary channels of spiritual influence, as he did the apostles through the extraordinary channels. Why not? Do we not *need* this assistance? The apostles needed the larger, supernatural measure of it to enable them to recall and understand the oral lessons of the Master, and to strengthen them for the initial work of establishing the kingdom of God on earth, and committing these oral instructions permanently to record. We need the minor, natural measure of the Spirit to enable us to recall and understand the written word of truth. Does the Holy Spirit enable the ordinary Christian to understand the Bible? Of course he does. Is it not a fact that the ordinary Christian man, who prayerfully studies his Bible, seeking God's help to understand it, does understand it better, and enjoy it more, than the more intellectual unbeliever, who studies it to oppose it?

Can we comprehend this matter? Not wholly, but let us catch what light we can. Hear Paul again: "*If by the Spirit ye put to death the doings of the body, ye shall live.*" Notice, "*By the Spirit ye put to death.*"

That is, you by the assistance of the Holy Spirit subdue your carnal nature. Then what? Then “you are led by the Spirit.” And then again, the apostle says: “If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk”—the Holy Spirit helps us to overcome the flesh and to make dominant the spiritual nature. It is by the Holy Spirit then, that we morally and spiritually “live,” and “walk,” and “remember,” and are “led,” and “guided,” and “taught.”

When it is said that the Holy Spirit “teaches us *all things*,” and “guides us into *all truth*,” what are we to understand to be the meaning? Not that he teaches us absolutely “all things,” or guides us absolutely into “all truth.” He did not lead the apostles into all scientific and philosophical truth. They knew nothing more about astronomy, or chemistry, or geology, or botany than other men. Neither physics nor metaphysics, philosophically considered, occupied their attention. Moral and spiritual truth was the field of their operations. Nor are we to suppose that the Holy Spirit led the apostles into a full knowledge of *all* moral and spiritual truths; but only into so much as was necessary to equip them for successfully preaching the gospel. “He shall teach you all *necessary* things, and guide you into all *necessary* truth.” There is the idea. Hence, as it was not neces-



sary to continue the miraculous "gifts" of the Spirit beyond the apostolic age, they "ceased," as Paul says, with that age. But the ordinary "gift" of the Holy Spirit is always necessary to the Christian. Hence the apostle John, after all the other apostles were dead, and after the apostolic age had virtually passed away, writing to Christians in a general way concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in their hearts and lives, says: "Ye know all things—as for you, the anointing which ye received of him abideth with you, and ye need not that any one teach you, but his anointing teacheth you concerning all things"—concerning all moral and spiritual truth necessary for wise and consecrated Christian living. We have then the written Word of God in our Bibles, and the Spirit of God in our hearts. These are distinct and different factors in our religious life. The Spirit helps us to understand the word, and the word helps us to understand the Spirit. They are never opposed to each other, but always co-operate harmoniously in the edification of Christian character and life. It is not held that we can distinguish, in our experience, between these two forces in our spiritual life; that we can so far analyze our feelings and perceptions as to point out *this* as the work of the Spirit and *that* as the work of the word.

In the general result of our physical life and health we cannot distinguish between the effects of the atmosphere and the sunlight; between the effects of a tonic and our food in the strength we gain; between the influences of physical and metaphysical causes that have contributed to make us what we are. But who will deny that there *is* a distinction and a difference in fact, all along these lines?

4. He *declares* to us *things to come*. "And he shall declare unto you the things that are to come." (John 16: 13.) The Holy Spirit then not only assists the memory in recalling what it has known in the past, but gives to the understanding prophetic power to forecast the future. While the "gift of prophecy," primarily belongs to the supernatural department of religion, and is to be classed with the extraordinary "gifts of the Spirit," yet there is a sense in which every true, earnest, intelligent Christian soul is a seer. The Holy Spirit aids the human understanding, the mental, the moral and the spiritual understanding. Our rational, intuitional and emotional nature is brought into fellowship with the divine, and under the dominion of the Spirit of truth, in such way and in such measure that we are endowed, not miraculously, yet consciously endowed, with a moral and spiritual insight into

truth. A profound Christian consciousness is a luminous gift. It enables the royal child of God to discern, and to properly estimate the moral and religious factors involved in the unsolved problems of society, and to forecast results which are hidden to the unrighteous man. It was on this ground that the Savior rebuked the morally blind men of his day. "Ye hypocrites, ye know how to interpret the face of the earth and the heaven; but how is it that ye know not how to interpret this time?" (Luke 12:56.) And we read in Heb. 5:14 of "those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil." And on this point we are further taught by Paul (1 Cor. 2:14, 15): "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man."

With certain mathematical factors the mind forecasts certain results; with certain chemical ingredients the scientist predicts certain effects; with certain data before him the astronomer predicts definite phenomena in the heavens; with certain atmospheric conditions the weather-bureau man forecasts the coming storm or sunshine; and with equal confidence, and for

similar reasons, the spiritual mind intuitively discerns, in the presence of certain moral forces, the essential and competent factors to certain inevitable moral and religious results. And, foreseeing these things, as a spiritual prophet, he proclaims them to the world.

5. He *glorifies* Christ. "He shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." (John 16:14.) To glorify is to honor, exalt, magnify.

Christ left his work incomplete. The incarnation was a great mystery. "Great is the mystery of godliness." As we read the gospel narratives, we are impressed with the idea that all the while the Savior was with his disciples on earth, they were in a dazed condition—half asleep, half awake, as to their understanding of him and his mission. It could not be otherwise. "God manifest in the flesh" was a new thought. The whole scheme of human redemption was necessarily veiled in mystery. It is yet. The world is still "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets said" concerning the Christ; and even Christians, at their best, find need of help to penetrate into the depths of gospel truth with clear vision and with spiritual relish and discernment. When the Son of God ascended to heaven his work on earth lay in confusion. The coming of the Holy Spirit was

a necessity to the proclamation of the gospel and the establishment of the kingdom of God among men. All the oral instructions of the Master concerning himself and the Father, concerning human duty and the coming kingdom, were yet, in the minds of the disciples, in a chaotic state, "without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." There was need that the Spirit of God should again "move upon the face of the waters," and that the Holy One might again say, "Let there be light." Nor has the time ever yet come, nor will the time ever come, to the finite soul, when it will not yearningly open itself and stretch out toward the infinite Spirit for larger measures of light concerning Christ and his salvation. "He shall glorify me."

The Holy Spirit glorifies Christ in the inspiration given to the apostles—inspiration whereby they were enabled to understand the gospel of our salvation—to understand it sufficiently well to formulate it before the world. What a mighty event was Pentecost! What a marvelous transformation that of common fishermen into apostles of Christ, into "masters of assemblies!" By a perception of truth, clearer and more definite than intuition, they hold spell-bound the multitudes, and send the gospel message home to the consciences of men with such

force as to make them cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" With an irresistible power this oral gospel is disseminated in Jerusalem, then in Judæa, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the world. "The weak things of the world confound the mighty, and things which are not bring to naught the things that are." Under the guidance of this inspiration the divine message of human redemption is committed permanently to writing. The New Testament is given to the world—a book, a small volume, an outline history of events, an informal statement of Christian doctrine, an uncodified form of divine truth and law, whose depth of meaning, whose breadth of significance, whose heights of wisdom and knowledge constitute at once the unsolved moral problem and the unexplained phenomenon of the world's history. By the same Spirit the church of God, as an organized, and yet an unorganized, society of believers, has been established, guided, defended and builded—a unique association, a weird fellowship, a "peculiar people zealous of good works," the most remarkable combination of moral and material forces in the world. In all these ways, and others unnamed, has the Holy Spirit, through inspiration and revelation, "glorified" Christ. And he is yet glorifying him through an enlarged, an

enlarging and more vigorous Christian consciousness. "He shall abide with you *forever*," is the promise.

Since the days of supernatural inspiration (there is a supernatural and a natural inspiration) the Holy Spirit has been incessantly at work with the human mind and in the human heart. And he is glorifying Christ to-day—glorifying him through the increased insight he is giving men into his revealed word of truth; glorifying him in the increased understanding he is giving men of the true nature and character of the Christ himself; glorifying him in the increased Christian literature of the world; glorifying him in the music and splendid psalmody indited by Christian hearts and employed in the worship of the church; glorifying him through a sanctified æsthetical taste and culture, whereby the true, the beautiful and the good are portrayed in works of art, and brought through the physical sense in touch with man's spiritual understanding; glorifying him through the conscious experience of the individual Christian as he communes with God over his personal sorrows and burdens, his duties and responsibilities; his efforts and opportunities—communes with God until he feels the touch of the unseen hand, until the way is made clear,

and light and peace and joy break in upon the soul.

The chief question with each one of us should be, How may the Holy Spirit, in the largest measure, glorify Christ to me, and glorify Christ through me?

6. He *strengthens* the Christian. “For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man.” (Eph. 3:14-16.) Paul earnestly prays to the Father for something. What is it? “That he would *grant* according to the riches of his glory.” It is God then that grants this blessing—grants it in answer to prayer. What blessing? “That ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man.” The Christian then may receive additional “power” to his own; and this power “strengthens” him—strengthens him “in the inward man”—in his heart; and all this is “through his Spirit.” The same apostle makes a similar prayer in behalf of his brethren at Colosse. Hear him: “For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray and make request for you, that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom



and understanding, to walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all power, according to the might of his glory, unto all patience and long suffering with joy." (Col. 1:9-11.) What richness of conception! What wealth of expression! Paul's personal experience in regard to this matter is directly in point, and very valuable. "*When I am weak, then am I strong,*" he says. And this is a moral conflict of which he is speaking. Paul had a physical infirmity, "a thorn in the flesh;" and he says, "Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me, and he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee, for my power is made perfect in weakness." (2 Cor. 12:8, 9.) Hence his general conclusion—"When I am weak, then am I strong." Weak in himself, but "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." Made strong through the personal presence and personal ministry of the Spirit of God in the "inner man." Chaste thoughts, delicacy of expression, refinement of feelings and suavity of manner, come with the higher forms of culture and civilization. The boor will have none of these things. The rustic inveighs against them. The church and even the ministry sometimes have their rustics—men

who only know the "letter," but not the "spirit" of religion, who have "a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof;" men who are not content to recognize the fact that, possibly, wherein *they* fail to lay hold upon these higher forms of Christian thought and life, of appreciation and enjoyment, others may find the chief staple of their spiritual living, the essential and vital part of their religious being. These men feel called upon at times to disparage the reality and the value of what the more intelligent Christian regards as the genuine Christianity of the Bible; and they even ridicule the idea of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying personal ministry to the soul. Their crude effusions on this subject in the public prints, and their effrontery in dogmatic deliverances, not unfrequently offend good taste, and humiliate many reverent and godly people. In the meanwhile the work of grace still goes on, the ministry of the Spirit continues, and it is not impossible that even these men may be brought to a "knowledge of the truth," and cease to do "despite unto the Spirit of grace."

7. He *intercedes* for us. "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity; for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that

searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." (Rom. 8:26, 27.) This is a rare bit of divine truth; a most luxuriant passage of that most luxuriant epistle of Paul to the Romans—luxuriant in spiritual thought and suggestiveness. Let us consider it item by item. "*The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us; . . . he maketh intercession according to the will of God.*" There is the plain declaration, in duplicate form. What matters it if this is the only instance in the Scriptures where the Holy Spirit is said to intercede for the saints—is this not sufficient? Christ intercedes for us in heaven; the Spirit intercedes for us on earth. Christ intercedes for us before the law and the divine government; the Spirit intercedes for us before the conscience, and the spiritual understanding. The intercession of Christ in heaven before the law touches earth with its effects. The intercession of the Spirit on earth, before the spiritual understanding of man, touches heaven with its effects. Christ and the Spirit are not opposing counselors in this case, they are co-counselors, both seeking to attain the reconciliation of the human and the divine; not operating precisely in the same methods, yet co-operating for substantially the same ends.

We have in Christ *the* incarnation; and we have in the Christian *an* incarnation. There is certainly an essential difference here, and the distinction should be clearly made. The Holy Spirit dwelt in the body of Christ and he became the God-man. The Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian and he becomes a godly man. Spiritual law in the natural world in the one instance, natural law in the spiritual world in the other. We have the supernatural Christ and we have the natural Christian; both the product of the Infinite Spirit operating in spheres and by methods we do not understand. We accept the facts, but presume not to venture upon their explanation.

If Christ intercedes in heaven for man, he must exercise an active, personal ministry that is helpful to man. If the Holy Spirit intercedes on earth for us, he must exercise an active, personal ministry that is helpful to us. "*Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity.*" Yes, "our infirmity!" That men are weak through the flesh—that "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit," needs not to be argued. That we desire and seek assistance in the great moral struggle of life is a matter of conscious experience with all good men. How does "the Spirit help our infirmity"? He helps us to order our thoughts and prayers wisely before

God. "We know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit maketh intercession for us." The incompetency of men to pray is attested not only by human consciousness, but by the Word of God. "You ask and receive not because you ask amiss." (James 4:3.) "You know not what you ask." (Matt. 20:22.) "If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." (1 John 5:14). Does the Holy Spirit have anything to do with our praying? Listen! "Praying in the Holy Spirit." (Jude 1:20). "Praying, at all seasons, in the Spirit." (Eph. 6:18.) "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us." (Rom. 8:26.)

How does the Holy Spirit help us to pray? We are not required to explain that. We may not be able to comprehend the fact were it set before us. We can conceive of impressions and suggestions from the Holy Spirit, conveyed, we know not how, to the human heart, that would be very helpful to the burdened soul. In the text before us, the writer seems to have touched bottom in the ethical and pathological side of the subject—"The Spirit maketh intercession for us with *groanings* which cannot be uttered." The idea of the inadequacy of language, even when the Spirit is lending his assistance, and of the adequacy of "groanings," through the helpful sympathy of the Holy

Spirit, is here suggested to us. It is no uncommon thing for men to be oppressed with anxious care and deep grief, to such a measure that language fails them. It is no uncommon thing for the soul thus burdened to give vent to its emotions by "groanings." Even this brings its relief. If such is its experience in its solitary struggles, may it not be thus, and even more so, when the Holy Spirit "helpeth our infirmity," and "maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered?"

The difference is, and a mighty difference, too, that these "groanings," when inspired by the ministry of the Spirit, are wisely directed, "because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." How gladly should the Christian avail himself of the intercessory work of the Holy Spirit, praying always—"praying at all seasons, in the Spirit."

8. He *bears witness* of our adoption. "Ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." (Rom. 8:15, 16.) "God sent forth his Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. 4:4-6.) "My

conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Spirit.” (Rom. 9: 1.)

This last quotation is made not because it refers to the subject of adoption, but because it bears directly and pointedly upon the matter of the Spirit’s “bearing witness.” Paul is here speaking of his own deep feeling of interest in the spiritual welfare of his Jewish brethren. Hear him: “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren’s sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh.” Paul’s moral nature, his moral sense “in the Holy Spirit,” as affected and influenced by the Spirit, assured Paul of his own intense fraternal feeling toward the Jews—“my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Spirit.” In the same way Paul teaches us that the Holy Spirit bears witness in the matter of the Christian’s adoption, his sonship with God. “*The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God.*” Why not? If the Holy Spirit, in his relation to Paul’s moral nature, made Paul conscious of his intense *fraternal* feeling toward the Jews, why should he not, in his relation to Paul’s spiritual nature, make him conscious of his own

*filial* feeling toward the Heavenly Father? Can a man have a filial heart toward God and not be a child of God? And how does he obtain this filial heart? Listen again to Paul: "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." God did something—what was it? Answer: "God sent forth the Spirit into our hearts." And then the Spirit "in our hearts" did something. What was it? Answer: "Crying, Abba, Father." A little metonymy here. It is the human spirit that cries, "Abba, Father;" but it does so through the influence of the Holy Spirit—"Whereby *we* cry, Abba, Father," is the way Paul puts it in the first passage at the head of this section.

Through his moral consciousness, then, man recognizes himself as being definitely affected toward his fellow men, and as being definitely related to them; and through his spiritual consciousness he recognizes himself as being definitely affected toward God, and as being definitely related to him. The Holy Spirit, then, operates from without on the human mind, through the gospel of Christ, along with the gospel of Christ, and not without the gospel of Christ; and thus convicts the mind and converts the soul, and leads the man, through the gospel truth, into discipleship with Christ,



and into sonship with God. The divine Father then sends the Spirit of his Son into the heart where he operates through the word of truth, along with the word of truth, and not without the word of truth, creating in the heart a spiritual consciousness of filial relationship whereby the child of God cries, "Abba, Father." It is in this way, as we understand it, that "the Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God."

9. He *renews* us. "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Savior." (Titus 3:5.) "Be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." (Rom. 12:2.) "Though our outward man is decaying, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." (2 Cor. 4:16.) "Put away, as concerning your former life, the old man, who waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, who after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth." (Eph. 4:22-24.) "You have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, who is being renewed unto knowledge

after the image of him that created him.”  
(Col. 3: 10.)

These Scriptures, which might be easily multiplied, indicate clearly the fact of a great moral change contemplated in the religion of Jesus Christ; and point out in some measure the nature of that change, as well as the agency through which it is accomplished. While a man's individuality is not disturbed nor his identity lost in the revolution experienced in becoming a Christian, yet that revolution is so radical as to call for very strong expressions in any attempt to convey an adequate idea of it. The “*old man*” and the “*new man*” are set in contrast before us—“the old man with his doings” is said to be “put off,” while the “new man, who is renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him,” is “put on.” The similitude of doffing old clothes and donning new ones is suggestive when applied to character; and would seem to mean more than is sometimes observed in men professing Christianity. That this is true is made to appear in the further unfolding of the subject by the same apostle. “The old man who waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit,” is represented as being “put away” while the same person is said to be “renewed in the spirit of his mind, and puts on the new man,

who after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth." This implies something more than "joining the church," something far more significant than making a "profession of religion." The "inward man," "the spirit of your mind," is "renewed," is redressed, rehabilitated "in righteousness and holiness," and "unto knowledge after the image of him that created him." What dignity of character! What nobility of Christian manhood! What change, what revolution, what transformation, so great, so real, so important as this? It will help us to understand this subject if we recall the fact that it is the same original term employed in the Scriptures when they speak of the transfiguration of Christ that is used in speaking of our moral transfiguration — *metamorphoo*, metamorphose. In his account of this event Mark says: "He was transfigured before them; and his garments became glistening, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them." While Matthew says: "He was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his garments became white as the light."

Now turning from this scene to the other we read: "Be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye *transfigured* by the renewing of your mind." And then again in 2 Cor.

3:18, we hear as follows: "We all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are *transfigured* into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit."

Let it be noted carefully that this wonderful transfiguration within us of our moral character and our spiritual life is "*from the Lord the Spirit.*" As presented to us in the first text quoted above under this item, we have God achieving this result through the means and agencies of his own appointment, thus: "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and *renewing of the Holy Spirit* which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Language could not be more explicit. This is the work of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men.

But now let us carefully note the fact that this great spiritual change, this transformation of character, this transfiguration of life, is not an instantaneous, miraculous work of grace. "The inward man is renewed *day by day,*" is the scriptural idea. It is a process. It is a question of time for its full development and complete realization. Again, it is the result of personal effort—"You have put off the old man with his doings"—"You have put on the new man." And yet, it is personal agency co-op-

erating with divine agency—"Who is *being renewed*"—"Who after God hath *been created* in righteousness and holiness." A religion that excludes human agency is fatalism. A religion that excludes divine agency is rationalism. A religion that includes both human and divine agency, properly adjusted and properly proportioned, is *Christism*—Christianity.

10. He *anoints* and *sanctifies* us. Under the old dispensation persons were set apart from the ordinary vocations of life to the special services of religion by anointing them with oil. In the twenty-eighth chapter of Exodus we find Moses instructed concerning the separation of Aaron and his sons to the priestly office—"Thou shalt anoint them, and consecrate them, and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office." And in giving further instructions in the twenty-ninth chapter, God says: "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil and pour it upon his head, and anoint him."

In the tenth chapter of Acts, the Apostle Peter, preaching concerning Jesus of Nazareth, says: "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power." And in the same line of thought Paul writes to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 1:21), after this manner: "He that stablisheth us with you in Christ, and anointed us, is God."

The Apostle John also speaks very pointedly and tenderly of this matter. (1 John 2:20-27.) "You have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . The anointing which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you; but his anointing teacheth you concerning all things."

In Rom. 15:16 the Apostle Paul, speaking of his special ministry to the Gentiles, and his preaching to them the gospel through the grace given him of God, says all this was in order "that the offering up of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit."

And in writing to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. 2:13), he says: "We are bound to give thanks to God alway for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, for that God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

The Apostle Peter, also in his general epistle to the dispersed Christians, reminds them of their election, "According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit." (1 Pet. 1:2).

To sanctify is to make holy. To make holy is to separate from sin—from its practice, from its guilt, from its effects. We speak now of

sanctification as applied to personal character. The Holy Spirit is an essential factor in separating a man from sin and making him holy in heart and in life. This process begins with the first act of the soul's surrender to Christ, and continues with every effort it makes to free itself from the dominion of sin; and until its final emancipation from all the direful effects of sin—its direful effects on the physical, intellectual and moral nature of man. In referring to this subject the Scriptures sometimes speak of sanctification as effected in our first formal separation from the world and identification with Christ and his church. Thus Paul addressed the saints in Corinth as, "them that *are* sanctified in Christ Jesus." And subsequently, in 1 Cor. 6:11, he says: "Ye were washed, ye *were* sanctified, ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." This view of sanctification considers it as already accomplished. Yet every Christian knows that his separation from sin is not completed in his first formal commitment to Christ. The practice of sin must now cease, and the effects of sin must yet be overcome.

A broader view of this subject is taken by Paul in 1 Thess. 5:23: "The God of peace sanctify you *wholly*, and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without

blame, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” It is the Holy Spirit then that sanctifies us; and in this gracious work he is said to be “poured” out—“I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh.” This is said in allusion to the pouring of oil in the consecrating service of the Jewish religion. And this is John’s idea when he speaks of the “anointing which ye received,” and, “the anointing from the Holy One.” Paul says: “He that anointed us is God.”

It is this anointing from the Holy One, this sanctification of the Spirit that makes the souls of sinful men “acceptable” unto God—“That the offering up of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, *being sanctified by the Holy Spirit.*” And it is in line with this thought that Paul (Rom. 12:1.) exhorts his brethren after this style: “I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your spiritual service.”

11. He bears *fruit* within us. “The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance.” (Gal. 5: 22.)

We gather fruit from trees, and without the tree there can be no fruit. The Holy Spirit is here presented to us under the figure of a tree



bearing fruit. And what a rich cluster of fruits —“Love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance!” What a unique tree to produce such fruit! Without the Holy Spirit how different the fruit produced by human nature—“Fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, parties, envyings, drunkenness, revellings, and such like.” (Gal. 5: 19.) The difference between this latter catalogue of fruits and the former indicates the introduction of a new factor, a new force, a new influence into human life. By the process of grafting the quality of the fruit which a tree produces may be radically changed. So the Holy spirit operating in the human heart changes the moral quality of the feelings. The Holy Spirit and his fruits are not to be identified. This would be to identify cause and effect. The Holy Spirit so moves upon the human heart as to create in it a spirit of holiness; but this spirit of holiness and the Holy Spirit are no more the same than the love which a mother inspires in the heart of her child is the same as the mother. Through that love thus planted in the child’s heart the mother and the child are brought into sympathy and fellowship with each other. So through the spirit of holiness

created in the human heart, the human spirit and the Holy Spirit are brought into fellowship or communion with each other.

In Rom. 5:5 Paul says: "The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit that was given unto us." Whether this means God's love to us, as some commentators hold, or our love to God, as others teach, it matters not. The result is substantially the same. If the Holy Spirit makes us sensible of God's love toward us, this awakens love in our hearts in response toward God. "We love him because he first loved us." And thus our love to God is "shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit that was given unto us." It is in this view of the subject that the Scriptures speak of "the love of the Spirit," and of "love in the Spirit."

Joy, as the fruit of the Spirit, is frequently mentioned in the Word of God. "And the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit." (Acts 13:52.) "The kingdom of God is joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14:17.) And in writing to the Thessalonians, the apostle speaks of their "having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Spirit." (1 Thess. 1:6.) And no Christian grace is more emphasized in the divine Scriptures than "peace," another "fruit of the Spirit." The

Savior was wont to say unto his disciples, "Peace be unto you." In the Gospel of John 20: 21, 22, we read: "Jesus therefore said to them again, Peace be unto you; as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit." And the apostles often invoke the benediction of peace upon those to whom they write. Thus Paul, in the introduction of his epistles to the church in Rome and also at Corinth says: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." And he again says: "To be spiritually minded is life and peace." Also in Rom. 15:13 hear him: "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit." In the same epistle he further declares: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

While it is true, and a truth that should never be ignored, that human nature has its good as well as its evil impulses, yet it is a fact that we cannot appreciate too highly, that the noblest tendencies of our being, our purest and most spiritual feelings and desires, our chief moral and religious virtues, are the "*fruit of the Holy Spirit.*"

12. He enables us to *know*—to know the *divine*. “This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.” (John 17: 3.) “If you had known me, you would have known my Father also; from henceforth you know him.” (John 14:7.) “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: you know him; for he abideth with you and shall be in you.” (John 14:16, 17.) “You have an anointing from the Holy One, and you know all things. I have not written unto you because you know not the truth, but because you know it. . . . The anointing which you received of him abideth in you, and you need not that any one teach you; but his anointing teacheth you concerning all things and is true.” (1 John 2:20-27.) “I know him whom I have believed.” (2 Tim. 1:12.)

This phase of our subject was discussed, in some measure, in a preceding section, but it is important enough to be enlarged upon from another view—to be extended in another direction. And it is on this account that the same passages are sometimes quoted a second, or even a third time. Men not unfrequently preach

very different sermons from the same text of Scripture, and yet their different lines of thought may be authorized by the text. Truth is manifold, many-sided, and is susceptible of various applications.

The discussion heretofore on this point has had reference to the assistance given us to recognize moral and spiritual truth when revealed to us. In the present investigation, reference is had to our ability to recognize, not divine truth so much as *divine being*.

“This is eternal life that they should *know thee*, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.” What a pathetic utterance that of Christ, “O righteous Father, the world knew thee not.” He says also in another place, “They know not him that sent me.” And Paul writes to the Thessalonians of “The Gentiles who know not God;” and then of Jesus Christ “taking vengeance on them that know not God.”

While all men are endowed with an intuitive power by which they perceive God, yet they need to be aided in the right use and exercise of it, in order to an adequate and satisfying apprehension of the divine Being. It is the Holy Spirit that lends this aid—lends it according to man’s moral condition and receptive capacity. Concerning this Holy Spirit, the Savior says,

“The world cannot receive him, neither know him,” for the reason that, in their spiritual blindness, they “beholdeth him not.” But with his disciples, whom he had led, partially, at that time, though not fully, out of darkness into light, it was otherwise. To them the Master said, “*You know him.*” And he then proceeds to explain, “For he abideth with you and shall be in you.” He has been and is now operating on your understanding, and he shall hereafter operate upon your hearts. It is in allusion to this partial and fuller apprehension of the divine Nature that the Son of God said to his disciples: “If you had known me, you would have known my Father also; and *from henceforth you know him.*” If the “anointing from the Holy One” enabled the disciple to know the truth, to recognize moral and spiritual truth when revealed to him, much more does it make clear his spiritual vision to discern God, the author of all truth.

Can you persuade the truly awakened and enlightened Christian that the idea of God is all a dream, that Christ is a fiction, that the Holy Spirit is a myth? Paul said, “*I know him whom I have believed.*” To “know” God means something more than to believe in God. We begin in faith and grow into knowledge. I now “know him,” says Paul, “whom

I *have* believed," heretofore. The Christ of history, the Christ of God, the divine Christ can be recognized in his true nature and character only by the helpful ministry of the Holy Spirit—"No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." (1 Cor. 12:3.)

13. He *comforts* us. "So the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, had peace, being edified; and, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, was multiplied." (Acts 9:31.) "*In the comfort of the Holy Spirit,*" can only mean that the Holy Spirit comforts us. "In the fear of the Lord," means our fear toward the Lord, and not his fear toward us. "In the comfort of the Holy Spirit," means the Spirit's comfort to us, and not our comfort to the Spirit. This does not need to be argued. One of the names applied to the Holy Spirit, in the Scriptures, is "Comforter." "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." (John 14:16.) "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." (John 14:26). What has already been said in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit in our hearts will serve to indicate, in part at least,

the manner in which he gives comfort to the Christian.

If the Holy Spirit “leads” and “guides” the Christian into the perception of divine truth hitherto undiscerned by him; if he recalls to our “remembrance” truth already known but now forgotten; if by suggestion or impression or original thought pertaining to new or old truth, or by the removal of obstructions to the entrance of light, or the removal of difficulties and hindrances to its due observance and just appreciation, he brings “peace” to the anxious, troubled soul; if by “shedding abroad in our hearts the love of God”—God’s love to us or our love to God, a deeper sense of the divine philanthropy and of our own filial relation and affection toward the Heavenly Father is inspired in those hearts; if this gracious ministry, in any wise, plants “joy” in this pilgrim life, especially if it be that divine measure of joy—“joy unspeakable and full of glory;” if it places the child of God in position to “abound in hope in the power of the Holy Spirit”—hope with reference to victories in this life, or the final victory of eternal life; if it “helps” and “strengthens” him to “gird up the loins of his mind” with greater faith and endurance, and to “lift up the hands that hang down and the feeble knees”—if the Holy Spirit by his



holy ministry does all these things, may we not believe that there is a "*comfort*" in that ministry to be found nowhere else?

14. He *seals* us, and is the *earnest* of our inheritance. "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance." (Eph. 1:13, 14.) "Who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (2 Cor. 1:22.) "Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God, who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit." (2 Cor. 5:5.) "And not only so, but ourselves also, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." (Rom. 8:23.)

The idea here is that God sends the Holy Spirit into the heart and life of his child as a seal is placed on a business document. The metaphor evidently means something, and was intended to teach us a lesson concerning the work of the Spirit in the Christian. A seal properly applied to a document means an *official recognition* of the parties to the transaction. If the parties are not personally known, they cannot be officially recognized and known as parties to the transaction in hand. The official seal thus affixed is an *authoritative approval* of the parties to the transaction—approval so

far as the given transaction is concerned. It is also official *endorsement* of the *validity* of the transaction, and places the parties and the transaction within the sphere of responsibility to the law governing the case. Figures are not to be pressed too far. They are only intended to illustrate truth, and not to exemplify it in detail. We may safely say, however, that when the Heavenly Father gives the Holy Spirit to those who seek him, it is his official approval and endorsement of the validity of their claims, and a recognition of the legitimacy of the transactions involved in the case. "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" can mean nothing less than that, and that certainly means very much. And it may be added that an official seal gives *public notice* and *information* of the facts recognized, approved and endorsed by the seal, and pertaining to the transaction, whatever that may be. Without this seal a grave defect would attach to every interest involved. We have shown in a preceding section that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart is made manifest to the world by the effects produced on the character of the subject, by the "fruit" exhibited in the life—love, joy, peace, etc. This fruit, this change into the likeness of Christ, gives information to the world that God has given

his Holy Spirit to the Christian. Need we add that without this gift of the Holy Spirit, without this divine seal, a grave and fatal defect attaches to all our professions and pretensions in the matter of religion?

But this gift is also "the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts," and "an earnest of our inheritance," called also "the first fruits of the Spirit." The first fruits of the harvest are a pledge and assurance of a more bountiful blessing in store for the future. An "earnest" is a foretaste, an advance payment certifying and securing a covenant for larger measures of grace, for full payment of purchase price. That which follows the "earnest," the "advance payment," the "first fruits," is the same in quality, but more abundant in quantity than the foretaste. As gracious, as comforting, as strengthening to the child of God as the Holy Spirit in his heart may be, yet it is not difficult to believe that this is only an "earnest of our inheritance," only the *first* fruits of the Spirit, and that heaven will be far more abundant of "love, joy and peace." And, believing with Paul that "He that wrought us for this very thing is God," we can also with him say, "We groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." As we were "adopted" into the earthly family, the

church, and received the "spirit of adoption," so shall we be "adopted" into the heavenly family, the "Church of the first born," and receive the "spirit of adoption" in larger measure.

We have now brought to the attention of the reader *fourteen* things which the Scriptures declare the Holy Spirit does in the human heart. Each of these topics is a fit theme for a discourse. We commend them in this light to the preachers of the gospel.

#### WHAT WE MAY DO TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Throughout this discussion it has been assumed that in all his operations on the human soul the Holy Spirit moves in harmony with the established laws of spiritual natures; that he is ever observant of those laws, and so operates as in no wise to infract or disturb them; that the human mind was endowed with the capacity to think and feel and will, and that the unrestrained exercise of these functions is at all times necessary to the freedom of choice, which in turn is necessary to give a moral cast to action and character. We are now to consider the operations of the human spirit on the Holy Spirit, and we assume the same principles to obtain in this case as in the

former. The Holy Spirit thinks, feels and wills; has free volitional power, and consequently moral character. The Scriptures plainly teach that the human spirit may operate upon and affect the divine nature. In this investigation we are not to lose sight of the fact that there is a vast difference, however, between these two natures, the human and the divine. The one is finite, the other is infinite; the one is mighty, the other is almighty; the one is peccable, the other is immaculate. The difference, however, between the capacity of each to affect and influence the other is probably not so great as these varying attributes might suggest, since each is limited in its power to move upon the other by the fact that the other is invested with personality, freedom of choice, and moral character, and all operations of the subject toward the object must be in full recognition of these essential attributes.

Now to the subject in hand—What may the human spirit do to affect the Holy Spirit?

1. We may *resist* the Holy Spirit. “Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye.” (Acts 7: 51.) “As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.” (2 Tim. 3:8.) “Be subject,

therefore, unto God; but resist the devil and he will flee from you.” (James 4:7.)

This last passage is introduced because of its indirect bearing on the subject. “Be subject, therefore, unto God.” This clearly implies that we may receive or resist the approaches of the divine nature. In the exercise of our personal freedom we may open or blockade the way of ingress for the ministry of the Spirit of God. “Resist the devil and he will flee from you,” indicates also this same capacity on the part of one spirit to resist another.

“As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth.” Here one human spirit resists another human spirit. But more than that. Moses was God’s minister, and the Holy Spirit wrought in him and through him. And to resist Moses is to resist the Holy Spirit, and also to “resist the truth” which the Holy Spirit uttered through Moses. “Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit,” said Stephen. It is the work of the Holy Spirit to implant truth in the human mind, and to inspire the soul with the purest and holiest emotions, impulses and tendencies. In whatever ways, means, or methods the Holy Spirit may instil into our souls these divine thoughts, incentives and impulses for good, we

resist him when we resist these thoughts, incentives and impulses. And when we follow these we are "led by the Spirit," and "guided" by the Spirit, and "taught" by the Spirit, and "sanctified" by the Spirit.

2. We may do *despite* unto the Spirit. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (10:29), we read of those, "Who have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace." *Despite*—that is a very strong expression. It implies thought and feeling—intense thought and unholy feeling of one intelligent being toward another; in the present instance, of the human spirit toward the divine Spirit. Nor need we assume the attitude of personal animosity or intentional disrespect toward the Holy Spirit in order to reach that end. We need only to think and feel and live out of harmony with *a holy spirit* in order to do despite to *the Holy Spirit*. The sin we are considering is so classified in the text above as to indicate the degree of its sinfulness—"trodden under foot the Son of God," "counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing," "done despite unto the Spirit of grace." A man might become more criminal, but he could not

well become more sinful. He might commit other acts of violence toward men, but he could not well make his spiritual nature more depraved. When a man turns his back on religion the die is cast. He may go on "heaping up wrath against the day of wrath," but all subsequent sins are but exponents of this lost virtue; exponents of a nature that has suffered a moral eclipse, of a character that has passed into a state of spiritual atrophy. "*Trodden under foot the Son of God,*" means more than neglecting the Son of God, more than disobeying the Son of God. "*Counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing,*" means more than to count it an unnecessary thing. And to "*do despite unto the Spirit of grace,*" means more than to disregard or even to dislike the Holy Spirit. And yet these incipient sins always prepare the way for the graver and grosser ones. He who neglects and disobeys the Son of God habitually will soon reach the point where he can "tread him under foot" with disdain. He who counts the blood of the covenant an unnecessary thing, will come later on to "count it an unholy thing." And he who habitually disregards the impulses for good which the Holy Spirit plants in his heart, will soon come to dislike them, and later on to "do despite" unto them, and to the Holy Spirit himself.



3. We may *grieve* the Holy Spirit. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption." (Eph. 4:30.) "They rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit." (Isa. 63:10.)

Doing despite unto the Spirit involves an experience in the human heart; grieving the Holy Spirit involves an experience in the divine nature. The perverted moral conditions in man that lead him to do despite unto the Spirit, become a cause that touches and affects the divine nature. A moral cause in the sinful nature of man produces a moral effect in the sinless nature of God. It is in this way that the spirit of man operates on the Holy Spirit. The divine nature is sensitive to moral influences, more so than human nature, because better, purer, holier. Is it possible that I may "*grieve*" the Holy Spirit? What a thought! Grieve him who is infinite, almighty, immanent, immaculate? Why not? Does he see within us the possibilities of better things? Does he "strive with man" to instil motives, incentives, tendencies and inclinations for holy living in his heart? Does he providentially work to remove difficulties and obstructions out of his way? Does he "stand at the door and knock," seeking entrance that he may "dwell" with him, that he may "sup" with him, that

he may “commune” with him? Does he come with love, sympathetic love, and with blessings, rich spiritual blessings, divine blessings, and “helpful,” “strengthening” blessings? Does he live evermore around us, and breathe the breath of heaven evermore upon us? Does he do all these things, and do them to the very verge of divine power, to the very verge of human freedom; and yet, man disregards his admonitions, and dislikes his importunities, and even “does despite to the Spirit of grace”? What else *can* the Holy Spirit do except “grieve”?

4. We may *blaspheme* against the Holy Spirit. “Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven.” (Matt. 12:31.) “Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.” (Mark 3:29.) Is there any thought more appalling than that of a man’s blaspheming against the Holy Spirit? Is there anything more startling to man’s moral sense of responsibility than the idea of committing a sin that “*shall not be forgiven him;*” that “*hath never forgiveness*”? Is there any conception of sin so terrifying in its effects upon a man’s moral consciousness as that it may become “an *eternal sin*”? What is meant

by a sin's being eternal? As a matter of fact, all sins are eternal. An act once performed is performed forever—can never be recalled. Our regrets over it, our repentance of it, our apologies for it, can never change the fact that it was done, that the deed was committed. But repentance and forgiveness remove the consequences of sin; and this, in Scripture style, is removing and expunging sin. "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." (Ps. 103: 12.) "He was manifested to take away our sins." (1 John 3: 5.) "He washed our sins away in his own blood." (Rev. 1: 5.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.)

To say, then, that a sin is forgiven, is to say that it ceases to exist; and to say that a sin is *unforgiven*, *never* forgiven, is to say that it is *eternal*. There is one sin that "hath never forgiveness," that is "an eternal sin;" and that is, "*blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.*" The apostle John in his first epistle, 5: 16, says: "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that he should make request." Why

is it that this one sin, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, cannot find forgiveness? For the simple reason that a man cannot repent of it. "Repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," always and everywhere, secures the favor and forgiveness of God. This conclusion is vindicated by the highest moral reasoning, and by the plainest scriptural teaching. Let us read now a lesson on this subject from the divine word: "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance." (Heb. 6: 4, 5.) "*It is impossible to renew them again to repentance*"—there is the difficulty. But why is it impossible for them to repent? For the reason that the cause which induces repentance has been exhausted. Repentance means a change of mind. But the mind does not change without cause. That great moral change, repentance, is wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit, through the gospel of Jesus Christ. Now when that soul, deliberately and intelligently, turns away from that gospel, and repudiates that holy ministry, he is lost to the only moral agency that can superinduce gospel

repentance. And being morally unable to repent, God is morally unable to forgive. What an awful possibility there is before every soul!

5. We may *quench* the Holy Spirit. "Quench not the Spirit." (1 Thess. 5: 19.) To quench is to extinguish, to put out of existence. Water taken within quenches thirst, poured on fire extinguishes it. The injunction, "quench not the Spirit," implies the ability on the part of man, in some sense, to extinguish the Spirit. The infinite Spirit of God, I suppose, could, as a simple question of power, extinguish the finite spirit of man. But can the finite extinguish the infinite? Can the human spirit quench the Holy Spirit? Certainly not in a literal sense. The human spirit cannot put the Holy Spirit out of existence absolutely. But it may put him out of existence relatively. The human spirit may put itself in such a plight, may assume such a moral attitude, and grow into such a moral condition, as to preclude the possibility of any fellowship with the Holy Spirit. Men sometimes grow out of sympathy with each other to such an extent as to render any sort of friendly intercourse between them impossible; all business relations and all social commerce cease. In this case they are extinguished to each other. They are mutually put out of

existence. It is in this way that the spirit of man may quench the Spirit of God. We become engrossed in worldly affairs and lend ourselves to carnal indulgences; we grow indifferent to the nobler incentives, and the holier impulses of the divine Spirit; we follow these tendencies sometimes to such an extent as to become positively averse to light and purity, to truth and righteousness, and to all that is divine and good. This spiritual condition on the part of man excludes the ministry of the Holy Spirit as a moral consequence, and as a moral necessity. So far as that soul is concerned the Holy Spirit is quenched, extinguished—ceases to exist. “If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.” What a climax sin can make for itself! Beginning with insidious and imperceptible tendencies to “resist” the Spirit of God, it rises—shall we not rather say, it sinks?—sinks lower and lower, through gradual, but certain, and increasing infirmity, degeneracy, decay, and unto death—spiritual death—eternal sin and eternal death! *Resist, despite, grieve, blaspheme and quench* the Holy Spirit!

## VII.

### ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT.

JOHN L. WALLER, a distinguished Baptist minister and editor of the *Western Recorder*, published at Louisville, Ky., in 1851, replying to some things Dr. N. L. Rice of the Presbyterian Church had written against Alexander Campbell, said:

“Dr. Rice has suffered his zeal and his temper to betray him into an act of gross injustice. In charging Mr. Campbell with denying the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit, and in fraternizing with Arians and Universalists, etc., he has disregarded all the facts in the case.

“Dr. Rice had a protracted debate with Mr. Campbell some eight years ago. That discussion furnishes no authority for the above sweeping charges. Mr. Campbell then most emphatically maintained the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit. All candid men have decided that upon that subject he was, at that time, as sound and as orthodox as Dr. Rice, or any other man in the evangelical world. . . . Excepting his ‘metaphysical nonsense’ on the design of baptism, which we ascribe to his Presbyterian education—on all other great and fundamental truths of our holy religion, we unhesitatingly declare that we esteem Mr. Campbell as orthodox as any of this day and generation. We have not seen a sentiment of his respecting the design of baptism, which gave more importance to the ordinance than is given to it in the Westminster stand-

ards. Indeed, he has not gone so far as do all the pedobaptist formulas, whether Papal or Protestant. Mr. Campbell, in his most extravagant amplification of baptism, never claimed that it did more for a *believer* than the whole pedobaptist world have taught that it did for both *believers* and *unconscious babes*."

The above extract will be found in the *Millennial Harbinger* for January, 1852, page 45. It is introduced here because it shows in what light Mr. Campbell was viewed by one of his contemporaries, a very prominent and a very competent journalist and leader in religious thought among the Baptists of that day. Mr. Waller had come to understand better the teachings of Mr. Campbell, and had grown out of his early animosities into cordial relations, and a positive personal friendship with him. It was Mr. Waller's father who felt called upon, after prayerful consideration over the matter, to deliberately consign to the flames and burn up the new translation of the New Testament which Mr. Campbell published. The son, John L. Waller, had grown up with strong prejudices against Mr. Campbell, but having heard him in his debate with Mr. Rice, and having read after him extensively, he came not only to view him as a sound theologian, but admired him for his great abilities and his personal qualities as a Christian man. What



Mr. Waller calls Mr. Campbell's "metaphysical nonsense" about the design of baptism, was Mr. Campbell's distinction between "real" and "formal" pardon. While with Mr. Campbell the sinner's "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" put him in a moral state of acceptance, yet he was not in a legal state of acceptance until he was baptized. But it was this very phase of the subject that Mr. Campbell felt called upon to emphasize before the world, because he saw it was not justly estimated. In his estimation, the Scriptures made baptism as truly a condition of remission of sins as the blood of Christ, or as faith and repentance, though not in the same "sense." The blood of Christ was an essential moral prerequisite, on the divine side, in the mind of God; faith in that atoning Christ was an essential moral condition on the human side, in the mind of man; while baptism was the essential *legal* condition, appointed of God, and to be accepted of man, *in order to the sinner's full and free forgiveness and his induction into all the privileges of the kingdom of God on earth.* Let not the reader suppose that the writer has forgotten the subject proposed for investigation in this chapter—"Alexander Campbell on the Word and the Spirit." When the Savior said, "Except a man be born of water and of the

Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," he placed baptism and the Holy Spirit in close proximity. And the two most conspicuous doctrinal points in Mr. Campbell's plea for a reformation were the *mode* of the Holy Spirit's operation and the *design* of baptism. These are the two capital points referred to in the quotation from John L. Waller at the head of this chapter. And we shall be at a little pains in opening up the present discussion to view these two topics in this relation.

Mr. Campbell's mind was clear on these points, but, as he himself frequently said, he was not always "equally felicitous" in expressing himself. And this lack, at times, of felicity on his part became the opportunity for misunderstanding and misrepresentation on the part of others.

Mr. Campbell clearly distinguished between the *moral state* into which the sinner is brought by the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the man, and the *legal state* into which he is brought by his obedience in baptism. And he was at great pains to set this forth in the beginning of his debate with Mr. Rice on the influence of the Holy Spirit. Hear him:

"I therefore now most distinctly and emphatically state that with me, and in reference to this discussion, these

terms (conversion, regeneration, sanctification,) severally and collectively indicate a *moral*, a *spiritual* and not a physical or legal change. A physical change has respect to the essence or form of the subject. A legal change is a change as respects a legal sentence, or enactment. Hence pardon, remission, justification, have respect to law. But a moral or spiritual change is a change of the moral state of the feelings, and of the soul. In contrast with a merely intellectual change—a change of views, it is called a change of the affections—a change of heart. It is in this acceptance of the subject of my proposition that I predicate of it, 'The Spirit operates only through the Word.' "

Let us pause here now long enough to raise a question. Was it possible for Alexander Campbell to maintain, as he did, that the Holy Spirit works in the sinner conversion, regeneration, sanctification, a change of heart, or, as Mr. Campbell expresses it elsewhere, "the inward baptism that changes the state," and yet maintain that that man is in a state of *moral condemnation*? The thing is impossible. The Savior says, "He that believeth on the Son of God is not condemned." Why is he not condemned? Because, as the Savior elsewhere says, "He that believeth is passed from death unto life"—has passed from one moral state into another. And yet, Mr. Campbell held that that man was in a state of *legal condemnation* until he was baptized, and he rightly so held. A man then may be in a state of moral acceptance with God, and at the same time be

in a state of legal condemnation; and this is precisely the status of every true believer until he is baptized, and precisely the status of every Christian man who has not been *immersed*.

John L. Waller respected and fraternized with all sincere and godly pedobaptists, and in doing so, he held practically to the same "metaphysical nonsense" with Mr. Campbell. Mr. Campbell saw all this very clearly, and he always claimed that what he boldly avowed on this subject was the common doctrine of the Protestant world as taught by their leaders and in their standards. And he even charged them with a lack of courage and consistency in not being true to their own convictions and declarations on this subject.

In 1846, Mr. Campbell published in the *Millennial Harbinger* a formal statement of the chief points in his religious faith, which was as follows:

"1. I believe all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, is profitable for teaching, conviction, instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly accomplished for every good work.

"2. I believe in one God as manifested in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are therefore one in power, nature and volition.

"3. I believe that every human being participates in all the consequences of the fall of Adam, and is born into the world frail and depraved in all his moral powers and capa-

cities. So that without faith in Christ it is impossible for him, while in that state, to please God.

“4. I believe the Word which from the beginning was with God, and which was God, became flesh and dwelt among us as Immanuel, or ‘God manifest in the flesh,’ and did make an expiation of sins by the sacrifice of himself, which no being could have done that was not possessed of superhuman, superangelic and divine nature.

“5. I believe in the justification of sinners by faith without the deeds of law; and of a Christian, not by faith alone, but by the obedience of faith.

“6. I believe in the operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word, but not without it, in conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

“7. I believe in the right and duty of exercising our own judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

“8. I believe in the divine institution of the evangelical ministry, the authority and perpetuity of baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”

Attention is called especially to the fifth article in this declaration—“I believe in the justification of sinners by faith without the deeds of law; and of a Christian, not by faith alone, but by the obedience of faith.”

The construction of this article is such as to preclude the possibility of any mistake as to Mr. Campbell’s meaning, as it would seem. He believes in the justification of the sinner, “*by faith without the deeds of law;*” and the justification of the Christian, “*not by faith alone, but by the obedience of faith.*” The expressions “*by faith without the deeds of*

law," and "by faith alone," are regarded by the general Christian world as equivalent, as theological synonyms. Mr. Campbell knew this to be so, and he either intended to be so understood, or he intended purposely to mislead the public. And it is impossible for us to believe the latter.

In the year 1855, Dr. S. W. Lynd, a distinguished Baptist minister, at that time, I believe, a resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, felt called upon to defend Mr. Campbell against a virulent assault made upon him in the *Tennessee Baptist* by its editor. Dr. Lynd lays before his readers the foregoing declarations of faith by Mr. Campbell, and then writes a lengthy article in defense of Mr. Campbell, which was republished in the *Millennial Harbinger* for September, 1855. Among other things Dr. Lynd says:

"Is there a Baptist church in the world which can show a more sound confession of faith? . . . I am no apologist for the errors of Mr. Campbell, or any other man, but I do most heartily indorse the principles stated in this confession. I feel bound, as far as possible, to explain his views, as published since that confession was made, by his fundamental principles. If he is an honest man, he will write nothing which he does not believe to be in conformity with these principles.

"I think it but an act of justice, and the laws of language demand it, that his views as published in *Christian Baptism*, which you quote, should be explained in the light of the fundamental principles which he has solemnly declared he holds.

“I believe with Mr. Campbell that *faith is belief* upon testimony. The circumstances under which it is exercised, embracing the views of the sinner, and his state of heart, constitute the difference between belief which saves, and belief which does not save. And that is taught in *all* theological schools, though not always in the same words.

“I have no sympathy with the doctrine that immersion is to be administered to procure remission of sins, and yet I believe that the design of this ordinance is imperfectly comprehended both by Baptists and by pedobaptists. No person who believes the Bible can deny that there is a connection between baptism and salvation, as there is between regeneration and salvation, or between faith and justification, or between persevering obedience and salvation. The question to be determined is, What is that connection? I believe that Mr. Campbell has not reached the truth in this matter, and, therefore, I do not indorse his views. But may not Baptists generally fall short in their views of the design of baptism? Is there not a point of view to which all of us may before long be brought, by honest and Christian-like discussion? I believe that we enjoy the love of God in our hearts the moment we believe in Christ; but that it may be shed abroad more fully by the Holy Spirit, and that the most of the spiritual blessings we enjoy may be consequent upon our baptism, must be admitted by all who hold that baptism is *‘the answer of a good conscience toward God.’* How can a believer fully enjoy spiritual blessings while this answer of a good conscience has not been had?”

Dr. Lynd evidently understands Mr. Campbell to hold that there is a sense in which the sinner is forgiven and accepted of God before his baptism, and yet to hold that, in some sense, his baptism is connected with his salvation, and he avows his own belief in the same doctrine, though probably not holding just the

same view of it that Mr. Campbell did. He further states his conviction that all parties need to come to a clearer understanding of this subject.

After publishing the foregoing sentiments with regard to Mr. Campbell and his teachings Dr. Lynd was led by some things that appeared in our papers to conclude that he did not probably understand Mr. Campbell as well as he thought; and to clear up uncertainties on this point he wrote a letter to Mr. Campbell for the purpose of calling him out more definitely. This letter and Mr. Campbell's reply to it were published in the *Harbinger* for December, 1855. In this letter Dr. Lynd says:

“Our differences may certainly be discussed in a Christian spirit. If there is no real difference, no difference that, in the view of either, affects cardinal doctrines, I see not why we should not aim to be one people. If such difference does exist, then it ought to be fairly understood. . . , . An article from the *Christian Intelligencer* of June 30, you commend, in your *Harbinger* for August, to the attention of Baptist readers as worthy of their grave consideration. In this article the following passage occurs: ‘In preaching to sinners the Baptists declare that justification or remission of sins is enjoyed by faith alone; that as soon as a sinner believes in Christ his sins are pardoned. The disciples declare that it is not only necessary for a sinner to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and to repent sincerely of his sins, but to be baptized, also, before he can enjoy the forgiveness of his sins.’

“Under the circumstances I am compelled to conclude



that this is the settled conviction of the disciples, and that it is also your own conviction. While I feel bound to explain your language in detail by the great principles which you have laid down in your Articles of Faith, as long as it can be done, even by a liberal interpretation, I feel myself unable to harmonize the above sentiment respecting justification with your fifth article. It reads thus: 'I believe in the justification of a sinner by faith, without the deeds of law, and of a Christian not by faith alone, but by the obedience of faith.'

"The words, 'by faith, without deeds of law,' I understand to mean *by faith alone*. I suppose this to be your meaning, and my construction is obviously yours, according to the laws that govern language; for your subsequent expression cuts off all exception, viz.: 'and of a Christian *not by faith alone*.' As thus interpreted I believe it with all my heart. Is this your view of the subject? If so there is no difference between us on this point. But how can I reconcile this with the sentiment contained in your August number? When you say, 'by faith, without the deeds of law,' do you mean that faith and baptism are connected together, in order to justification, regarding *baptism* as not embraced in the words, '*the deeds of law*'? If so, then on a fundamental doctrine we are wide apart in our views. I believe that justification is *by faith alone*, and I am persuaded that the Scriptures will bear me out in this position."

Evidently Dr. Lynd thinks Mr. Campbell appears inconsistent, but does not Dr. Lynd himself appear quite as much so? Hear him: "I have no sympathy with the doctrine that immersion is to be administered to procure remission of sins." "No person who believes the Bible can deny that there is a connection between baptism and salvation." "*Baptism is 'the answer of a*

*good conscience toward God.*' How can a believer fully enjoy spiritual blessings while this answer of a good conscience has not been had?" "I do not believe that justification follows immersion." "I believe that justification is *by faith alone.*" "The question to be determined is, What is the connection between baptism and salvation? I believe that Mr. Campbell has not reached the truth in this matter, and, therefore, I do not endorse his views. But may not Baptists generally fall short in their views of the design of baptism?" "I believe that we enjoy the love of God in our hearts the moment we believe in Christ, but that it may be shed abroad more fully by the Holy Spirit, and that the most of the spiritual blessings we enjoy may be consequent upon our baptism must be admitted by all who hold that baptism is *'the answer of a good conscience toward God.'*" "Is there not a point of view to which all of us may before long be brought by honest and Christian-like discussion?"

It would be difficult to find anything more apparently incongruous in Mr. Campbell's writings than appears in the above sentences quoted from Dr. Lynd. And yet it is not here alleged that either one of these distinguished theologians is really out of harmony with himself, or out of harmony with the Bible, when

both are properly interpreted. Indeed, the writer of these lines does not believe this to be the case. But of this more hereafter.

We will now hear Mr. Campbell's reply to Dr. Lynd, quoting such parts as are pertinent to the matters in hand:

“DR. S. W. LYND:

“*Much Respected Sir*:—Your favor of the 7th ult., via the *Western Recorder*, now lies before me, as I have here placed it before my readers. Accustomed, as I have long been, to the discourteous assaults of *mere* Baptists—*special pleaders*, in a majority of cases, for their darling doctrine of *the mode* of baptizing a *believing subject*—I cannot but thank you for your Christian, gentlemanly and scholarlike epistle. . . . As to our faith and practice, we are quite as tenacious as the Baptists. And farther, I presume we have quite as much scrupulosity of being thought to endorse their peculiarities, as they have, or can have, to endorse ours. . . . The point of your inquiries, my dear sir, seems to me not to involve any *principle* or *doctrine* of Christianity, but, as I understand it, has simply respect to any *change* in my views. Suppose, then, for the sake of illustration, I have changed in some point; and that this change is, in your judgment and that of others, for the better. . . . Is it not wise to change for the better? . . . It is said, with good reason, too, that wise men do sometimes change, but fools never change. I might, then, perhaps, be ashamed to say that I have not changed in one prominent position during my editorial career, lest I should be in jeopardy of the reputation of a sound and disposing mind and memory. That I have somewhat increased in knowledge, and am more confirmed in the common faith and doctrine of Christianity, I should be ashamed not to think, and probably still more ashamed not to avow it; and also to add that I have not, at all times, been equally

felicitous in expressing my views on some litigated questions.

“But in my views of the operations of the Holy Spirit, developed in my debate with Dr. Rice, or my views expressed on that subject in a certain declaration of my faith and doctrine, published in the *Christian System*, or in my review of the Evangelical Alliance (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1846, 1847), I am not conscious of any change, only in enlarged convictions of the value and importance of the views expressed. . . . That we are begotten by the Holy Spirit, and therefore born of water and of the Spirit under one figure, is as plain as our Lord’s discourse with Nicodemus.

“Does *birth* change a man’s nature, or only his *state*? That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*, and that which is born of the Spirit is *spirit*. Wind and water are the natural parents of every living thing, animal and vegetable, upon the green earth. Wind and water are, therefore, the chosen symbols of regeneration in its fullest comprehension. The Spirit first, as indicated by the breath of life, and the water next. Hence, unless a sinful man is quickened or made spiritually alive by the Holy Spirit, water never can give him life. If bread and wine become symbols of spiritual blessings through the sacrifice of Christ, why should not wind and water be used as symbols of spiritual blessings!

“Why did the Great Teacher himself use the metaphors of *wind* and *water* in his discourse with a ruler of the Jews unless opposite types or figures of speech, indicative of the means or causes of that regeneration which he taught! The *wind* or *word* is but the embodiment of the Spirit; and the *water* is but the outward symbol of spiritual purification. Neither wind nor water, however used, have any innate power in, or of, themselves, to impart life of any kind—vegetable, animal or spiritual. All nature is but an *envelop* of Divine power; for it is by God ‘we live, move and have our being,’ animal or spiritual, temporal or eternal.

“Baptism, by itself, is not regeneration; nor is faith, by itself, justification, sanctification or salvation. There is no isolated or insulated act of any agent, exhibited as the means of generation or of regeneration. Baptism, indeed, is by one apostle called ‘*the washing* of regeneration,’ or the washing of the new birth. But no educated mind imagines that the washing of anything is the thing itself. Again: no man was ever born of one parent. Hence the Christian is not born of water alone, nor of the Spirit alone; but born of water and of Spirit; and in this sense only *politically*, or with reference to an earthly state or kingdom. Christ’s kingdom in this world is not political, in our use of that word; and yet the best writers in Christendom write of church *polity*, and regard the church as a *kingdom* or an organized state.”

This letter from Mr. Campbell to Dr. Lynd is a very remarkable production. Mr. Campbell never wrote anything that exhibited greater wisdom, tact and skill. He was writing under a tension, a tension produced by a peculiar combination of public influences and causes, and the circumstances conspired to develop Mr. Campbell’s strength. He never expressed more truth in less space, nor expressed it with more vigor and acumen—truth, philosophical, theological and scriptural.

Attention is called to one sentence in which Mr. Campbell has focalized the teaching of his life with regard to the Holy Spirit and baptism.

“The Christian is not born of water alone, nor of the Spirit alone, but born of water and of Spirit; and in this sense only *politically*, or with reference to an earthly state or kingdom.”

Let the reader study that sentence in the light of all that Mr. Campbell ever wrote on the subject, and he will perceive in it a marvelous condensation of thought. Mr. Campbell always held that the Holy Spirit operating along with the truth of the gospel, by a personal agency, quickens the sinner, and makes him spiritually alive; and thus brings him, of his own free volition, into a moral state of acceptance and favor with God. After this he is baptized, which brings him into a legal state of acceptance. The sinner is thus “born of water and of the Spirit *under one figure*,” he says. Hear him further: “And in this sense only *politically*, or with reference to an earthly state or kingdom.” Mark that carefully. The Holy Spirit’s work in the conversion of the sinner, in his moral regeneration puts him in the *heavenly* kingdom, while baptism, “*the washing* of regeneration” puts him in the “earthly state or kingdom.” All of which is only saying in another form what Mr. Campbell proclaimed in 1823—“Paul’s sins were really pardoned when he believed, formally pardoned when he was baptized.” Hence Mr. Campbell says: “Baptism, by itself, is not regeneration; nor is faith, by itself, justification, sanctification or salvation.” That is, “Baptism, by itself,” (without this previous work of the Holy Spirit

in the heart,) "is not regeneration" (in its full sense); "nor is faith, by itself," (without repentance and baptism,) "justification, sanctification or salvation" (in their full sense). There is a moral state and a legal state, a moral salvation and a legal salvation. And if, in writing upon these different phases of the subject, Mr. Campbell appears at any time, or in any measure, inconsistent or contradictory, it is no more than Dr. Lynd does; it is no more than John L. Waller did; it is no more than Luther did; it is no more than Calvin did; it is no more than Wesley did; it is no more than all the creeds of Protestantism do; it is no more than all great critics and scholars do; it is no more than the New Testament itself does. The narrow, special pleader may conceive of artful and artificial methods of interpretation and exegesis that wear no such appearance; but men of broad minds, conscientious men who are seeking the truth in the love of it, have always shown this apparent inconsistency on this subject of remission of sins. But the contradictory nature of their writings, like that of the Bible, is only in appearance and not in reality. This subject has been discussed in previous chapters of this book under the head of "The Real and the Formal."

In spite of us this seeming digression from the more obvious point for discussion in this chapter has obtruded itself upon us; not, however, it is hoped, without some compensation to the reader who is desirous of the truth of the matters considered.

Let us now direct our efforts to the capital point before us.

### THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT.

In regard to the Word of God and the Holy Spirit, and their relation to each other in the work of salvation, there are three theories:

1. It is taught by some that, in consequence of the depravity of human nature, the word of God is ineffectual and a "dead letter," without any competency to reach the understanding and awaken an interest in the heart, until the Holy Spirit has preceded it; and, without the word, has regenerated the soul and enabled it to receive and understand the revealed word.

2. Another view is that the Holy Spirit originally inspired—supernaturally inspired the prophets and apostles to write the Bible; and after this revelation of truth was given the Holy Spirit, like Christ, ascended back to heaven; and that this revealed word, in the hands of a living ministry, is the only agency or means for the conversion of men. The first



view may be called the *Spirit-alone theory*. The second view may be called the *word-alone theory*.

3. The third theory is that, in the conversion and salvation of sinners, the Holy Spirit and the word of truth accompany each other and operate together—co-operate in the illumination, sanctification and salvation of men.

The question now before us is, Which one of these positions did Alexander Campbell occupy? In this matter, as in the matter of baptism for remission of sins, we may say that Mr. Campbell has been *soundly misunderstood*, and *profoundly misrepresented*. Perhaps this, also, has been due to the fact that Mr. Campbell “has not always been equally felicitous in expressing himself.”

Mr. Campbell’s stereotyped position on this question, as repeated over and over again, in his writings, is in the following words, found in his debate with Rice, and also in his book on *Baptism with its Antecedents and Consequents*:

“On the subject of spiritual influence, there are two extremes of doctrine. There is the *word-alone* system, and there is the *Spirit-alone* system. I believe in neither. The former is the parent of a cold, lifeless rationalism and formality. The latter is, in some temperaments, the cause of a wild, irrepressible enthusiasm; and, in other cases, of a dark melancholy and despondency. With some, there is a sort of compound system, claiming both the Spirit and

the Word—representing the naked Spirit of God operating upon the naked soul of man without any argument or motive interposed, in some mysterious and inexplicable way—incubating the soul, quickening, or making it spiritually alive, by a direct and immediate contact, without the intervention of one moral idea or impression. But, after this creating act, there is the bringing to bear upon it the gospel revelation, called conversion. Hence, in this school regeneration is the cause, and conversion, at some future time, the result of that abstract operation.

“There yet remains another school, which never speculatively separates the Word and the Spirit, which, in every case of conversion, contemplates them as co-operating; or, which is the same thing, conceives of the Spirit of God as clothed with the gospel motives and arguments—enlightening, convincing, persuading sinners, and thus enabling them to flee from the wrath to come. In this school conversion and regeneration are terms indicative of a moral and spiritual change—of a change accomplished through the arguments—the light, the love, the grace of God expressed and revealed, as well as approved by the supernatural attestations of the Holy Spirit. They believe, and teach, that it is the Spirit that quickens, and that the Word of God—the Living Word—is that incorruptible seed which, when planted in the heart, vegetates, germinates, and grows, and fructifies into eternal life.

“They hold it to be unscriptural, irrational, unphilosophical, to discriminate between spiritual agency and instrumentality—between what the Word, *per se*, and the Spirit, *per se*, severally does, as though they were two independent and wholly distinct powers or influences. They object not to the co-operation of secondary causes; of various instrumentalities: the ministry of men; the ministry of angels; the doctrine of special providences; but, however, whenever the Word gets into the heart—the spiritual seed into the moral nature of man, it as naturally, as spontaneously, grows there as the sound, good corn when deposited

in the genial earth. It has life in it, and is, therefore, sublimely and divinely called 'The Living and Effectual Word.' "

This is a careful differentiation of the theories of spiritual influence as Mr. Campbell understood them. The last view presented he avows as his own. With that clear, comprehensive statement, so wisely worded, so cautiously expressed, it would seem impossible to misunderstand him.

It is true Mr. Campbell at other times wrote in very strong terms emphasizing the value and importance of the Word of God as an essential factor in man's salvation; but it is also true that at other times he wrote pointedly of the value and importance of the Holy Spirit as an essential factor in this work. And it would be just as fair to parade his utterances on this latter point to prove that he was an advocate of the "Spirit-alone theory," as it is to parade his utterances on the former point to prove that he was an advocate of the "Word-alone theory." But it is wholly unfair to do either in the presence of his emphatic declaration—There is the Word-alone theory, and there is the Spirit-alone theory, *I believe in neither.*"

It is the firm belief of the present writer that there is an insidious self-deception practiced by many preachers among the Disciples, in whose

interest this book is chiefly written,—self-deception, I mean, with regard to the proposition maintained by Mr. Campbell that “in conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the truth.” Many persons affirm this as their faith on the subject of spiritual influence, when they mean to affirm by it the “Word-alone theory,” with the appearance of believing in the Spirit also. They retain the words without the meaning, the sound without the sense. Mr. Campbell positively repudiated such a construction of his proposition as that, and the clear setting of his belief on this subject, presented in the foregoing quotation made from him, precludes the possibility of such a construction.

Let us note carefully that statement of Mr. Campbell. He says: “There yet remains another school which never speculatively separates the Word and the Spirit”—he recognizes both as present, co-ordinate factors, and then adds—“which, in every case of conversion contemplates them as co-operating”—not only are they both present, but are both at work, co-operating”—he then explains—“or, which is the same thing, conceives of the Spirit of God as clothed with the gospel motives and arguments, enlightening, convincing, persuading sinners, and thus enabling them to

flee from the wrath to come”—it is the Spirit that does this, the Spirit “clothed with the gospel motives;” but the Spirit is the present, efficient, personal agent that works the result, “enabling them to flee from the wrath to come.”

Again he says: “It is the Spirit that quickens”—then the Spirit is present with the human soul and positively does something—“The Living Word is the incorruptible seed which, when planted in the heart, grows and fructifies into eternal life”—then the *Word* is also present and does something—“They hold it to be unscriptural, irrational, unphilosophic, to discriminate between spiritual agency and instrumentality”—just how the Spirit and the Word operate and co-operate we cannot know, and should not attempt to “discriminate” here—“What the Word *per se* and the Spirit *per se* severally does, as though they were two independent and wholly distinct powers or influences;” here Mr. Campbell draws the line; while he recognizes both as actually present in the conversion and salvation of men, he does not attempt to weigh or measure or determine the nature and extent of their several relative influences. Now let us hear him in still broader views of this subject: “They object not to the co-operation of secondary causes”—the Spirit

then may employ other instrumentalities besides the Word—"various subordinate instrumentalities; the ministry of men; the ministry of angels; the doctrine of special providences"—what a latitude he here gives to the Holy Spirit in carrying on his great work! But all this is regulated by the one fundamental principle,—*it is light, thought, intelligence, motive, that converts the soul, notwithstanding the various agencies, means or instrumentalities that may be employed in bringing these to bear upon the soul*—"The word has life in it; and is, therefore, sublimely and divinely called, 'The Living and Effectual Word.' "

To understand Mr. Campbell's deliverances on this subject we are to bear in mind the condition of things that confronted him in his day. Mr. Campbell was raised a Calvinist, and the battle of his life was with the people who held to that faith—the Presbyterians and the Baptists. Calvinism holds rigidly and severely to the "Spirit-alone" theory of regeneration and conversion. With it the Word of God is emphatically a "dead letter," and the human soul is incapable of understanding it until regenerated by the Holy Spirit, which is effected, as Mr. Campbell expresses it, "without the intervention of one moral idea or impression," or as he elsewhere expresses it, "by the Spirit

alone operating by a physical power, tantamount to that which raised up to life again the dead body of the crucified Messiah.”

To combat a theory of religion like that, of course Mr. Campbell had to emphasize the value and importance of the Word of God. In doing this, however, it was no part of his intention to *supplant* the Holy Spirit with the Word; but only to *supplement* the personal agency of the Spirit with the instrumentality of the Word of truth, the gospel of Christ.

In his debate with Mr. Rice it was Mr. Rice's chief effort to make it appear from Mr. Campbell's previous writings that Mr. Campbell was an advocate of the "Word-alone" theory. And to make good this contention, Mr. Rice, in his first speech on this subject, quotes from Mr. Campbell's writings such statements as the following:

“Because arguments are addressed to the understanding, will, and affections of men, they are called moral, inasmuch as their tendency is to form or change the habits, manners, or actions of men. Every spirit puts forth its moral power in words; that is, all the power it has over the views, habits, manners, or actions of men, is in the meaning and arrangement of its ideas expressed in words, or in significant signs addressed to the eye or ear. All the moral power of Cicero or Demosthenes was in their orations when spoken, and in the circumstances which gave them meaning; and whatever power these men have exercised over Greece and Rome since their death is in their

writings. . . . As the moral power of every man is in his arguments, so is the moral power of the Spirit of God in his arguments. . . . As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power, in the words which it fills with its ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power, in the words which it fills with its ideas.”

Now it cannot be denied that had Mr. Campbell never uttered anything else on this subject, the inference of Mr. Rice would be fair and legitimate. But, it must also be conceded that any particular passage in any man’s writings can only be fairly interpreted in the light of all that he may have said on that subject. It is only in this way the Bible can be understood, by interpreting each passage in the light of all other passages bearing on the subject in hand.

We will now hear what Mr. Campbell has to say in reply to this point made by Mr. Rice. On page 643 he says:

“I will make some remarks on the gentleman’s use of my writings. I do not shrink from the discussion of anything I have ever written on this subject. Yet it would be more than human, more than any mortal man has yet achieved, if, in twenty years’ writing, and in issuing one magazine of forty-eight octavo pages every month, written both at home and abroad, in steamboats, hotels, and in the houses of my private friends and brethren; I should have so carefully, definitely, and congruously expressed myself on every occasion, on these much controverted subjects, as to furnish no occasion to our adversaries to extract a sentence or a passage which, when put into their crucible



and mixed with other ingredients, might not be made to appear somewhat different from itself, and myself, and my other writings. To seal the lips of caviling sectarians and captious priests is a natural impossibility. The Great Teacher himself could not, at least he did not, do it. . . . We may not, however, always express ourselves with equal clearness and precision. As respects the passages read from *Christianity Restored*, I will say that the gentleman has very greatly misrepresented me. I was explaining what is usually called moral power in contradistinction from *physical* power, or what some call *spiritual* power, as defined by some of our schoolmen. Reasons, containing *motives*, constitute the elements and materials of all moral, *converting* or *sanctifying* power, so far as known to man. God's power is omnipotent, but it is consistent with himself and itself. The gospel, says Paul, is 'the power of God unto salvation.' Hence the moral omnipotence of God is in the document called the gospel. God's moral power is infinitely superior to ours. *Yet all that power is in the gospel*, and this is all we mean by all the converting power being in the Word of God. God may employ other means, other power, if you please, in converting men, but nothing finally converts them but the light and love of God in the gospel. . . . With Mr. Rice conversion and sanctification seem to be by the Spirit alone. If this be so in one case, it is so in all cases. . . . The doctrine which I oppose, so far as it is really believed and acted on, neutralizes preaching, annuls the Bible, and perfectly annihilates human responsibility. . . . While, then, I believe and teach and rejoice in the presence and power and positive influence of God's Spirit in the work of conversion and sanctification, I do repudiate a doctrine full of desolation—which makes man a mere machine, annihilates all rational liberty, destroys human responsibility, and makes the Word of God a mere superfluity, of no essential importance, of no salutary instrumentality in the great work of regeneration."

And now, as there is no better way of arriving at a knowledge of a man's real position on any question than to place him under the fire of a present, living, competent opponent, we will here introduce the salient points made by these two distinguished disputants on this vital issue.

Replying to Mr. Campbell, Mr. Rice says, page 646:

“I was not pleased with the wording of the proposition now under discussion; and I agreed to debate it with the distinct understanding and agreement on his part that I would appeal to his writings in determining its true meaning.”

And on page 668, Mr. Rice says further on this point:

“The main point in the debate is not whether the Spirit *always* operates through the truth. I was surprised to hear Mr. Campbell read the proposition in this way, ‘*only* or *always*.’ I was not aware that the words *only* and *always* are synonymous. I presume that no dictionary can be found that defines *only* to mean *always*. If you will substitute *always* for *only*, it will make a proposition radically different from that we are now discussing.”

And, again, on page 669, Mr. Rice further argues:

“We believe and teach that the Word is ordinarily employed in conversion and sanctification. Yet there must be, and there is, an influence of the Spirit on the heart, in addition to the Word and distinct from it; and by this influ-

ence, especially, man is converted and sanctified. This is, practically, the great point on which we differ.”

On page 673 Mr. Campbell says:

“The legitimate point of discussion in this proposition is not whether the *Word operates*, but whether the *instrumentality* of the Word be necessary, according to the terms, ‘*only through the Word.*’ The gentleman is shifting the ground. I never said, nor wrote, that the Word was the original cause of man’s salvation, nor even the efficient cause. I have never ranked it above the instrumental cause. All that has been offered by Mr. Rice upon the subject, in any other view of the matter, is gratuitous or irrelevant. It is to change the proposition and hide the point in his system, which I repudiate. The proposition is, in its own language, a refutation of all these insinuations. It affirms that the Spirit of God *operates*. The question is not upon *operation*, but upon *instrumentality*—‘*only through the Word.*’ If Mr. Rice will make the Word the uniform and universal instrument, he agrees with me. There is then no controversy about it.”

And then in the same speech, page 678, Mr. Campbell says:

“I have, indeed, no faith in conversion by the Word, without the Spirit; nor by the Spirit, without the Word. The Spirit is ever present with the Word, in conversion and in sanctification.”

Mr. Rice, on page 679, responds energetically thus:

“I do not know what Mr. Campbell means when he says, the Spirit is always present with the Word; nor does he convey any definite information concerning his views, when he says, men are converted and sanctified by the

Spirit and the Word. We desire to know what he means by these expressions. Does he mean that in addition to the words and arguments contained in the Scriptures, there is an influence of the Spirit on the heart? If so, what are we contending about?"

Mr. Campbell replies, page 684:

"I have asked Mr. Rice for a single verse, Old Testament or New, that asserts *regeneration by the Spirit alone*. When adducing those passages of the most unambiguous and incontrovertible import, affirming regeneration through the instrumentality of the Word of God, I have not succeeded either in getting such a text, or in obtaining a response to those which I have presented."

On page 689 Mr. Rice makes this answer:

"My friend calls on me to prove by the Scriptures that the Spirit ever operates in conversion and sanctification, *without* the truth. He affirms, and has undertaken to prove, that the Spirit operates *only* through the truth. Has he produced a solitary passage that sustains his proposition? He has not, and he will not; for there is none such in the Bible."

Mr. Campbell replies, page 695:

"That the Spirit *operates*, is agreed on both sides. Mr. Rice admits that the Spirit *sometimes* operates through the Word. That is not the point to be proved. What, then, must I again ask, is the proposition? Is it not that, 'In conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates *only* through the Word'? He has proved that it operates through the Word. This I affirm. Has he come over? Does he mean to use the Scriptures that prove his operations *through* the Word, to prove his operation *without* the Word!! You will all understand that a passage of Scrip-

ture that proves the Holy Spirit operates *through* the Word, does not prove that he operates *without* the Word or independent of it.”

And on page 701 he further says:

“I do, sir, most sincerely regard the Holy Spirit as the author of every spiritual and noble desire in the human heart; the author of every pious affection, of every holy aspiration of our souls. His mysterious but certain power is in and with the gospel, and he makes it the power of God to salvation to every one that believes it. He sanctifies us through the truth. He works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.”

And now on page 716, Mr. Rice asks some questions:

“Does Mr. Campbell hold to an influence of the Spirit in conversion, distinct from the Word? As my friend is fond of asking questions, I wish to ask him, What kind of influence does the Spirit exert on the minds of immersed believers?”

And then on page 717, Mr. Rice says:

“The gentleman asks, What can the Spirit do, after all his arguments have been put forth? Will he inform us how the devil tempts men to sin? He acknowledges that the devil has access to the minds of men, and exerts a moral influence, not by words and arguments addressed to the eye or ear; yet he cannot tell how that influence is exerted. If, then, we do not know how good or evil spirits can exert an influence on our minds, is it not presumptuous in any man to assert that the Holy Spirit *cannot* exert a moral or spiritual influence except by the words and arguments addressed to the eye or ear? Shall we venture to say that the devil has more power over the human mind than God?”

Mr. Campbell makes some very incisive statements. He says, "The point of discussion is not whether the *Word operates*." Again he says, "The proposition affirms that the Spirit of God *operates*. The question is not upon *operation* but upon *instrumentality*." The parties in this discussion both agree that "*sometimes*" the Spirit operates through the Word. The point of difference is, does the Spirit "*always*" operate through the Word. Mr. Campbell's position is that, in conversion and sanctification, he *always* operates on the human mind in connection with truth, with light, with thought, with intelligence, with knowledge, with motive, with love. He says, "If Mr. Rice will make the Word the *uniform and universal* instrument, he agrees with me. There is then no controversy about it." He says again, "I have, indeed, no faith in conversion by the Spirit without the Word, nor by the Word without the Holy Spirit." This settles the "Word-alone" doctrine so far as Mr. Campbell is concerned. He repudiates it

But Mr. Rice cannot understand Mr. Campbell and asks, "Does he mean that in addition to the words and arguments, there is an influence of the Spirit on the heart? If so, what are we contending about?" It is plain enough

what they are contending about. It is this, whether in conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God ever operates *without* the presence of the Word of Truth. This Mr. Rice affirms. This Mr. Campbell denies. They now come to close quarters. Mr. Campbell calls on Mr. Rice to produce a single passage of Scripture that “asserts *regeneration by the Spirit alone.*” In turn Mr. Rice calls on Mr. Campbell to produce a single passage that asserts that “the Spirit operates *only* through the truth.” And the gentlemen are both tied up, neither can do it. There is this difference, however. Logically, it is Mr. Rice’s duty to give the passage asserting that the Spirit operates in regeneration without the truth, since this is what he really affirms and what Mr. Campbell really denies.

Mr. Rice makes the point that he and Mr. Campbell agree that Satan, the great tempter, can and does approach the mind of man directly, without the intervention of words or arguments; and then certainly the Spirit of God can do so. But the question is not whether the Spirit *can* do so; but whether, according to the Scriptures, the Spirit of God *does*, in “conversion and sanctification,” operate on the human mind, except *in connection*

with the Word of Truth. This, and this only, is Mr. Campbell's contention.

On page 722, Mr. Campbell says.

"I said in the commencement of this discussion, that I did not affirm nor deny as to any other operations of the Spirit, save in conversion and sanctification. What he may do in the way of suggestions or impressions, by direct communication of original ideas, or in bringing things to remembrance long since forgotten, I presume not to discuss. I believe he has exerted, and can exert, such influences. Nor do I say what influence he may exert, or cause to be exerted, in bringing men's minds to consider these matters; but I confine my reasonings and proofs to *conversion and sanctification*."

Also on page 708, Mr. Campbell says on this point:

"There is no debate upon spiritual operations. They are of an abstract nature and quality. It is not possible for a man to conceive of spiritual operations. The fact of the operation is as evident as gravity, but who can explain it? No man can form a single conception of any spiritual influence or operation. Who can grasp the idea of a spirit? Who can apprehend its nature, its identity, its form, its person, or its modes of living, moving and operating? That the Spirit of God operates on the human understanding and heart is just as certain as that man has an understanding and affections. Our spirit is allied to the spiritual system, to the Great Spirit. God can commune, and does commune, with man, and man with God."

And then on page 719, Mr. Campbell says:

"I will answer his interrogations when they are more definitely set forth. Let him explain his *distinct* power. I



cannot comprehend his theory of an abstract power. If he says superadded power, I wish to know of what character it is: physical or moral? I can readily conceive of various means being employed to secure the attention of persons to impress the subject on the mind, and of means used providentially to remove obstructions; but to talk of super-added power, of a distinct power, without any definition of the nature and character of it, seems not, in the least, to enlighten us. If I see a man take an axe and fell a tree, I call the axe the instrument, and I say, whatever power he puts forth in felling the tree is put forth through the axe."

Then on page 725, Mr. Rice says:

"I was very much gratified to hear the illustration of the work of the Spirit introduced by the gentleman. It is this: An individual takes an axe and cuts down a tree. All the power he exerts is through the axe. Now I wish to know whether the man does not, at the time he is cutting the tree, put forth power? Is this not the fact? Then if the illustration be appropriate, it follows, at the time when a man is converted, the Spirit of God must put forth power in some form—by some direct act; and this is precisely what my friend denies . . . I think I can give a much more correct and striking illustration of his doctrine. A certain man made and tempered the axe, the axe cut the tree, and therefore the *maker* of the axe might be said to have cut the tree! . . . The man who employs the axe as the instrument must, at the time, put forth power, or the instrument can accomplish absolutely nothing. Now the question before us is, whether conversion is affected *by the truth alone*, or whether the Spirit puts forth its power in addition to the influence of the Word. The gentleman's illustration proves our doctrine conclusively."

On page 729, Mr. Rice further argues:

"I will now offer some additional arguments against the doctrine taught by Mr. Campbell. This doctrine makes it

both useless and improper to pray for the conversion of men. I know he will not deny that it is both the duty and privilege of Christians to pray that God would convert sinners, for we have both precept and example authorizing and requiring it. . . . If, then, no special divine influence is promised, or can be exerted to cause men to repent and believe, why should we pray for it? And how can we pray in faith?"

Mr. Campbell here avows his faith in "spiritual operations." "The fact of the operation is as evident as gravity," he says. That the Holy Spirit may *aid* the Word by "direct communication of original ideas, or in bringing things to remembrance," and thus "influence men's minds to consider" the Word of Truth, he believes. But he holds that it is finally the *truth*, seen and apprehended, that converts. He says, "I presume not to discuss what the Spirit may do in the way of suggestions or impressions, by direct communication of original ideas, or in bringing things to remembrance long since forgotten. I believe he has exerted, and can exert, such influences."

While avowing his belief in all these things, he declined to speculate on them, because he does not understand the subject. He says, "No man can form a single conception of any spiritual influence or operation." Hence Mr. Campbell confines his reasonings and proofs to the proposition, holding that in conversion and

sanctification the Spirit *always works along with the truth, never without it.* And, when Mr. Rice contends for a "distinct power, or a superadded power," Mr. Campbell does not deny it, but calls on Mr. Rice to "explain" his "distinct power;" and then Mr. Campbell promises to affirm or deny his belief in just what Mr. Rice holds to. Mr. Campbell illustrates his view of this subject by a man using an axe to fell a tree, the man representing the Holy Spirit, the axe the Word, and the tree the sinner.

Mr. Rice likes the illustration, but insists it does not represent Mr. Campbell's teaching, and he amends the illustration according to his understanding of Mr. Campbell, as follows: "A man made the axe, the axe cut the tree, and therefore the man who made the axe cut the tree!" That Mr. Rice understood Mr. Campbell to hold this view is certain, and that some preachers in our own ranks to-day so understand Mr. Campbell is certain; but it is just as certain that Mr. Campbell denies holding any such view. On this point he believes with Mr. Rice that the Spirit puts forth power in addition to the Word; but he does not believe with Mr. Rice that the Spirit converts *without* the Word, or that the man cuts down the tree without the axe.

The subject of prayer, as bearing on this, will be noticed later on.

On page 731 Mr. Campbell says:

“I repeat once more, that whenever the gentleman describes his metaphysical power, superadded to the Word, I will affirm or deny in the most definite manner. I believe in a substantive influence of the Spirit of God through the truth upon the conscience, the understanding and the affections. He appears to approve of the figure of the wood-chopper and his axe. But in his remarks he seems to have forgotten that on his theory the wood-chopper has to cut the tree down *without* the axe, or, if he used the axe in any case at all, he must superadd some power without the axe, beyond the axe, and wholly extra its instrumentality!! Figures are not to be used for any other purpose than they are proposed. I do not make this one represent the Word of God in any other particular than its instrumentality. . . . Fellow citizens, from all the premises before my mind, I conclude that the Spirit of Truth—that omnipresent, animating Spirit of our God—whose sword or instrument this book is—is always present in the work of conversion, and through this truth changes the sinner’s affections and draws out his soul to God. It is, therefore, doing us an act of the greatest injustice to represent us as comparing the Bible to the writings of any dead or absent man in this point of comparison. In some points of view all books are alike; but in other points of view they are exceedingly dissimilar. In comparison of all other books, the Bible is superlatively a book *sui generis*. Its Author not only ever lives, but is ever present in it and with it, *operating through it, by it and with it*, upon saints and sinners. . . . Great injustice is done me by Mr. Rice in sometimes changing the position of *only* in the proposition. I do not maintain that a person is converted by the Word only. I say that ‘in conversion and sanctification the Spirit operates only through the

Word;’ not that a person is converted by the Word only. The latter excludes the Spirit altogether, which is directly in contradiction of the ground assumed in my opening speech. We are only converted through the Word; only we are converted through the Word, and we are converted only through the Word, are three very different propositions.”

On page 737 Mr. Rice says:

“The gentleman has failed to make any answer whatever to my argument against his doctrine that it makes prayer, especially for unbelievers, unnecessary and improper. Does he deny it, or attempt to prove that the objection is not valid? Not a word of it. He makes no attempt to prove that his doctrine is at all consistent with prayer. . . . He tells us the Spirit of God is always present with his Word. I have asked, and now ask again, what does he mean by this language? . . . Perhaps I can explain in what sense he supposes the Spirit to be present and to operate with the Word. As Mr. Campbell’s spirit is present with the ideas he has published in his *Harbinger*, operating on the minds of his readers, so in the same sense the Spirit of God is present with the Scriptures. I use his own illustration. Such being his meaning, does he believe in any other agency in conversion and sanctification than that of the Word dictated and confirmed by the Holy Spirit? . . . *How* the Spirit operates on the heart in conversion and sanctification, I profess not to understand. And since Mr. Campbell cannot tell how Satan exerts an influence on the human mind, I am certainly not bound to explain how the Spirit operates in conversion. Indeed, we cannot explain the how of many facts in nature. No wonder, then, if the agency of the Spirit is mysterious.”

Then on page 739 he says:

“The gentleman makes a criticism on the difference between the phrases, through the Word only, and only

through the Word. I am not concerned to answer it. I was not pleased, as he knows, with the proposition as it is worded, because I believed it left room for quibbling, and I would not have consented to debate it but with the distinct and express understanding that I should interpret it by his publications on the subject. I have proved that in his *Christianity Restored* he says there are only two kinds of power, moral and physical, and that only moral power can operate on the human mind, and that all moral power is in words and arguments."

When through with these quotations we shall certainly not fail to understand Mr. Campbell. He again calls on Mr. Rice to *describe* the power of the Holy Spirit for which he contends, and promises to affirm or deny definitely in regard to it when he hears Mr. Rice's description. Mr. Campbell himself believes in such a power, but contends that it is always exercised in connection with an intelligent understanding of the Word of Truth. He unhesitatingly declares his belief "in a *substantive* influence of the Spirit of God through the truth upon the conscience, the understanding and the affections." He then twits Mr. Rice over his theory of the wood-chopper cutting down a tree *without the axe*—the Spirit converting *without* the truth of the gospel. And he says, again, that Mr. Rice does him the greatest injustice in representing him as comparing the Bible with its gospel message "to the writings of any dead or absent man," and affirms that

the "omnipresent, animating Spirit of our God is always *present* in the work of conversion." Finally, as if to cut off all cavil or doubt as to his position, he says, "*I do not maintain that a person is converted by the Word only.*"

But Mr. Rice is persistent. He insists that Mr. Campbell does not really believe in any influence of the Holy Spirit other than that which the revealed Word *alone and of itself* exerts upon the mind. And he calls on Mr. Campbell to explain what he means by the Spirit being "always present with the Word." Mr. Rice then makes an important and significant statement in connection with this subject. It is this: "*How* the Spirit operates on the heart in conversion and sanctification, I profess not to understand." Now Mr. Campbell said in a preceding speech, "No man can form a single conception of any spiritual influence or operation." We have these gentlemen both tied up again. Each calls on the other to explain what each admits to be inexplicable and mysterious. Both admit the operation, both declare it to be mysterious, and yet each twits the other because he will not undertake to "explain." The fact is, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice do not differ about the "Word-alone," but only differ about the "Spirit-alone," and this is the question they ought to have debated.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Rice honestly believed that Mr. Campbell held to the "Word-alone" doctrine, and so thought from what Mr. Campbell had written on the subject. But there can be no doubt that Mr. Campbell repudiated the doctrine. Mr. Campbell will answer Mr. Rice on prayer in his next speech.

On page 756 Mr. Campbell, in his closing speech, referring to what Mr. Rice had previously said, that according to Mr. Campbell's teaching on the subject of spiritual operations, there could be no use or propriety in our praying for the conversion of sinners, says:

"The best philosophy of prayer is that God has granted the privilege, enjoined the duty and given the promise. We, therefore, violate no decree, and sin against no revelation in praying for all. I believe, practice and preach the necessity and propriety of praying for the salvation of our children, families, friends, etc., as much as I believe, preach or practice any point of domestic and social duties and privileges. . . . Mr. Rice says there is a certain power displayed in conversion; and so say I. And does it not come with as good a grace from me as from him? But he says he goes for a power beyond the naked Word, and that, too, an accompanying power. Well, the word *accompanying* explains not the nature of that power, and for that I have asked more than once, but I have asked in vain. He can neither expound what the '*accompanying power*' is, or can be, nor how it operates; and, therefore, whether or not we agree I could not say. I believe the Spirit accompanies the Word, is always present with the Word, and actually and personally works through it upon the moral nature of man, but not without it. I presume



not to speculate upon the nature of this power, nor the mode of operation. I believe the Holy Spirit sheds abroad in our hearts the love of God, and dwells in all the faithful; that it sanctifies them through the truth; that it works in them to will and do, and that it comforts them in all their afflictions. But the Spirit of God does not thus enter into the wicked.”

Again on page 747 he says:

“It is, then, so far as the New Testament deposes, idle and worse than idle to talk about sanctification or conversion without the Word and Spirit of God. They are always united in the great work. No one is converted by the Word alone, nor by the Spirit alone.”

Finally, on page 751 Mr Campbell says:

“In conclusion, then, I must say that we have been much reproached and slandered on this theme. . . . The man who represents me as opposed to a spiritual religion and to the operations, converting and sanctifying, of the Holy Spirit, does me the highest injustice. . . . I have been long endeavoring to draw the proper lines between a wild enthusiasm and the true Spirit of our God—between what is spiritual and animal in some of the present forms of Christianity—and to save my contemporaries from a religion of blind impulses, animal excitements and new revelations, by which I most sincerely believe vast multitudes are deluded to everlasting ruin.”

On page 752 Mr. Rice in his closing speech says:

“One of my most conclusive arguments against Mr. Campbell’s doctrine is that it makes prayer for the unconverted, as well as for the sanctification of believers, both unavailing and improper. . . . I repeat the argument. If his doctrine be true there is absolutely no propriety in

praying. Why should we and how can we pray for blessings which we verily believe God will never grant? He says he prays for the conversion of sinners. When he enters the pulpit he stands before the congregation and prays that God will convert the unbelieving portion of it; and then he opens his Bible and tells them that God *will not* convert them—that the Spirit has dictated and confirmed the Word, and they must be converted and sanctified by it or be lost!!! If his doctrine be true, what are his prayers worth?”

Finally, on page 753-4 he says:

“Naked Spirit, Mr. Campbell asserts, never operates on naked spirit. This is mere assumption. How can the gentleman prove it true? Does he know how one spirit influences another? Can he inform us how Satan can tempt men? But he says he does not pretend to know how the Spirit operates. He has tried to tell us both how he *can* and how he *cannot* operate. I will not misrepresent him. Let me read from his *Christianity Restored*: ‘As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas. . . . If the Old and New Testaments contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent, and he that is not sanctified by these cannot be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine.’

“The gentleman could not have employed language more clear or definite. He puts the Holy Spirit, in regard to conversion and sanctification, on a perfect equality with man, except so far as he may present more powerful motives than man. In the most definite terms he denies any other influence of the Spirit, other than that of his words and arguments. I hold that the Word is ordinarily used,

but not always; and that when it is used there is also an influence of the Spirit distinct from it, renewing the heart and inclining the sinner to receive the truth in the love of it."

In two speeches previous to this Mr. Rice insisted that Mr. Campbell's theory of conversion, which Mr. Rice persistently represents as the "Word-alone" theory, excluding all divine agency, made prayer for the conversion of sinners useless and improper. Mr. Campbell's answer to this point is like his position on the operations of the Holy Spirit. He does not claim to understand the philosophy of either, but believes in both and practices accordingly.

If any person who reads these lines fails to understand Mr. Campbell's position on the Holy Spirit, it will not be Mr. Campbell's fault, nor will it be the fault of the writer. Mr. Rice avows his belief in an "*accompanying power*" of the Spirit with the Word. Mr. Campbell avows his belief also in an "*accompanying power*." Here they are agreed. But each wants the other to explain his idea of this "accompanying power," to see whether they are agreed in their *philosophy* of it, and neither can explain; both confess their inability to understand the mode of the Spirit's operations. I wish now to call attention to a statement of Mr. Campbell that is a complete embodiment of

his views and teachings upon this whole question, I will italicize and capitalize it. It is this: "*I believe the Spirit ACCOMPANIES the Word, is ALWAYS present with the Word and ACTUALLY and PERSONALLY works through it upon the moral nature of man, but not WITHOUT it. I presume not to SPECULATE upon the NATURE of this power, nor the MODE of operation.*"

In conclusion, attention is called to the fact that Mr. Campbell held and taught that in the *conversion of sinners*, as well as in the sanctification of Christians, the Holy Spirit is always present and assisting in the work. He says: "I do not maintain that a person is converted by the *Word only*. I say that, in *conversion* and sanctification, the Spirit operates only through the Word, *not that a person is converted by the Word only*. The latter excludes the Spirit altogether, which is directly in contradiction of the ground assumed in my opening speech." Let this fact be carefully noted. Mr. Campbell teaches this, over and over, in various forms, throughout his speeches and writings. He ever held, however, that the Scriptures plainly teach that there is a difference in the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the sinner and to the Christian; that the kind of aid the Spirit gives is not the same in both

cases. The sinner he aids from *without* by “providential acts,” “removing obstructions,” “making suggestions,” “quickenning the memory of things forgotten,” etc., that the Word of Truth may find opportunity to throw in its light and converting power; while he dwells *in* the Christian and strengthens him in the inner man, and sheds abroad the love of God in his heart.

We have thus been at great pains to present Alexander Campbell to the world in the true light of his own teachings. To some minds this will appear to have been done even to redundancy, but we are writing for the people, and it is necessary to be elaborate, even to the appearance of being superfluous, that there may be no grounds for misapprehension as to Mr. Campbell’s position on this vital and fundamental doctrine of our holy religion.

## VIII.

### RIGHTEOUSNESS AND LAW.

THERE is probably no word in the Bible more conspicuous, or more important, or more conspicuously important than the word righteousness. Righteousness in religion, like justice in law, is a fundamental idea. Human government is formed around the conception of justice. In all their diversities and ramifications, seeking to adjust themselves to the conditions and the wants of men, human laws, whether constitutional or statutory, evince evermore the one great purpose of attaining the ends of justice among the people. So the chief end of all divine government, of all divine legislation, is the attainment of righteousness in men and among men. As applied to persons the term righteousness is indicative of a moral state and of moral character. A righteous man and an unrighteous man are not in the same moral state, nor of the same moral character. In these respects they are radically different. And yet, men's ideas of righteousness differ, and in some instances are very superficial, falling far short of the scriptural conception of this subject. These differences

call for some such classification as the following:

1. The righteousness of *custom*.
2. The righteousness of *law*.
3. The righteousness of *good intention*.
4. The righteousness of Christ *imputed*.
5. The righteousness of *faith*.

Let us consider each of these briefly in the order named.

1. The righteousness of *custom*.

A repetition of the same act or the same course of life forms a custom and creates a tendency in that direction, both with individuals and with society. What is customary? This with some people is the supreme question. The authority of custom is final with many. In matters of mere expediency or casuistry a deference for custom may be regarded as wise and legitimate, but where moral and religious principles are involved the conscientious man appeals to a higher court than the customs of society. And there is perhaps no better test of genuine Christian manhood than the ability to disregard and ignore the customs that have been formed and have grown into a sort of unwritten law in a vitiated social community. The tendency to run in grooves, to be in the fashion, to be like other people, is a most dangerous and besetting influence. It was to lift

the world above this paltry notion of things that God placed before men the life of Christ. In the Sermon on the Mount we have a remarkable example of the courage which defies popular sentiment that had crystallized into custom. From beginning to end it is an earnest protest against the idea of mere routine living, of mere popularized duty, and an earnest effort to clear away the accumulated rubbish of customs that he might purge the conscience and establish a nobler standard of righteousness. To this end the Savior repeated, over and over again: "*Ye have heard that it was said.*" And then rising above all traditions he adds, in an authoritative way: "*But I say unto you.*" With this introduction his hearers are led into profounder views of thinking, of feeling and of living.

"Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." What a bold, revolutionary declaration! "There came to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and scribes, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. And he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?" And the world is full enough of just such people to-day—people



who never look beneath the surface of things to determine their character by the sound principles of morality or religion; but who follow custom and tradition, even to the extent of violating the most fundamental laws of righteous living. One example here will be enough to fix the lesson in the mind of the reader, and to suggest many others of the same sort.

“And there came unto him Pharisees, trying him and saying, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said, Have ye not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh? So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why, then, did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it hath not been so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that marieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.” (Matt. 19:3-9.)

Commenting on this divine law of marriage, the Apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. 7:10, says: "But unto the married I give charge, yea, not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." There could be nothing plainer or more emphatic written on the subject. And yet, how many members of the church to-day are living in open violation of this divine law! And how many church officials wink at it; and how many preachers make themselves *particeps criminis* by solemnizing the rites of marriage in such cases—all condoned because the law of the state and the custom of a vitiated society tolerate it—true Christian manhood sacrificed on the altar of custom, a custom, too, directly in contravention of divine authority concerning the most sacred and important institution pertaining to man's social nature and life!

The difficulty with which men abandon an old custom, simply because it is a custom, and the facility with which they adopt a new custom, simply because it is a custom of others strikingly illustrate the force and authority with which this form of righteousness asserts itself over our lives. Any change proposed in the established forms of the worship,

or of the transaction of business, or the government of our churches, is usually met with a protest: "It is contrary to our custom," which is considered by many as a most potent argument against it. Whether the new method proposed is more efficient, more competent and consequently better, is wholly lost sight of in the clamor of righteous indignation at the bare thought of surrendering "*the custom of this church;*" and we might add, the imaginary "righteousness" therein. First-class church rows, alienation of old friends, resignation of pastors, etc., are some of the fragrant fruits that grow on this tree of "righteousness." And especially if the custom obtained "in Jerusalem," or among "the apostles" and "primitive disciples," although without divine appointment, is it held to tenaciously by traditionalists and made the battle ground for the adventurous, progressive iconoclast. Hence, the *pros* and *cons* of "feet washing," the "holy kiss," the "silence of women in the church," polygamy, slavery, etc.

There must be something more in favor of any custom than the mere fact that "it is our custom," or "it was the custom of the primitive Christians" before it can be held as authoritative or necessary in personal or congregational faith and life. And there must be some-

thing more against any proposed practice than the mere fact that "it is not our custom," or "it was not the custom of the primitive disciples" before it can be held as unauthorized or unnecessary in personal or congregational faith or life. The customs of one people or one age do not always suit another people or another age, and cannot, therefore, conduce to their spiritual welfare. And that Christian liberty provided for in the great general principles of the New Testament, authorizes and even makes necessary, in some cases, the discarding of old customs and the adoption of new.

On the other hand, how easily and gracefully professing Christians sometimes yield to the seductive influences abroad in fashionable society and fall in with the pernicious, irreligious customs of their day and generation; as, for example, those of dancing, card-playing, horse-racing, etc. Not perhaps at first positively committing adultery with the *lewd* dance, card *gambling* and horse-*betting*; but only coy with their younger sisters, the "parlor dance" at the elder's home, the "social game of high five" or "progressive euchre" at the deacon's house, and the "speed ring" at the county fair; while the weakling preacher shuts one eye that he may not see it, and winks encouragement with the other. "Ye adulterers and adulteresses,

know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.” (James 4:4.)

2. The righteousness of *law*.

That form of religion that finds its highest attainment and its highest enjoyment in “keeping the commandments” was not wholly exterminated with the Pharisees. It is to be admitted, however, that the righteousness sought in obeying law is of a higher order than that found in the observance of custom, inasmuch as the former seeks to measure self by something appointed of God, while the latter measures self by something appointed by man. The self-deception, however, in each case is very similar in nature. It consists in an outward and mechanical conformity to an outward and mechanical standard, instead of an inward, spiritual conformity to an inward, spiritual standard. “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.” (Phil. 2:5.) “Beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, we are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.” (2 Cor. 3:18.) “The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.” (2 Cor. 3:6.)

The Savior was always probing after the heart. He was ever seeking to break through

the crust of legalism that the "hidden man of the heart" might find opportunity for development. That was a memorable interview which the Savior had with that "rich young man" in Matthew 19:16. "Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" A proposition to buy his way into heaven by *doing* something "good" rather than by *being good*. Let us point a moral here by quoting the Savior in another case: "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" "Whether is greater, the gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" And may we not add, whether is greater, the doing or the moral condition of the heart that sanctifieth the doing?

But the Master understood his man, and he gave him full scope to expose himself. Hear his reply: "If thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments."

The young man now finds the opportunity of his life to exploit his legalistic attainments. After the Savior had recited to him the decalogue for his observance, even that command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," the young legalist replies: "All these things have I observed; what lack I yet?" Now is the Savior's opportunity. And what did he lack? He lacked the *moral* qualities of righteousness

—that inward condition of soul that is essential to all acceptable service. And that this young man might see the barrenness of his attainments in this particular, the Savior says: “Go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.” Now here was a “commandment” to be observed. But it was such a command as could not be obeyed without new moral conditions. His legalism was not strong enough to brook the order. Hence it is said, “When the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful.” “Weighed in the balance and found wanting,” as will ever be the fate of a “righteousness of law.”

It was the special purpose of the Apostle Paul, that most philosophical and most theological of all the New Testament writers, to place under ban, forever, the delusive and misleading notion of the possibility of attaining to a “righteousness of law.” Hear him: “Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works.” (Rom. 9: 31, 32.) If Israel could not find righteousness through law, can any other people hope to do so? No other people, before or since, ever had so favorable an opportunity for doing this very thing. Their legislation

was plainly written and complete. They had scribes and rabbis and priests and prophets and inspiration and miracles, abundant and superabundant, to aid and encourage them, day by day, as no other people before or since ever enjoyed. And yet they failed to "attain to righteousness." The defect was not in the law. No better legal code has ever been proposed. The Jewish law is the foundation of all subsequent legislation, and of the best civilizations of the world. It was not for the lack of providential sympathy and agency. No people were ever more signally favored in this regard. Why did they fail? "Because they sought it by works"—sought it in mere conformity to legal forms and requirements. And their failure will ever be the failure of all who seek righteousness in that way, whether it be at Jewish altars or Christian altars.

In human governments, this outward conformity to law is all that is aimed at, all that is required, all that is expected, all that is practicable. The president, the governor nor the sheriff feels called upon to inquire into your views and feelings upon moral or religious or political questions, but they do feel called upon to see that you pay your taxes, and obey the laws, whether you approve of these things or not. And, if they desired to go further than



this, they would be estopped by their inability to read and regulate the minds and hearts of the people. In religion, however, the soul is the supreme sphere of action, and God is able to see and weigh and estimate the conditions of the mind and heart with even more facility than our state officials can look after our outward conduct.

If we would draw music from any instrument, the first important thing is to see that the instrument itself is "in tune." Without this, no effort, however scientifically directed, however rigidly conforming to the *laws* of music, will ever produce music. Nor will such efforts ever put the instrument in tune. Piano-tuning and piano-playing are two distinct arts. No obedience to the outward forms of religion ever puts a human heart "in tune," ever turns it away from the love of sin to the love of God. No external observances can ever adjust our internal moral relations with the Father of spirits. They can give expression to these spiritual conditions, and by their very exercise tend to a deeper realization and enjoyment of them. A "righteousness of law," in morals or in religion, is a mischievous sham, a fatal fraud, philosophically or theologically considered.

3. The righteousness of *good intentions*.

That frame of mind that leads a man to follow the requirements of law because he believes them to be in the line of his moral obligations, is certainly superior, in its moral quality, to that other frame of mind which obeys the law simply because it is law. The former would probably endure the pains and penalties of an unrighteous law, rather than defile his conscience by doing what he believed to be morally wrong. The latter would probably shift the responsibility from himself onto the law, and stifle his conscience with the idea of his great loyalty to "the powers that be." In a case of casuistry, however, where no provisions of law obtain, where conscience and a personal sense of duty are the only guides, it would not be difficult to foresee the diverging lines of conduct on the part of these two characters. The one having been loyal to the moral law, even to the extent of incurring and enduring the penalty of an unrighteous statutory commandment, would not hesitate to forego what might redound to his own personal advantage and interest, in order that he might be true to his convictions of conscience and duty, while the other, seeing no written law to forbid, would follow the leadings of his own selfish inclinations and interests, wholly ignoring the question of the right and the wrong in-

volved in the transaction. What is the law? is one question, and a very important question. What is right? is another question, and a more important one. That courts often decide a case in favor of the law and against the right, and that juries often decide a case in favor of right and contrary to law, are well known facts.

The most insidious and dangerous moral influence is probably that encountered by the professional lawyer. Far be it from me to say, or even remotely intimate, that a lawyer may not be a righteous man, from a moral point of view, or even a righteous man from a religious point of view. But that with the average lawyer the standard of righteousness is the "righteousness of law," is a well known fact. By the very force of habit the average lawyer is nothing more than a *lawyer*. He measures everything by the law in the case. The significant smile that plays over the face of such a man when you would talk to him of the moral principles, the right and the wrong of a case, is phenomenal, and calls to mind the exclamation of the Master—"Woe unto you lawyers!" The greatest villainies known to history have, in many instances, been performed in the name of law, and under the protection of legal technicalities; while, in other instances the most laudable deeds and achievements of moral heroism have

been wrought out in opposition to, and in defiance of, law. The aphorism that "might makes right," is a pernicious and dangerous doctrine; while its converse, "right makes might," is a declaration of sublime moral truth. The former is the language of tyranny and unscrupulosity; the latter is the language of that unsophisticated moral nature, wisely tutored, which God has originally given to every man.

But after all the "righteousness of good intentions," while superior in its moral tone to the "righteousness of law," can bring one to the possession of *morality only* and not of Christianity. It is a fact, however, that many very good people, whose moral excellence we would not discredit in any measure, either in the eyes of men or in the eyes of God, are living under the delusion, may we not say the fatal delusion, that theirs is the very highest attainment to be experienced in righteousness.

No unchristianized character revealed to us in the Bible is, perhaps, more attractive, more commended, or more commendable, than that of Nathanael. Let us read in John 1:45, and following: "Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And

Nathanael said unto him, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael coming, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!"

The tone of righteousness pertaining to Nathanael's character—a righteousness not only of conformity to law, but of sympathy with the meaning and spirit of law, a righteousness of good intentions as well—was not only evinced in his high ideal of the Coming One, and the incongruity of such an one coming out of Nazareth, but is declared more emphatically and more authoritatively in the words of the Master—"Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" That was certainly no ordinary degree of excellence in righteousness to which Nathanael had grown. Was there any higher possibility in the way of spiritual evolution and righteousness in reserve for this guileless man, and to which he might hope yet to come? Let us note the sequel:

"Nathanael said unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered him, Rabbi, *thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel.*"

The New Testament record is brief, con-

densed and graphic. In these few verses concerning the meeting of Christ and Nathanael, there is material for lengthy chapters—chapters concerning righteousness, righteousness of custom, righteousness of law, righteousness of good intentions—all culminating in a new view of the subject, a new experience, an enlargement of soul, an enlargement of faith and of life—a “righteousness in Christ,” and a “righteousness of Christ.”

This splendid spiritual drama which imagination so easily conceives, is closed by a promise of a still more splendid spiritual seance in the future, as new visions of this divine righteousness in Christ and of Christ shall be revealed to Nathanael—revealed to him within and without. Hear the Master: “Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee underneath the fig tree, believest thou? Thou shalt see greater things than these? And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.”

A too literal and materialistic interpretation placed upon passages like this, let fall so frequently from the divine lips of the Divine Teacher, shock us with their almost sacrilegious temerity and grossness. Evidently the Savior

means to open up, perspectively, to the expanding spiritual apprehension of Nathanael, the fact and the possibilities of a larger growth on his part, and a larger realization of the power of faith—that faith to which he had now, in a measure, attained—and a richer experience and enjoyment of that righteousness of faith in the righteousness of the “Son of God,” and the “King of Israel,” as now discerned by this man “in whom there was no guile.”

Obedience to law through a feeling of loyalty to rightful authority, even where it is averse to one’s inclinations and convictions, is well. It is well for the subject himself, in so far as he is thus restrained from the commission of overt acts of violence and sin. It is well for society that is thus protected from his evil inclinations, or what might otherwise be the consequences of them.

Obedience to moral law induced by a love of the principles on which they are founded—obedience from good intentions, is better. It is better because the obedience is voluntary rather than involuntary; it is from choice, rather than against choice; it is from the love of the right rather than through fear of punishment; and to this extent the obedience has moral quality, and hence, is better.

The righteousness that comes through obedi-

ence to law, is the righteousness of loyalty; the righteousness that comes through obedience to good intentions, is the righteousness of morality; the righteousness yet to be considered, that is secured in Christ, is Christianity, and is best. Righteousness of loyalty, righteousness of morality, righteousness of Christianity—these three, but the greatest of these is the righteousness of Christianity.

4. The righteousness of Christ *imputed*.

Before considering the righteousness of Christianity in its true and final sense, it may be well to glance at that spurious form of it that once obtained currency in some of the old theologies, and which may not be entirely obliterated even at the present day. Almost every valuable thing has had its counterfeits. And every fundamental doctrine of Christianity has been followed by spurious imitations and misrepresentations at some period of history. The form of righteousness we are now to consider, called the “imputed righteousness of Christ,” consists in supposing the essential and real righteousness of the character of the Son of God, by some sort of spiritual legerdemain, to be transferred to the sinner, and to become his righteousness. In this view of the subject, Christ is a princely clothier with an ample surplus of righteousness, out of whose abundance



there are "robes of righteousness" for every elect son of God. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to the sinner, and the sinner becomes righteous *de jure* and *de facto*. This is a part of that commercial theory of the atonement which the world is fast outgrowing, and which, by an advancing civilization, is being relegated to merited oblivion. An honest man and an honest God are not satisfied with shams in their relations or in their transactions. Sin is a real, personal thing, made more easily accessible by the overshadowing effects and influences of the first Adam. Righteousness is a real, personal thing, made more accessible by the far-reaching consequences and influences of the second Adam. But in both instances the transactions, all around, are genuine. There is no jugglery with truth and the eternal principles of righteousness on the part of God, nor can there be any sleight-of-hand performances in the matter of sin and salvation on the part of man.

If I am arraigned before a court of justice and charged with a crime, let me be either convicted or acquitted on the facts in the case. If I am acquitted, let it be upon the ground that I am "not guilty," and not simply upon the ground that I am "not proven guilty." If I am convicted, let me suffer the penalty of the

law I have violated, or let me obtain the clemency of the government under which I live—obtain it in the way and according to the provisions appointed by my government for extending pardon to transgressors of law, and their restoration to citizenship. When I stand before the court, convicted of crime, let not the presiding judge say to the jury: “This man is guilty, but his brother here is an innocent, good man; so make your verdict as to place to the credit of this bad man the good qualities of his brother, and declare him righteous—not guilty.”

Would a procedure like this be tolerated in a human government? Are we to believe that a policy that is unworthy of a human government, would be adopted and practiced in the divine government?

There are three forms of righteousness:

(1) A righteousness of *nature*. God is essentially righteous in his nature. Enlightened reason and revelation alike view him in this light. We cannot conceive of his doing wrong. When the Scriptures declare, “It is impossible for God to lie,” we have but an announcement of the fact that the divine nature is not only immaculate, but impeccable.

(2) A righteousness of *character*. A person may be righteous in character without

being holy or immaculate in nature. The moral nature may not be strong enough to resist evil successfully at all times and under all conditions, but the desire and purpose are ever present to do so. Abraham was a righteous man—righteous in character though not in nature.

(3) A righteousness of *state*. There is a difference between being of a righteous character and being in a righteous state. There is a difference between a parental state and a parental character. A man may be a father and have children in his family, and not be fatherly—not have the character of a father. There is a difference between the filial state and character. A son may be in the family, and of the family, and yet be very unfilial in character. State has reference to a man's relations; character has reference to what he is, morally considered.

Christ Jesus our Lord is righteous—righteous in nature, righteous in character, righteous in state. He was divine in his nature; he was loyal in every desire and purpose to live right; he was always in normal relation with his Father. The sinner is unrighteous—unrighteous in nature, unrighteous in character, unrighteous in state. He is human and peccable in nature; he is not loyal in his desire and pur-

pose for holy living; he is in abnormal moral relation with God the Father.

Now the Scriptures declare that Christ has been “made unto us righteousness,” and that he is “our righteousness.” Christ, in the divine scheme of redemption, is the means, the medium, and the mediator, by which and by whom we are transformed and transferred—not transformed nor transferred in our *nature*, but transformed in our moral *character*, and transferred in our moral *state*—transformed from an unrighteous character into a righteous character; transformed from an unrighteous state into a righteous state. Carrying with us the same peccable, human nature, we are transformed in our desire and purpose of unholy living into a desire and purpose for holy living; we are transferred from our abnormal moral relations of unbelief into the normal moral relations of faith in God. And this brings us to our next section.

#### 5. The righteousness of *faith*.

The doctrine of “justification by faith,” or the “righteousness of faith,” is fundamental in the Bible. The terms justify and justification have reference to the gracious act of God in receiving and forgiving us on the ground of our faith in his Son. “The righteousness of faith” is a scriptural phrase expressive of that moral

transformation which our faith in Christ produces in us both as to character and state. Faith, gospel faith, is a moral force, a moral factor, a moral cause that produces moral motion, moral results, moral effects. It produces a change in a man's moral state. Faith transfers a man from the moral state of unbelief into the moral state of belief, from insubordination to subordination, from alienation to affection, from unrighteousness to righteousness.

Righteousness through law or through loyalty to law is impossible, and was so demonstrated of God in the history of the Jews—impossible because mere loyalty to law, because it is law, does not generate moral qualities in character; impossible because perfect loyalty has never been attained by any man save the man Christ Jesus. And nothing short of *perfect* loyalty to law can secure the "righteousness of law." "He that keeps the whole law and offends in one point is guilty of all."

Righteousness of morality is impossible for the same reason—its incompleteness. No man save the God-man has ever given the world a complete morality, a perfect fidelity to a perfect standard in all things. The "righteousness of faith" then is the only righteousness possible to a sinner. Through the atoning life and death of Jesus Christ God graciously forgives

sin, and enters into a new covenant with man whereby his faith—his self-surrender through conscious unworthiness on his own part, and his trust in the proffered mercy of God—is “reckoned unto him for righteousness.”

The apostle Paul gives to this subject an exhaustive treatment in his epistle to the Romans, in which he repeatedly gathers the rays of light into a luminous, burning focus in the way of a conclusion that is unmistakable and overwhelming. Take the following as an example:

“What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, who followed not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works. They stumbled at the stone of stumbling; even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence: and he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame.” (Rom. 9:30-33.)

We have in this passage this whole subject in a nutshell. The very essence of the gospel and the very quintessence of Christianity are contained in this brief paragraph, “I lay in Zion a stone,” that is Christ Jesus our Lord, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the

world. "And he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame." Why is he not put to shame? Because he is forgiven and received into the divine favor. Why is he forgiven? Because he "*believeth on him.*" Here is the righteousness "that the Gentiles attained to, even the righteousness of faith." Here is the righteousness at which the Jews "stumbled"—"but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law." Now hear Paul raise a question over this and answer it. "Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works." "Going about to establish their own righteousness, they have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." (Rom. 10:3.) They did not, in a spirit of conscious unworthiness, surrender themselves in faith, and trust in Christ, who was "made unto us righteousness;" trust in "Jehovah, our righteousness;" trust in the "righteousness of faith"—*in the righteousness of trusting in the righteousness of God.*

Let us now inquire, what advantage is to be gained by this view of the subject?

First. It brings the soul and holds it ever more directly in touch with God and in sympathy and fellowship with Christ. The tendency of men has always been to interpose something between themselves and God, rather than come

directly into personal relation with him. "Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die," said the people to Moses. "And Moses said unto the people, Fear not; for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before you, that ye sin not." It is ever thus, God seeking to get near the people, and the people seeking to hide from God. Catholicism seeks to interpose a priesthood between the soul and God; and the priests magnify their official importance in the eyes of their willing dupes. Protestants imitate the Catholics largely in this direction by ignoring the fact that Christianity constitutes *all* Christians—"a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," and by turning their personal duties and devotions over to the preacher, worshipping God largely by proxy. Creeds and rituals and ordinances are, in many instances, so unduly magnified in their importance as to receive that reverence and homage that should be given unto God; and thus become hindrances instead of helps to the Christian's communion—direct communion—with Christ. Law itself, and loyalty to law, objectively viewed, absorbs the attention and commands the efforts; and men thus seek a "righteousness of law." "This is the covenant that I will make with



them, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws *on their heart, and upon their mind also will I write them*”—righteousness of law, righteousness of ordinances, and righteousness of priestly intercession, are all to give place to the “righteousness of faith”—*a righteousness that brings the soul, and holds it evermore directly in touch with God, and in sympathy and fellowship with Christ.*

Second. It makes the idea of imputed righteousness *real* and not fictitious, *scriptural* and not spurious. No intelligent Christian man wants to appear before God in borrowed clothes—in a robe of righteousness that is really Christ’s and not his own. The righteous intercession of the righteous Christ makes it possible for God to “be just and the justifier of him that believeth;” and makes it possible for the believer to clothe himself with a “righteousness of faith,” and a personal righteousness of life and of character. Not that we are absolutely perfect in character yet, but we are in that moral state where our frailties are provided for, and where we may grow in righteousness of life and character and ultimately “become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world by lust.” (2 Pet. 1:4.) The righteousness then that is “imputed” to the Christian is his *own*

righteousness attained through the forgiveness of sins and the development of a personal Christian character in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Third.—It places a value, an intelligent value, upon all moral worth, and upon all good works. “Whosoever shall give a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, he shall in no wise lose his reward.” (Matt. 10:42.) That is the lesson in brief—“*In the name of a disciple*” carries along with it the element of *faith*; and even the small charity, a “cup of water” becomes an accretion to his “righteousness of faith.” To give a cup of water to a disciple because some law or custom required it would be a mechanical service and carry along with it no moral value, no moral “reward.” While the water given, even mechanically, would be to the thirsty man a blessing, as great a physical blessing as if given in faith, yet it would not be of moral benefit to the giver. “Righteousness of law” can not enrich itself by good works, but the “righteousness of faith” *never* “loses its reward.”

Thought, feeling and action determine character. Character is what a man really is, reputation is what he appears to be. Thought and action alone do not give moral tone to character. They may give reputation, even the

reputation of being religious; but feeling is essential to moral character; and faith, which is a form of feeling, is essential to religious character.

Righteousness imputed, in the sense of being bestowed upon a man from without, is unreal and without moral value. Righteousness that grows from within, under the inspiration of faith in God, is genuine, and all its works have a real value.

Fourth.—It gives a new and stronger incentive for the attainment of personal righteousness. A wayward boy falls into disgrace, and, humiliated by a sense of his own unworthiness, is on the verge of despair. His older brother comes to him with a message from the father. He is assured of the brother's sympathy and of the father's affection, of their confidence in his ability to yet become a man, and of their readiness to help him in the attempt, to re-enforce his efforts by fraternal and paternal sympathy and assistance. With faith in these promises and assurances, he is renewed in his strength, and becomes a man again. He is now wiser for his experience—knows himself better, knows sin and its tendencies better, knows the nature of filial and parental love better, has the new impulse of gratitude planted

in his heart, and feels a new and stronger incentive for the attainment of moral excellence and a virtuous manhood than he ever had, than he ever could have had without this experience, without this righteousness of faith to which he has come.

The application of this to our redemption from sin through the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, and the new incentive for holy living thus created in our souls by the "righteousness of faith," is too apparent to need emphasis. The revelation made to the soul of man through this wonderful scheme of salvation is a sublime impulse. The possibilities of its own moral and spiritual nature thus disclosed—disclosed as they could have been in no other way—leads it to exclaim, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him, or the Son of man, that thou dost visit him!"—visit him with such a marvelous redemption as enables and inspires a really unrighteous man to become a really righteous one! And the infinite possibilities of the nature and character of God thus revealed impel the further exclamation, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who

hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and unto him are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen.”











