

The following two articles appeared in the October and November issues of the Millennial Harbinger. Much of the writing centers around the “Campbell-Jennings Debate.”

A REVIEW OF A REVIEW OF SOMETHING CALLED “CAMPBELLISM.”

Published in the January and April numbers of the American Biblical Repository.

The article is labeled by its author as follows. —“CAMPBELLISM BY REV. R. W. LANDIS, JEFFERSONVILLE, PA.”

‘Our country is full of pretended reformers, who never read the Bible, and who, animated by a blind impulse, vainly imagine they are turning the world upside down, while, in fact, they are only turning upside down in the world’—CLOUGH’S DISCOURSES

This Review, divided into two parts, fills almost 70 octavo pages, and is endorsed by the Rev. Absalom Peters, D. D., in the words following, to wit: — *No. I*, p. 130.

“NOTE. —We regret that our limits will not allow us to conclude this article in the present No. of the Repository. In the remaining sections, the author presents a brief synopsis of direct arguments against Campbellism, considers, at some length, the Unitarianism of the system, and reviews with much point, and in a very satisfactory manner, the *Translation of the New Testament* adopted by the Campbellites, showing it to be a gross deception practised upon the public. His arguments are characteristically biblical, and the article, as a whole, appears to as highly valuable and appropriate at the present tune, as an able and learned refutation of the scheme of a pretender, whose popularity in some parts of our country has given him the power of destroying much good. The reader will also perceive that the strong language of disapprobation used by Mr Landis, is fully justified by the facts in the case. The conclusion will appear in the Repository for April next.”—EDITOR.

In reviewing my Reverend Reviewer, I can find a cheap and suitable motto in his own, by a very plausible emendation or two: —

‘Our country is full of pretended Reviewers, who have never read with either candor or care, trip works which they review; and who, animated by the spirit of the party to which they have attached themselves, vainly imagine they are exposing the errors and sophistry of those whom they review; while, in fact, they are only exposing their own ignorance, prejudice, and recklessness of truth.’

Clough’s wisdom amended and improved.

When truth or character is at stake, we ask no favors from friend or foe. We demand investigation. We challenge criticism—fair, honorable, impartial criticism. We fear not the tribunals, nor the canons, nor the decisions of enlightened, high-minded, honest criticism, however severe; but the petulant cavils of saucy sectarianism, the acrimonious quibblings of cynical piquancy, the mawkish disdain of affected sanctity, and the supercilious denunciations of wounded pride—of *ex cathedra*, swollen, pampered orthodoxy, I can not endure; especially when it constitutes itself court, and jury, and witness, and hastens to pronounce sentence

without privilege of a reply, or of an appeal. *

* I have written twice to Absalom Peters, D. D., and waited two months for an answer on the simple question, Will my defence be laid before his readers? to which he has vouch safed no reply.

I am sorry that there is so much in the article before me to call up such unpleasant associations of ideas, and to demonstrate that Tetzal, to say the least, was as well qualified, and as impartially prepared to review Lutheranism, and Luther's version of the Bible, as the aforesaid Rev. R. W. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa. is to do either myself, or any thing I have written, justice before the public. Few of my readers may perhaps remember that this same Rev. R. W. Landis, who has so graciously undertaken the office of my reviewer, is that identical Mr. Landis, whose profound criticisms on the Greek of Acts xxii. 16; and admirable exegetical labors, together with his *remarkable disingenuousness in attempting to impose a palpable delusion on all unlearned readers, of his dissertations on self-baptism*, called for a brief, but thorough exposition from me, in the 6th volume Millennial Harbinger, pp. 168—169. By turning over to those pages the impartial inquirer will see how this very erudite and honorable scholar, critic and divine fared in my hands, while attempting to make the readers of the ephemeral "Christian Gazette," of Philadelphia, believe that Ananias commanded Paul "to *be baptized*," and to "*wash away his sins*," in different voices. The one command, said he, is active, the other passive; while, in fact, in Greek they are both in the same voice. From this eminent display of critical shrewdness and Christian honesty, my readers will not be astonished, either at his admirable qualifications for a literary reviewer, nor at the zeal with which he undertakes my condemnation.

Judges of law rarely or ever sit on the tribunals of justice, in cases in which they have only been employed in counsel; much less in those in which they are, or have been a party. But the clerical nerves of my pious reviewer are not so morbidly sensitive as those of the lawyers. He can oppose my views in the "*Christian Gazette*" in a personal controversy with myself, and when driven from the bar he ascends the bench, and in the *American Biblical Repository*, as from a literary and ecclesiastic tribunal, proceeds to pronounce an *ex cathedra* sentence upon his quondam antagonist, as though he were canonically appointed to decide, as sovereign arbiter of my doctrine, writings, and manner of life.

When seated on this literary throne, he cannot wait to quote any of my premises or conclusions, or to examine any of my positions, before he condemns me as an errorist. No, that would be a process too tedious for the inward burnings of his zeal. But most unfortunate for my reputation, with all who are doomed never to hear me, but to listen exclusively to my judge, who pronounces me an "errorist, having no more valid claims to be Christian than the Mormons,"—and proves that

“error in religion” in my case, as in all others, “arises from depravity of heart.” He avows that “my views are essentially another gospel,” and still worse, he more emphatically implicates my moral standing: —“We venture to affirm,” says he, “that the course which Mr. Campbell has pursued in relation to his pretended translation of the New Testament, has been such as cannot fail to fill every one with the deepest horror, who will favor our remarks with a perusal.” What need have they of farther witness who believe in Mr. Landis!

But as if all this was not enough to aggravate my doom, in the very commencement of his review he affirms some half dozen of palpable falsehoods concerning my early history, emigration to this country, embarrassed circumstances, connexion with the Baptists., &c. &c.; matters too, which he must have known to be false, had he read the works which he professes to review. My exposure and refutation of that most infamous libel of my sentiments, got up by one Jennings of Pittsburgh, under the pretence of its being the posthumous production of Dr. Obadiah Jennings of Nashville, in volume 3d of the old series of this work was before him, and other public documents in the Christian Baptist, from which he might have known the truth of these matters.

Had my impartial and benevolent reviewer delayed his fulminations till he had stated some premises from my writings, and given me even the mockery of an apparent hearing and refutation on my own words and actions, he might have been regarded as less indecorous and malignant; but to have preambled his review with such a phalanx of ungrounded assertions, unmanly imputations, and viperous calumnies, not only evinces him to be wanting of every primary attribute of an impartial reviewer, and more eminently qualified to abuse than to convince; but also, furnishes a very striking proof of one of his own favorite apothegms, viz: —“Error in religion, is, to say the least, much more the result of depravity of heart, than of honest and conscientious mistake.” Now if this be true as respects *error in theory*, how much more in regard to error in practice! What then will this censorious world say of one who so wantonly errs from that candor and benevolence which have ever been regarded as most prominent attributes of Christian character!

Still I cannot but be thankful for the timous display of his acrimony, sinister feeling, and prejudice. Should any of his readers ever see my review they, in common with mine, cannot but doubt his utter incompetence to do me justice, nor good will to prove me erroneous in theory, and immoral in practice. His failure in the end cannot now be imputed, either to want of determination, or to lack of zeal in the cause of defamation. We shall, then, with all calmness and self-possession, proceed to the examination of this monstrous thing called Campbellism, and endeavor to consider its most obnoxious features from one whose determination to make them manifest cannot reasonably be doubted.

Our reviewer is somewhat methodical, and heads his first section—“The fundamental principles of Campbellism pointed out and examined.” “The fundamental principles” of this monstrous thing! What can they be! Alas! says Mr. Landis, there is no finding them out; for “the Campbellites keep their own sentiments concealed, either by not declaring them openly, or by the employment of a phraseology so ambiguous, that few can be found aside from their own denomination, who can give a rational account of even a few of the distinctive features of the system.”* Amongst this elect few Mr. Landis is indeed one. To him it is a great consolation that “of late years, however, Mr. Campbell himself has become somewhat more emboldened in the advancement of his views. Backed, as he is, by a numerous host of followers, he no longer feels that restraint which formerly held him in check, and prevented his coming fearlessly before the public with his system in a tangible form.”† Surely every one acquainted with our controversy, will here pause and smile at the qualifications of our reviewer; if at such temerity and ignorance he can smile. The very opposite to this statement is the fact, as every one but Mr. Landis knows. The most obnoxious volume I ever wrote was the 1st volume of the Christian Baptist, 1823. The universal sentiment or opinion among all parties is, that we are annually becoming more orthodox, and that one or two points excepted, all good Protestants could most cordially embrace us in the arms of their communion I do not say that this is a just view of the present state of the controversy; but certainly it is now affirmed very generally through the length and breadth of the land to be a true statement of the matter. Like the passengers in a ship approaching the land, to whom the land appears as though it approached them, some of our friends say we are fast coming over to their views, or returning to the paths of orthodoxy. But Mr. Landis, no doubt, from his own careful examination of my writings, frankly owns, “that any one who has the requisite patience to wade through his (my) tomes, may reasonably entertain the prospect of ultimately detecting his (my) sentiments.” Mr. L. has searched out the matter. We shall then hear him on the 1st and most fundamental principle of Campbellism— viz. FAITH.

“In Mr. C.’s narrative,” says he, “of the debate between him and

* Page 90. † Page 99.

the late Mr. Jennings, of Nashville, he asserts that “faith, ranked among the fruits of the Spirit, is fidelity. Millennial Harbinger Extra, No. 1.”* This is my first and fundamental error—the most fundamental of “the principles of Campbellism.” We do indeed plead guilty to this charge. It is a true bill. *Faith* in Gal. v. 22, as in Matth. xxiii. 23, and Titus ii. 10, ought to be translated “*fidelity*.” The word is the same in these three passages, viz. *pistis*. “The weightier matters of the law are righteousness, temperance, *fidelity*.” Matth. xxii. 23. “The fruits of the Spirit are *goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance,*” and “shewing all good *fidelity* to their

masters.” Titus ii. 10. The King’s version has *fidelity* in the last, and *faith* in the former two. Now it so happens that this radical error of Campbellism has been adopted by the good Presbyterian continuators of Matthew Henry’s commentary. It is also the new version of Dr. McKnight. That *faith* frequently denotes *fidelity*, we have also the testimony of Parkhurst, Greenfield, Campbell—even the King’s translators themselves, who so render it Titus ii. 10. The American and English Episcopalians are, with many Presbyterian Doctors, guilty of this fundamental sin of Campbellism; for with D’Oyly and Mants, they place *fidelity* for *faith* among the fruits of the Spirit, Gal. v. a2. Yes, and I fearlessly appeal to the Andover School itself, that I am right in translating *pistis fidelity* in Matth. xxiii. 23, and in Gal. v, 22, according to all their canons of interpretation. This fundamental error of Campbellism is indeed the common error of *ninety-nine hundredths* of the most learned and intelligent Christians on earth. But might not common sense itself perceive, that when Jesus associates righteousness and temperance with *faith* and calls them “the weightier matters of the law,” he means not a mere principle, but a moral virtue! And when Paul associates *faith*, in the passage in debate, with “goodness, meekness, and temperance,” against which there is no law, he means not a mere favor bestowed, but a moral virtue, sister to meekness and temperance!

But to the 2d proof of the fundamental error of Campbellism. It is in these words:

“His fundamental position in relation to the *faith* which the gospel requires, or that belief which is to the saving of the soul, is, that it is, “*in its nature purely historical*, consisting in the belief of a few simple facts, and not doctrines; that there neither was, nor could there possibly be any difference between that belief of the gospel which is requisite to the salvation of the soul, and that credence, which we usually with readiness yield to any other well authenticated history.” Vide *Debate*, pp. 32—33, etc. ut supra.”

Did you know, Dr. Peters, that this is an unmanly, an unchristian attempt to impose upon your readers the words of a weak and prejudiced opponent as though they were mine! Positively, to all who will examine it, it must appear a most Jesuitical attempt. Observe the manoeuver: Mr. Landis in the preceding period quotes from my narrative of “*the Debate*” with Mr. Jennings; and, without intimating to his readers, he quotes the next period from Mr. Jennings, and says to the reader, “*Fide Debate*, pp. 32, 33, etc. ut supra”—thereby deluding him into the belief that these are my words; whereas, in fact, they are the words of my antagonist!! Thus the reader is ingeniously imposed on, and words put into my mouth which I never uttered, and which cannot be found in any of my writings! My answer to this proof of error, and to the illustration which follows, is simply that they are not my words nor my views, but those of a weak and prejudiced opponent. Could not Mr. Landis, in all my volumes, as he intimates he had

patience to examine them—I say, could he not find whereof to accuse me of error in my own words, without jesuitically putting into my mouth the words of an opponent!

But in the third place he quotes the Christian Baptist, vol. iii. No. 7; the substance of which he gives in the following words: —“Mr. Campbell asserts that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe on him to the saving of the soul.” “It is not possible,” says he, “to misunderstand this.” Very good: what does it mean? Let an Apostle pronounce sentence on these words. John the Apostle affirms, “*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ (the Messiah) is BORN OF GOD.*” Surely, then, he has true faith! But he does not say that ‘every one who *thinks* he believes, nor ‘every one that *professes to believe;*’ but “every one that *does believe* that Jesus is the Messiah is begotten, or born of God.”

Again, in the same epistle, chap, v., John affirms that “this is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith;” and in the next verse defines this faith, saying, “Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?” Surely, then, John was a Campbellite! and his first general epistle genuine Campbellism!! I neither affirm more nor less than the above on the subject of faith; but I am willing to explain myself. fully, as I have often done on this subject. Mr. Landis has not, then, done me justice even in saying that “Mr. Campbell asserts that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe on him to the saving of the soul.” He is too gross and indiscriminating a reader of the Bible, and of my works, ever to be depended on in his quotations or comments. Had he examined my writings carefully he would have found me make this distinction—To believe a person, and to believe on him, are not always identical propositions. The one is often the cause—the other the effect. One must believe Jesus, before he can believe on him. I may sometimes believe Mr. Landis, but I am certain I do not believe *on* him, nor *in* him. I have no confidence in him. The demons believed Jesus, but did not believe on him. They could not believe on him, for he did not profess to be their Saviour. They could believe him; but they could not, therefore, believe on him. Sinners, however, amongst us, who do believe all that Jesus says to them, will, I rejoice to say, most certainly believe on him.

Mr. Landis may be of those who have too much faith to believe the gospel, or to believe Jesus. I know some persons who believe a great deal too much. They believe a thousand things about religion, and yet do not believe—nay, indeed, they do not understand the proposition that *Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God;* and therefore I am sure they cannot believe it. I reason about faith as I do about every thing else. Faith is something. It is an *effects* it must have a *cause*. But the cause is one thing, and the effect another. Faith is the belief of testimony; but it is first belief in the testifier. I must believe the witness to be a man of veracity, or I cannot

believe his testimony. Now the special faith of the New Institution is *belief in the testimony of Jesus concerning himself*; or it is the belief of the testimony of the witnesses concerning him: the consummation of which is *belief, faith, or confidence in him*.

Many, indeed, say they have faith in him, whom I cannot believe— because the world overcomes them: whereas he who believes on Jesus “overcomes the world.” Saving faith, or faith unfeigned, with me, is confidence, faith, or trust in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God, the all-sufficient Saviour of sinners.

The next quotation from my writings, (and on such an occasion I answer only for my views as I have expressed them,) is the following:

“In his Preface to his New Testament Mr. Campbell repeats this view: ‘When one question of fact is answered in the affirmative, the way of happiness is laid open, and all doubts on the nature of true piety and humanity are dissipated. The fact is a historic one, and this question is of the same nature. It is this—*Was Jesus the Nazarene the Son and Apostle of God?* This question is capable of being converted into various forms—such as, Are the subsequent narratives true? Did Jesus actually and literally rise from the dead after being crucified and interred¹? Did he ascend into heaven in the presence of his disciples’? Is he constituted the Judge of the living and the dead¹? or, Was he an impostor and a deceiver of men? It may be proposed in many a form; but it is still a unit, and amounts to this—*Is Jesus the Nazarene the Son ‘if God, the Apostle of the Father, the Saviour of men? When this question is answered in the affirmative, our duty, our salvation, and our happiness are ascertained and determined.*” Mill. Harb. Vol. VI. p. 82.

To this I fully subscribe; and the person that does not, had need to examine himself whether he be in the faith, or whether he believes on the Son of God: for surely if any one believes on him he will believe what he says, and what his Apostles said. And so explicit is Paul on this subject, that he simplifies still farther, and affirms that “if thou shall confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shall be saved.”*

He next proceeds to my second fundamental error—“The Doctrine of Campbell on Regeneration.” The Doctrine he expresses as follows: —

1. “With one consent the Campbellites declare that regeneration, or being born again, is essential to salvation.”

2. “Mr. Campbell and his friends declare that immersion in water is essential to regeneration.”

3. “Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is absolutely essential to forgiveness of sins.”

4. “The Campbellites declare that immersion in water and regeneration are two

names for the same thing.”

Under these allegations some words of mine and of other persons, found in my volumes, frequently dislocated, and never taken in their whole connexion, are offered as proof. From these, most repulsive corollaries are deduced, and the sentence of damnable heresy and palpable absurdity is reiterated with greater zest.

As this portion of the review is managed, it is a tissue of misrepresentation and perversion from beginning to end. Three of the four propositions are truly and properly false and delusive. The last, though not in form false and perverted, is made so by its connexion with the others, and the main drift of the meaning attached to one of the terms in it. Oh! for a little of that candor and charity so often commended, but so seldom exhibited from the pulpit and the religious press of this backsliding age! Had Mr. Landis given my definition of the word “*salvation*,” and of the word “*regeneration*,” or of “*washing of regeneration*,” it would have saved him and myself some trouble, and his readers much imposition and deception. In his definition of the terms I may be branded with wanton error; in mine I am as scriptural, rational, and consistent as Paul is with himself in Athens, in Corinth, and in Rome.

With many of Mr. Landis readers “to get to heaven” and “to be saved” are synonymous phrases. Salvation, with me, is either temporal, spiritual, or eternal. I have, times without number, affirmed

* Romans x. 9.

my conviction that many will be found in heaven who never believed, repented, or were baptized. Often have we spoken of the salvation of our persons from the physical evils of this life—of our souls from the guilt, the pollution, and the power of sin; and of the salvation of our bodies from the grave—of our eternal redemption from every vestige of the consequences of moral evil. And having defined these three unequivocal acceptations of that term, I have been careful to a fault to show in which of these acceptations it is connected with baptism or regeneration.

All this is here passed over as though Mr. Landis knew nothing about it, and as if I used the word *salvation* in its popular meaning. A single passage from my writings would have made my meaning not only evident, but acceptable to all intelligent Protestants. It is a passage, too, found under date of July 5, 1830, in my first Extra on Remission of Sins: —

“We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh; we enter the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of Jesus Christ, in this life, by being born of water and the Spirit; we enter the kingdom of eternal glory by being born again from the earth, and neither by faith nor the first regeneration; neither by faith

nor baptism, but by being counted worthy of the resurrection of the just—‘I was hungry and you fed me:’ not because you believed, or were born of water; but because ‘I was hungry and you fed me,’ &c.

“There are three births, three kingdoms, and three salvations: One from the womb of our first mother, one from the water, and one from the grave. We enter a new world on. and not before, each birth.. The present animal life, at the first birth; the spiritual, or the life of God in our souls, at the second birth; and the life eternal in the presence of God, at the third birth. And he who dreams of entering the second kingdom, or coming under the dominion of Jesus, without the second birth—may, to complete his error, dream of entering the kingdom of glory without a resurrection from the dead!

“Grace precedes all these births—shines in all the kingdoms; but will be glorified in the third. Sense is the principle of action in the first kingdom; faith, in the second; and sight spiritual, in the third. The first salvation is that of the body from the dangers and ills of life, and God is thus ‘the Saviour of all men;’ the second salvation is that of the soul from sin; the third is that of both soul and body united, delivered from moral and natural corruption, and introduced into the presence of God, when God shall be all in all.”*

With the above, and many similar definitions and expositions in our view, let us now transcribe those four perversions called “the Doctrines of Campbellism:”—

1. “They with one consent declare that the phrase ‘washing of regeneration,’ found only once in the New Testament, refers to baptism, and is equivalent to that term, in primitive usage, and that this

* Christianity Restored. p. 239.

‘washing of regeneration’ is necessary to the present *salvation of the soul* from the guilt, pollution, and power of sin.”

2. “Mr. Campbell and his friends declare that immersion in water is necessary to ‘the washing of regeneration.’”

3. “Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *not absolutely*, but *relatively* essential to the forgiveness of sins.”

4. “The Campbellites declare that immersion in water and ‘the washing of regeneration’ are two names for the same action.”

I do not, indeed, altogether approve of the verbiage of the above propositions; but if I must keep up to the style of Mr. Landis, and with a reference to his caricature and travesty of our views express myself, I give the above as all that any candid, honest, and truth-speaking man could possibly exhibit from my writings as my views on these points; any thing else is downright misrepresentation and

calumny.

The term *regeneration*, as shown in my Essay on Regeneration, occurs but twice in the New Testament, and once has respect to a new order of things. But I have been at great pains to define both the scriptural and popular acceptation of this term. One passage from my Extra on Regeneration fully demonstrates the moral incompetency of Mr. L. to present my views fairly: —

Regeneration literally indicates the whole process of renovating new-creating man. “This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning, or consummating act, the name of the whole process. For —the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed incomplete until that act is performed. For example: In the process of tanning, fulling, forging, &c. the subject of these operations is not supposed to be tanned, fullled, forged, until the last act is performed. So in all the processes of nature. In the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, the last act consummates the process. To all acquainted with the process of animalization, germination, crystalization, &c. no farther argument is needed. But, in the style of our American husbandmen, no crop nor animal is *made* until it come to maturity. We often hear them say of a good shower, or of a few clear days, ‘This is the *making* of the wheat, or corn!’ In the same sense it is that most Christians call *regeneration* THE NEW BIRTH; though *being born* is only the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration.

“In this way the *new birth* and *regeneration* are used indiscriminate by commentators and writers on theology; and by a figure of speech it is justified on well established principles of rhetoric.

“By the ‘*bath of regeneration*’ is not meant the first, second, or third act; but the last act of regeneration, which completes the whole, and is therefore used to denote the new birth. This is the reason why our Lord and his Apostles unite this act with water. Being *born of water*, in the Saviour’s style, and *the bath of regeneration*, in the Apostles’ style, in the judgment of all writers and critics of eminence, refer to one and the same act, viz. —Christian baptism. Hence it came to pass, that *all the ancients* (as fully proved in our first Extra on Remission) used the word *regeneration* as synonymous in signification with *immersion*. In addition to the numerous quotations made in our Essay on Remission, from the creeds and liturgies of Protestant churches, we shall add another from the Common Prayer of the Church of England, showing unequivocally that the learned Doctors of that church used the words *regeneration* and *baptism* as synonymous. In the address find prayer of the Minister after the baptism of the child, he is commanded to say—

“Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ’s church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayer unto him that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning. ‘-----[*Then shall be said, all kneeling*]—‘We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant that he, being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of the Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of thy holy church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen!’” *

Another extract on the NEW BIRTH, from the same Essay, will farther manifest the great injustice done my views by the garbled extracts and corollaries of the *reverend* gentleman: —

“We have already seen that the consummation of the process of regeneration, or creation, is in the birth of the creature formed. So it is in the moral generation, or in the great process of regeneration. There is a state of existence from which he that is born passes; and there is a state of existence into which he enters at birth. This is true of the whole animal creation, whether oviparous or viviparous. Now the manner of existence, or the mode of life, is wholly changed; and he is, in reference to the former state, dead; and to the new state, alive. So in moral regeneration. The subject of this great change, before his new birth, existed in one state; but after it, he exists in another. He stands in a new relation to God, angels, and men. He is now born of God, and has the privilege of being a son of God, and is consequently pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, saved. The state which he left was a state of condemnation, what some call ‘the state of nature.’ The state into which he enters is a state of favor, in which he enjoys all the heavenly blessings through Christ: therefore it is called ‘the kingdom of heaven.’ All this is signified in his death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, or in his being born of water. Hence the necessity of being buried with Christ in water, that he may be born of water—that he may enjoy the renewal of the Holy Spirit, and be placed under the reign of favor.

“*All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment—not of procure-*

* Millennial Harbinger, vol. 4, 1833, p. 352.

ment. Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying the life possessed before birth. So in this figure—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life,

but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed. If the child is never born, all its sensitive powers and faculties cannot be enjoyed; for it is after birth that these are fully developed, and feasted upon all the aliments and objects of sense in nature. Hence all that is *now* promised in the gospel can only be *enjoyed* by those who are born again and placed in the kingdom of heaven under all its influences. Hence the philosophy of that necessity which Jesus preached—‘Unless a man be born again he cannot discern the kingdom of heaven—unless a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into it.’

“But let no man think that in the act of being born, either naturally or metaphorically, the child purchases, procures, or merits either life or its enjoyments. He is only by his birth placed in circumstances favorable to the enjoyment of life, and all that makes life a blessing. ‘To as many as received him, believing in his name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive not their birth from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God.’”*

I am no less travestied and caricatured—no less calumniated on the subject of remission of sins as connected with baptism, than on the subject of baptism as connected with the whole renovation or process of regeneration. A more flagitious perversion I have never met with than that expressed in the third dogma imputed to me—“Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *absolutely* essential to forgiveness of sins.” The most charitable construction I can put upon this, is, that Mr. L. does not understand his own language, or select his terms with discrimination. *Absolutely essential* to forgiveness! This is equal to ‘No baptism, no forgiveness’ in time or to eternity, for man, woman, or child. I never thought, uttered, or wrote such an idea. Mr. L. uses words without discrimination. At one time he says we “employ the terms regeneration, conversion, and immersion as synonyms.” The proof he adduces is, “*Conversion, regeneration, and immersion* are all descriptive of the same thing.” Now can Mr. L. confound *synonymous* terms with terms *descriptive of the same thing!* When I speak of Mr. Landis as my “reviewer,” his “reverence,” &c., do I, in using these terms as descriptive of him, authorize him to say that I use the words *Mr. Landis, my reviewer, and his reverence* as three synonymous words! I charitably hope, therefore, that his use of the words “absolutely essential” is owing to a lack of discrimination, rather than to intentional slander or actual maliciousness. Have I not repeatedly said, that “neither faith, repentance, nor baptism is *absolutely essential* to the future and eternal salvation:” for then infant

* M. H. vol. iv. 1839, p. 355.

salvation would be impossible. But faith, repentance, baptism, are necessary *to our present enjoyment* of the grace of God—to the present *assurance and enjoyment* of

the remission of our sins and adoption into the family of God. “He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be *saved*” —“Repent and be *baptized* for the remission of sins”—“The like figure whereunto baptism doth also *now save us*.”

My jaundiced friend has given us a string of propositions, syllogisms, and corollaries that really confound me. I know not whether to regard him as acting the knave or the simpleton. Listen, reader, to a few of them: —

1. “The faith which the Campbellites contend for has, confessedly, no connexion whatever with regeneration. They are truly separate!”

2. “Faith has no real connexion with pardon.”

3. “Mr. Campbell repeatedly ridicules the idea of the agency of the Spirit of God in the exercise of faith.”

Never, Mr. Landis—no, never! These three imputations are an outrage against reason, religion, morality. Why should Mr. Landis have noticed a system so preposterous! Surely it could not subsist one year. But hear him farther: —

4. “Infants, who die in infancy, are either lost; or, if saved, they are saved without being regenerated.”

On the two points of regeneration and remission, I have written two Extras, two full essays, which have been so definite and intelligible, at least, as to impart the same views to many thousands of all sects and persuasions; and of great variety of natural endowments, as well as educational prejudices. But never have I known such a perversion of any two pieces as that matured and exhibited on the pages of the Biblical Repository.

To prevent, as I imagine, the charge of Neologism, or wanton innovation, and all mistake too about my meaning, I concluded the last edition of my Extra on Remission with the following collection of witnesses, most of whom have at sundry times before appeared in my writings. Ten confessions of faith, and eight of them Protestant are summoned, viz: —

“BAPTIST. *Chap. xxx. Sec. 1.* —“Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ; to live and walk in newness of life.”

“The Baptist follows the Presbyterian church as servilely as the Methodist church follows the English hierarchy. But she avows her faith that immersion is a *sign* of remission. A sign of the past, the present, or the future! A sign accompanying!

“*The Confession of Bohemia.* —“We believe that whatsoever by baptism—is

in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all *that* doth the Lord God perform inwardly. That is, he washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him: for the bestowing of these excellent fruits was holy baptism given and granted to the church.”

“*The Confession of Augsburg.* —“Concerning baptism, they teach that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ: also, by baptism the grace of God is offered.”

“*The Confession of Saxony.* —“I baptize thee—that is, I do witness that by this dipping, thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God.”

“*The Confession of Whittenburg.* —“We believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the Prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins.”

“*The Confession of Helvetia.* —“To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, for to lead a new and innocent life.”

“*The Confession of Sueveland.* —“As touching baptism, we confess that it is the font of regeneration, washeth away sins and saveth us. But all these things we do understand as St. Peter doth interpret them. 1 Peter iii. 21.”

“*Westminster Assembly.* —“Before baptism the minister is to use some words of instruction—showing that it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our engrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, and life eternal.”

“The Roman Catholic and the Greek church say, “We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins.”

These are again sustained by Calvin, Wesley, and many other distinguished leaders of public opinion: —

“Calvin makes remission the principal thing in baptism.* “Baptism,” says he, “resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all, who believe, to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was *the principal* thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise—‘He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.’”

“John Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, (page 350.) speaks plainer than either the Methodist discipline or the Regular Baptist Confession. His words are: —“Baptism administered to real

* Inst. J. 4, c. xv. page 327.

penitents, is both a *means* and a *seal* of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this (pardon) on any, unless through this means.” This is almost, if not altogether, as much as we have said on the forgiveness of sins through immersion.”

With these documents, now for years before the public, I leave it to the good sense of my readers to say, why should I be thus slandered for saying sometimes less, and never more, than has been said by the wisest and best portions of the Christian church, in her purest and most undegenerate days! We do go farther than the theory: we *practise* what we preach. This is our greatest *error* in this age of empty professions and idle speculations.

6. “All mankind, therefore, according to the Campbellites, who are not immersed, perish forever.”

We cannot but thank Mr. Landis for this consummation of his ridicule. It reminds me of a caricature I read of the French, during the wars of Napoleon, which the author perfected, by giving the description of a Frenchman’s nose, that a little more than equaled the entire head of a fell Englishman. Nothing, Mr. Landis, like capping the climax well. Like a certain Canadian Autobiographist, you close admirably. In describing one of his adventures, he records a sect of people whom he discovered far north, who buried themselves in pyramids of snow during the winter, where, in a state of perfect torpidity, they slept six months without eating or drinking, and gently awoke every spring by the melting of the mountains in which they were comfortably encased.

But to be serious. Mr Landis is pre-eminently unfortunate in all his conceptions of this monstrous thing nick-named Campbellism: or he has less discernment or more knavery, than any theological pugilist I have ever encountered. It is impossible that any man of common education and common sense, who has ever read one volume of my writings, could honestly impute to me such a tissue of nonsense and absurdity as he gravely accumulates in the whole extent of the review.

After the development of the fundamental principles of Campbellism, our learned and critical reviewer takes up John iii. 5, Titus iii. 5, Acts xxii. 16, Matth. xvi 16, Acts ii. 38, and endeavors to show that we have misapplied these scriptures in our controversy with the sects.

On the first of these he says that our former opponents have taken wrong

ground, and that consequently in all these collisions our cause has triumphed. But he says we have assumed that *hudoor*, water, means *water*, in the phrase “*born of water and the Spirit*.” On the contrary he assumes that it does not mean water, but “constantly quite the reverse.” Can any one tell what is quite the reverse of water! Is it fire, or earth, or spirit, or what?

Sometimes, he says, it means *spirit*, and quotes John iv. 10, and vii. 39. But there it is “*living water*,” that is used for the symbol of spiritual influences, as it is in Apocalypse, xxii. 1—17. He cannot produce a single passage in the New Testament where *water* means *spirit*. Though he affirms that “*constantly*” water in the New Testament, means quite the reverse. Yes! “constantly” is his own word. It was the spirit then, that Jesus converted into wine, at the marriage of Cana. John said, I baptize you in *water*, that is, I baptize you in the Spirit. The ship was filled with water, i. e. with the Spirit!!!

The term *water* is found in the New Testament fifty times, and where it is impossible, from the connexion, it can mean any thing else. When it is used figuratively, it has some epithet affixed or prefixed, as “*water of life*,” “*living water*.” But again, I repeat, it is as baseless and as truthless an assertion as was ever made, that the word “water” means not the element of water: but in the New Testament “it constantly means the reverse.” “What wild beasts there are yet living at Ephesus!!!” In what awful straits do these spiritualizers place themselves while opposing the truth! If it will add any thing to my interpretation, be it known that the whole Westminster Assembly, the Church of England, the Greek and Roman churches, all the primitive fathers sustain my views of this passage.

The curious reader might desire to know how a theologian so spiritually learned would interpret this passage. We shall gratify him with this literary treat:—“Unless you are baptized internally, or with spiritual water, you cannot, &c. be saved.” Such is the new version of this passage; by the magic potency of which, not only I, but the primitive fathers, the Greek, Roman, English confessions, churches, and standards are refuted. I cannot spend time in farther exposing such puerile trifling with sacred things. Times without number have we replied to every thing else he has said upon this passage. We have long interpreted John iii. 5, as follows:—

The kingdom of God, of which Jesus spoke, was at this time future, not yet come; and Jesus is often speaking of it, and setting forth its advent and character under various appropriate similitudes. Here he speaks of *admission* into it in contradistinction from *admission* into the Jewish or fleshly kingdom of God No one by fleshly birth can enter this kingdom. He must be born again—*born of water and of Spirit*; not of “Spirit and Spirit—not of spiritual water,”—not of immersion alone; but by immersion and the quickening influence of the Spirit of God. Mr. L. may as justly say” that spirit means water, as to say that, water means spirit; or he

may as justly say that spirit constantly means quite the reverse of spirit, as that water, in the New Testament, constantly means quite the reverse of that element.

Our erudite reviewer next attempts to take from us Titus iii. 5.—“Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us *by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.*” By the phrase “renewing of the Holy Spirit” Mr. Landis understands the washing of the new birth, or of regeneration. There is, according to him, no allusion here to baptism. It is, or should be read, ‘By the washing of regeneration, *even* the renewing of the Holy Spirit”—the last clause as an exegetical reiteration of the first. He also quotes the Roman Catholic editions of the Vulgate to prove him right, while he acknowledges that the Rhemish translators departed from the common text of the Vulgate.

Suppose I should place the Westminster Divines, the Presbyterian church, the Roman Catholic, and the Episcopalian, against Mr. Landis and the Vulgate. What then?! Or suppose I should quote the Presbyterian Matthew Henry, whose words are sustained by all the preceding. What will Mr. Landis say? “The outward sign and seal thereof in baptism is here called the washing of regeneration.” Again, on the same passage he says, “Thus baptism saves figuratively and sacramentally where it is rightly used. Acts xxii. 16.” So adds he Ephesians v. 26. “That he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word.” But Mr. Landis will say I must not put him down by authority, but by argument. What, then, is his argument?! It is this, that *kai*, often translated *and*, is sometimes translated *even*; and because sometimes translated *even*, it must be so translated here! But for what reason? There is but one given; — the version must be so changed to enable Mr. Landis to oppose my application of it! Irresistible logic! But does an exegetical exposition make both clauses, that preceding the conjunction and that following, allude to the same thing? If so, then “washing with water” and the “word of life” are two names for the same action: for, says the Spirit, (Eph. v. 26.) “He cleansed the church by the washing with water—even by the word:” i. e. the washing with water and the word of God are two names for the same action

We have sometimes rendered *kai* by *even*, in *apposition*, or in clear unambiguous exposition; and especially when no other word will make sense—as, instead of God and the Father, we say God, *even* the Father—equivalent to *God the Father*. But never ought it to be so rendered between independent members of a sentence as merely exegetical, making the last a mere rendition of the first. Let us try Mr. L.’s canon of criticism: “He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire”—i. e. *even* in fire. Fire is, then, the *exegesis* of Spirit. “Repent and be baptized every one of you—Repent, *even* be baptized every

one of you. Baptism is, then, the meaning of repentance! Again, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Mr. L.’s rule says, ‘He that believes, *even is* baptized, shall be saved.’ Mr. Landis on his own assumption, is a super-oxygenated Campbellite. See where his criticism ends! By this time I trust he will begin to believe that

“*A little learning is a dangerous thing!*”

If his rule were sound, and if I desired to be as heterodox as he would have me to be, it would indeed exceedingly strengthen my cause. But with all the helps it offers, I reject it as preposterous and absurd.

But is it a fact, as Mr. Landis would have his readers believe, that the Roman church interprets Titus iii. 5., as not referring to baptism? Our reviewer is mistaken. Their words on that very text are, “As before in the sacrament of holy orders, so here it is plain that baptism giveth grace; and that by it, as by an instrumental cause, we are saved.” See the Rhemish Testament, Tit. iii. 5. —“Translated out of the Vulgate, and first published by the English College at Rheims.” I care not an atom what the Roman Catholic or Protestant churches may say; but I quote this to show how much credit is due to the quotations and comments of my pious reviewer. Macknight also supports our views. Indeed, I know no critic, translator, or scholar, living or dead, who has any fellowship for the bold and presumptuous gloss of this would-be critic of a matter which he does not understand.

Next comes Acts xx. 16—“Be baptized, brother Saul, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.” Paul ought to have said, or in fact did say, according to the interpretation of Mr. L., ‘Receive the external sign of having obtained the remission of sins.’ Mr. L.’s argument here is that Paul was to wash away his sins by prayer, and not by baptism. He makes the phrase “calling upon the name of the Lord,” according to my rule of interpreting participles with imperative moods, express the manner of washing away sins, rather than of being baptized. He cuts off the first clause; and, rejecting baptism from the imperative mood, “be baptized,” he reads it, “Wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.” He takes away from the word of the Lord the command ‘Be baptized,’ which, in fact, is the whole precept; and takes the motive given for the action as the principal imperative. I know not what a man may not prove or disprove by such a license or indulgence from the Pope.

But that this presumption may be refuted as well as condemned, will the reader please reflect that Paul had been invoking the name of the Lord for some time before Ananias gave him this precept. Of course, then, his calling upon the name of the Lord had not availed to the washing away of sins till Ananias came. Now who can believe that Ananias simply commanded Paul to do what he had been

doing for some time: for, said Jesus before he sent Ananias, “Behold he prayeth.” Did Ananias then go and say, ‘Brother Saul, arise and wash away your sins, praying on as you have been doing’! To Mr. Landis it is hard to kick against the spears. Is it not, then, by a *reduction to an absurdity* most evident that Mr. L.’s cutting off the proper imperative, and applying to the exegesis what belongs to the precept, “*Be baptized,*” converts the whole passage, together with the mission of Ananias, into an empty and unmeaning ceremony, alike unworthy of the Lord and unmeaning to Saul?

Mr. Landis next tries his canons on Mark xvi. 16: —“He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

Mr. L. himself, by the sheer force of conviction from these strong passages, does indeed concede in two periods all that for which we contend, and on account of which he has so unjustly misrepresented, perverted, and abused us. His words, p. 128, on Mark xvi. 16, are, “As no person can dispense with *any acknowledged command* of Christ, and be in a savable state, I conceive water baptism to be essential to the salvation of all who admit the ordinance to be enjoined by Christ, provided it be in their power to obey the command.” Thank the Lord that truth is so omnipotent as to force from the lips of one so hostile to our views as Mr. L., a full affirmation of all that for which we contend. I never affirmed, preached, or taught more than Mr. L. has now conceded. So long as he sticks to these words he is, on baptism, as great a heretic as myself. He adds, as if to show that we have not misunderstood him, the following words: —“It was *not*, however, essential to the salvation of the dying malefactor, nor is it to the person who may truly repent on his death-bed, or in any circumstances in which it is impossible to render obedience to the command.” This is precisely our own oft-repeated defence of ourselves against those who, because of the doctrine affirmed by Mr. L. in the first period, have represented us as making baptism as *absolutely* essential to salvation as faith. — Well now Mr. Landis and I are positively and incontrovertibly standing upon the same ground, as all my readers know, upon his own declarations wrested from him in the presence of Mark xvi. 16. I most cordially adopt every word in the above two periods as expressing all that for which I have ever contended on the relation of baptism to salvation. It is essential to the eternal salvation of every man “who admits the ordinance to be enjoined by Christ, provided always it be in his power to obey the command.” After this agreement he may dispose of his farther remarks on that passage as he pleases. If they do not pinch him, they do not pinch me: for we are precisely agreed as before affirmed.

He concludes this portion of his review with Acts ii. 38. For the curiosity of the affair, I shall give all that Mr. L. writes upon this passage. Any one conversant with our writings will see how imperfectly acquainted he is, with our views; for, in fact, he refutes himself and confirms our views in this critique on Acts ii. 38. But

we shall let him tell the whole story on our pages. I will only affix a note or two.

“This passage thus reads: “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins:” and from it the Campbellites argue that baptism is as intimately connected with remission as repentance is: and that remission cannot be obtained without baptism, any more than without repentance. But repentance is essential to salvation, and therefore so is baptism.

“It will not be disputed that the idea contained in this passage may, with propriety and correctness, be rendered “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, that your sins may be remitted:” *eis aphesin amartion*. In our translation, *fur* seems to convey a meaning not supported by the original. The word is not *gar* but *eis*; be baptized *unto* the remission of sins.” It steers clear of the idea of *desert* being attached to baptism; and this in fact is Mr. Campbell’s own rendering: “Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins.”

“The confidence with which Mr. Campbell relies on this passage, in support of his system, may be seen by the following quotation from his *Extra*, No. 1. p. 14. “They were informed that though they now believed and repented, *they were not pardoned*; and must reform, and be immersed, for the remission of sins.”—“This testimony, when the speaker, the occasion, and the congregation, are all taken in view, is itself alone sufficient to establish the point.”

“But what is it, I ask, to be baptized *eis aphesin amartion*? The clause can easily be understood by a reference to a few, of similar construction. “John preached the baptism of repentance (*eis*) *into the remission of sins*”—the same phrase. Set Mark i. 1. So Rom. vi. 3, “Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized (*eis*) *into* Jesus Christ,” etc. 1 Cor. x. 2, “And were” all baptized (*eis*) *into* Moses.” Matth. iii. 11, “I indeed baptize yon with water (*eis*) *into* repentance.” These references are sufficient. The construction is precisely parallel to the one under consideration. And now we ask, —What did John the Baptist mean by “I baptize you unto repentance?” Did he mean that *repentance was brought about by baptism*? If not, how can it be imagined, that when Peter used the expression, “Be baptized into the remission of sins,” he meant that baptism was to bring about remission of sins’! A similar question may be asked in relation to the other passages referred to.”

John, according to Dr. G. Campbell, says “I baptize you, that you may reform.” You repent. I immerse you then into the profession of a new life, that you may reform; or, in order to an actual reformation for the remission of your sins. Mark i. 2. No difficulty in the style.

“But let us take another brief view of it. With what is *eis ephesin amartion* (remission of sins) here connected? With repentance, or baptism, or both? Peter

himself, who uses the expression, shall also answer the question: “*Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,*” etc. Acts iii. 19. If then water baptism is in every case as inseparably connected with forgiveness as repentance is, Peter has here committed an unpardonable omission. If he has made no omission, then the vital connection in the text under review is not between baptism and remission, but between repentance and remission.”

This is equally as illogical and short-sighted as the remarks on “wash away thy sins;” only with this difference, that not finding any use for the last imperative “*be converted,*” he cuts it off and makes Peter say repent that your sins may be blotted out. But we have long ago shown that the command, be converted, here is precisely equivalent to the Pentecostian, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. And although Mr. L. must have read it in the Extra, he had the prudence, or the cowardice to pay no attention to it.

“But further: The peculiar circumstances of the case mentioned in Acts ii. 38, prove it to be *a particular instance* in the strictest sense of the term: and it is illogical and utterly out of the question to deduce *general* conclusions from it, and apply them to the present circumstances of mankind at large. I have no objections to allow that in the case of the persons here spoken of, baptism may have been essential to remission; and yet this case would afford no ground for concluding that baptism is essential to remission *in every case*. But unless this can be shown, the passage confessedly affords no support whatever to the system. A few remarks will show how peculiar were their circumstances.

1. “The persons here spoken of, must either have obeyed the command, and have been baptized, or have remained open and avowed enemies to the cause of Christ.

2. “It was the best possible, and in fact the only satisfactory evidence that they could then give, of their sincerity in renouncing Judaism and embracing Christianity. The step involved the loss of all things.

3. “*They*, circumstanced as they were, could not even *innocently* mistake, or misunderstand the command. The Apostles were present, and if any difficulty occurred it could be promptly obviated. Hence it was not even possible for them to be in error respecting their duty on the subject.

4. “They had ample time and opportunity to obey the command.

“Now to disobey under such circumstances, must argue an impenitent, unhumiliated heart. And to the possessor of such a heart remission could not be granted. And hence baptism was essential to the remission of their sins.”

This is enough—and all I ask from any man on this subject. When any man can then say that he comes not within the purview of this particular instance of

opening the gospel dispensation on Pentecost, I, with Mr. L., will say it is not his duty to be baptized. I believe that the four particulars above stated by Mr. L. are all very judicious; and when they all concur I hold baptism to be essential even to the everlasting salvation. But in the next paragraph Mr. L. exactly expresses my views.

“In the same sense that baptism was essential to the remission of sins in this case, it is also essential to remission at the present time; e. g. when it is admitted that baptism is positively enjoined on all his followers of Christ; and when there is time and opportunity to obey the command. Under these circumstances I do contend that no one can be in a salvable state while he lives in the open violation of this command. We have no more right, under these circumstances, to dispense with this, than with any other acknowledged command of the Saviour.”

This is the Alpha and the Omega of all that I have said and written on this subject. I ask no more. In whatever way Mr. L. can defend this paragraph from all he has written upon the subject, in the same manner he can defend me. His defence is mine. Here, as on Mark xvi. 16., we stand exactly on the same ground. Farther than this I have never gone. This is Campbellism in the superlative degree. If I could think Mr. Landis was a sincere good man, and honest in this assertion, I would hail him as a brother.

“But then it does not follow that if baptism be essential to the salvation of persons thus situated, it therefore is essential in the case of persons not similarly circumstanced; e. g. of sick persons, or of others, in whose cases it would be impossible to administer the ordinance. Yet unless it does follow that baptism is absolutely essential to remission *in every instance*, the passage confessedly affords no support to the theory that baptism is essential to the forgiveness of sin. If but *one instance* can be produced (and I have produced a number already) wherein it is admitted that remission of sins either was, or may be granted without baptism, the argument attempted to be deduced from this passage is false.

“But on this subject we want no better authority than that of Mr. Campbell himself. Let us therefore hear him. On page 165, volume VII. of his *Christian Baptist*, he says: “*I doubt not* but such Paedobaptists as simply *mistake* the meaning and design of the Christian institution, who nevertheless are, as far as they know, obedient disciples of Jesus, *will be admitted into the kingdom of glory.*” Now Mr. Campbell maintains that Paedobaptists are not baptized. Of course then, he himself being judge, the passage under consideration does not prove that baptism is equally essential to salvation as repentance. For while he admits that no sinner can be saved without repentance, he also “*doubts not*” that the unbaptized Paedobaptist may be saved. It follows therefore, that according to Mr. Campbell’s own testimony, the Campbellite exposition of Acts ii 38, is false.”

It also follows as logically that, according to Mr. Landis’ own testimony, Mr.

Landis' exposition of Acts ii. 38. is false.

"It is also worthy of remark that although in this instance we find "repentance, baptism, and remission of sins," in connection; yet in other passages we find "repentance and remission of sins" without any reference to baptism. A fact wholly inexplicable on the theory that sins are remitted by baptism. An instance of this has been given above; and the following are a few others. Acts v. 31, "Him hath God exalted with his own right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins." Luke xxiv. 47, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." See also Acts ix. 18. 3 Cor. vii. 10. Hence Paul also tells us, (1 Cor. i. 17,) that "Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the Gospel;" and he thanks God that he baptized "*none*" of the Corinthians, save a very few."

If Mr. Landis can reconcile this with all that he has said here and on Mark xvi. 16., he can as easily reconcile it with all that I have said: for we have both said the same things, and he is just as much bound now to refute himself as I am. On the connexion between baptism and remission he has said enough for me. I am told, too, he has been immersed for the remission of his sins. I presume it must be true! What say you, Mr. Landis? Then Campbellism is a terrible thing when even its warmest foes are constrained, even in the agony of their struggles, to affirm all its most peculiar and offensive dogmata. Mr. Landis, as far as he is gone, is pretty orthodox on baptism for remission of sins. Few of our warmest preachers have ever gone as far as the Rev, Mr. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa.

Calvin himself was too strong a Campbellite for me. On cutting the leaves of his article on baptism since writing the preceding, I perceive that he is not only with me, but even before me and Mr. Landis in his views of baptism as connected with immersion. Hear him: —

"In this sense we are In understand what is said by Paul, that Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth the Church "with the washing of the water by the word:" and in another place, that "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost:" and by Peter: that "baptism doth save us." For it was not the intention of Paul to signify that our ablution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains in itself the virtue to purify, regenerate, and renew; nor did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that the knowledge and assurance of it is received in this sacrament: which is sufficiently evident from the words they used. For Paul connects together the "word of life" and "the baptism of water;" as if he had said that our ablution and sanctification are announced to us by the Gospel, and by baptism this message is confirmed."

"Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past,

so that for sins into which we fall after baptism it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened in former ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of their death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life; a preposterous caution, which is frequently censured in the writings of the ancient bishops. But we ought to conclude, that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins. For though, when it has been once administered, it appears to be past, yet it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ is offered to us in it; and that always retains its virtue, is never overcome by any blemishes, but purifies and obliterates all our defilements.”

I wish I had room for the whole article. Our Calvinistic opponents are either very ignorant persons of their own system, or very great knaves. Calvin and Luther are with us most clearly and fully, as any one may see who examines their writings.

The second part of the Review is decidedly more perverse than the first. It was conceived under a more ominous star—inspired by a more unclean spirit—and born under more hostile fates. Its maliciousness is only excelled by its impotency to fasten upon my views the character of Unitarianism; and upon my moral reputation the stain of having deceitfully imposed upon the community a translation of my own, for that of Drs. Campbell, McKnight, and Doddridge. The genius of sectarianism is doubtless a most malign genius, intent on the massacre of the character of all who have the independence to think contrary to its prescriptions, or the daring to oppose its bold assumptions. The truth and its advocates have always been alike subjected to the vengeance and blasphemy of this world, and those deeply inspired with its spirit.

It has been our good fortune to have inherited a double portion of the anathemas and denunciations, the false imputations and slanders of the enemies of the pure and uncorrupt religion of the New Testament. For ourselves we care but little; indeed it is a pleasure to be persecuted and falsely represented by our enemies for righteousness sake—for our zeal and devotion to the faith anciently delivered to the saints. But to prevent the loss of that influence, which we ought to have with this community, it becomes our painful duty to enter into the list with those who, from mistaken views, or from corrupt motives, have endeavored to injure our reputation, that they might bask in the smiles of an adoring multitude; and domineer over them for their own advantage.

I hold the person who accuses me of Unitarianism, or of deliberately handling

the word of God deceitfully in translation or any other way, a malignant slanderer, under whatever pretext or from whatever apparent good motives he may do it.

No person who has ever examined my writings can honestly accuse me of Unitarianism any more than of Deism, Mormonism, or Shakerism. And if he have not examined my writings it is still worse to affirm that of which he is ignorant. And unless Dr. Peters and Mr. Landis, when they have heard my defence from these most foul and unfounded imputations, shall make the amende honorable, I, not only I, but this community will place them amongst defamers and calumniators of the foulest water.

Neither they nor any other persons can long stand before this community in a favorable attitude, who presume to outrage truth and candor by such imputations. Our denomination have no other translation than the common one as authoritative in all matters of controversy. They appeal to it as sovereign arbiter in all discussions, and to none else. But of all these matters in due time and place. We shall continue our review next number. A. C.

A REVIEW OF A REVIEW.

THE Reviewer next gives what he calls his direct arguments against Campbellism. He commences an argument against faith, as “the belief of the naked facts recorded in the gospel,” by relating a fable about some young woman reported in Mr. Jennings’ book, most fallaciously called “a Debate on Campbellism.” In his usual blundering style he proceeds to prove that faith is not “a mere naked assent to the truth of the facts mentioned in the gospel.” I would not trust a cause worth one dollar in the hands of a Lawyer who had no more discrimination than to confound “the belief of naked facts” with a “mere naked assent to the truth of facts.” The belief of naked facts is simply “the belief of facts;” but the mere naked assent to the truth of facts is assent without confidence, without consent, without any sort of interest in the matter. The belief of baked facts, and naked assent are just as different as the seizing of a naked person is different from a naked person’s seizing another. Mr. Landis argues as if it were one and the same to affirm, that ‘*John seized William only,*’ and that ‘*only John seized William?!!*’ Such precisely is the acuteness of my learned reviewer. I never read a more clumsy, senseless, and unmeaning description of faith than that given by Mr. L. With him faith is not this, nor that, nor any thing else; but what it is. And that he cannot, and consequently does not tell. With me, faith is the belief of the glorious facts of the gospel—a firm persuasion that they are true, which persuasion is always accompanied, with confidence in them and a hearty consent of the mind

to them. The man that merely assents to them, and does not confide in them, and give himself up to them is with me, an infidel, rather than a disciple of Christ. Let me say for the thousandth time, with me religion is a *personal thing*. It is a person believing a person, confiding in a person, loving a person, hoping in a person, rejoicing in a person, and obeying that person. It is nor an assent to a theory, or a fact; but It is a person believing, trusting loving, obeying, and rejoicing in a person—viz. Jesus Christ. Away with such nonsense as Mr. L. puts into my mouth, and into his own! He neither understands himself, myself, nor the Apostles on this subject. It is a bold attempt at traducing and slandering a person of whose views he is grossly, shamefully—I wish I could not say, wilfully ignorant.

His direct arguments against what he calls our views of baptism, regeneration, &c. are—

1. Infants, dying in infancy, are not saved; or if saved, they are saved without regeneration.

2. So are Paedobaptists.

3. A believing penitent, if he cannot get to the water, is lost forever.

4. This scheme places the salvation of men in the hands of men, and at the mercy of the administrator.

5. That men must be regenerated before they believe the Bible, and can never loose the grace of regeneration,

6. It is contrary to 1 Peter i. 2.

7. Mary, and the sick of the palsy, and the dying thief, had their sins remitted.

8. Cornelius was not baptized when God sent an angel to him. 9 The Lord opened Lydia's heart.

10. Simon Magus, believed and was baptized, and yet not saved, though truly regenerate, &c.

11. Salvation came to the house of Zaccheus.

12. This system makes Paul an unconverted man after the Lord had said, "*Behold he prayeth.*"

13. Paul thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians, but some seven or eight persons.

14. Paul thanked God, therefore, that he baptized but a few persons.

15. Paul says Christ "sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Therefore he sent him not to convert men! because, forsooth, Paul had no one to baptize them!! and he dare not baptize, because not sent!!

The entire strength of this Grecian phalanx of 15 has been routed times without number already; but on the present occasion it is entirely demolished by the suicidal hands of their present commander in chief, the Rev. Mr. Landis. In saying that no person can be saved who *refuses* to be baptized after he has learned that it is a command of Christ, as we have already shown from his own words to be his belief, he says, ‘No person is saved, converted, or regenerated that is not baptized.’ He is compelled to take this ground by my side, and be hewn to pieces by his own phalanx. Has any of my readers as little perception as my reviewer, and therefore ask how this can be—I answer that Mr. Landis, in making baptism essential to salvation in all such cases, (and I make it essential only in such cases as he does,) maintains that all such unbaptized persons are unconverted and unregenerate, or that converted and regenerated persons cannot be saved! “Alas! how are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished!” Haman, it seems, was not the only man in the world that erected a scaffold for himself. If there be a particle of sense in those quibbles about the word *convert*, which indeed are beneath the dignity of criticism as far as they are beneath the dignity of a Christian minister, they are as destructive of their author’s system as much as mine—inasmuch as already shown from his own pen, he and I make baptism essential to salvation only in all the same cases—and here we both use the word *salvation* in the same sense—i. e. as pertaining to a future state. How many converted and regenerated persons, on Mr. L.’s hypothesis and logic, must go to perdition! All those indeed who believe baptism to be a command of Christ, and are not baptized, I am happy to understand that Mr. L. is an immersed Presbyterian, and therefore goes for immersion as baptism; and with me he says, ‘There is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism!’ So ends the direct argument against Campbellism!

“UNITARIANISM OF THE CAMPBELLITES.”

Mr. Landis under this head insults this whole community with the following most foul, malevolent, and unfounded declarations: —“I do not mean to be understood that every individual is either an avowed Arian or Socinian; *but that the majority are such.*” A more wicked falsehood was never uttered. I do not know one avowed Arian—one avowed Socinian in all our ranks. Again, “Mr. Jameson, of the Methodist Episcopal church, at Mount Holly, in Kentucky, compelled him [myself] to acknowledge that he did not believe Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God.” This is also as flagitious a falsehood as the preceding. I never met Mr. Jameson at Mount Holly in my life. I saw him once in Mount Sterling, Ky.; and on his asking me whether I “believed that Jesus Christ was the Supreme God,” my reply was, that I always spoke of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit in the language of the Book—that the scriptures nowhere called Jesus Christ “the

Supreme God;" but "*the Son of God.*" But while I repudiated the term *Supreme* as applied to God; because there is no inferior God, I had no conception of any Divinity that was not supreme; and while I believe that the Divinity of the Messiah was as supreme as that of the Father, it was an item of that reformation for which I plead; and therefore my custom to call "Bible things by Bible names." What a perversion, then, for effect, is such a representation as that of Mr. Landis. Why did he not quote some passage from some of my writings on this subject? He has not quoted one!

In proof of my Unitarianism and that of our brethren, next comes as a witness, the Rev. Obadiah Jennings—"Amongst the Campbellites I asserted during the debate with Mr. Campbell, and still do assert without fear of contradiction, are found not only avowed Arians, but *most of the infidels, and semi-infidels or free-thinkers of our country.*" If Mr. Jennings ever wrote that sentence the Lord did not permit him to publish it: he was called to judgment before it was published; and I would not for the whole universe appear before the Supreme Judge of the living and the dead with such a lie upon my tongue. I do not, however, believe he wrote it; but a very irresponsible little nephew of his published that, and a good many other infamous tales, which he sold for 75 cents, under the delusive and false title of a "Debate on Campbellism," which has fallen still-born from the press: for it was too gross a tissue of falsehood for any decent Presbyterian in America, who knows any thing of our views, our writings, or our history. No man of character will quote that "Debate" in any thing pertaining to my views. It is as great a fraud and imposition as was ever printed in America.

Mr. Landis quotes the following sentiment, which I believe I have written. He calls it "insane." "There is much strife and division in the Christian world. This I attribute to false teaching. Crime and infidelity are on an alarming increase. This I charge on the pulpit."— This is "indecent" and "insane." Be it so: I am neither afraid nor ashamed to avow it. Who has made divisions] The laity! No; but the ministry. Isaiah was *indecent* and *insane* when he said, "The leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed." "Oh! my people, they that lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths," Jesus, too, comes under the condemnation of Mr. Landis: for he said, "You (scribes, elders, and leaders of the people,) make void the word of God by your traditions." "You shut the kingdom of heaven against men:" "You neither enter in yourselves, nor permit them who would, to enter." How indecent! How insane! "Paine himself, in the whole compass of his *Age of Reason*, has not ventured to employ language so scurrilous." So says the wise and decent Mr. Landis. "Woe to the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord: you have scattered my flock and driven them away." "The land is full of adulteries: because of swearing the land mourneth." "Both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house [the

pulpit—the sacred desk] have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord.”* How indecent, how insane art thou Jeremiah! I have no doubt but were such prophets to visit this land, (and perhaps the flock of some of my orthodox calumniators,) they would speak in the same style as *did* Jeremiah of his orthodox brethren.

Next comes the author of the Mirror—Dr. Thomas, I trow; of whom Mr. Landis says, “I have heard him ridicule in public assemblies the destructive doctrines of Trinitarianism in such language as the following:”—“The doctrine of the Trinity deluged the streets of Constantinople with blood.” &c. If he said so, of which I may be permitted to doubt after the specimens of the love of truth which my reviewer, rather *calumniator*, has furnished—I am not responsible for it, any more than Professor Stuart, of Andover, is chargeable with the maliciousness, recklessness, and falsehoods of Mr. Landis.

But a union was effected, some years since, in Kentucky, between certain portions of the people called “*Christians*,” and the brethren united with us; and we announced in the Harbinger such a union, observing that “*these brethren now go for the apostolic institutions.*” Had these persons all been *Unitarian* in the fullest sense of the word, and united with us on the ground of the *apostolic institutions alone*, does this prove that we are Unitarian for fraternizing with them, or meeting them on these principles? I never did, and I believe they never did, fraternize with Arianism, Socinianism, Sabellianism; or any other *ism*; but, in fact, upon a renunciation of all *isms* on their part and ours, and meeting on the apostolic foundation. Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Deists, Sceptics, Quakers and Baptists have united with us in hundreds and in thousands. Does that prove that we are Romanists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Deists, &c. &c. ! No more proves it that we are Unitarians because some of these also have united with us!!

Some of those called “*Christians*,” both in the East and the West, have denounced their old brethren in unmeasured terms for their apostacy, and have dragooned myself and brethren as Trinitarian, Calvinistic, and orthodox beyond endurance; and have shut their presses, their pulpits, and their houses against us, because of our erroneous sentiments.

* Jeremiah xxii. 1-11.

Our calumniating reviewer next gives a variety of quotations from works which I never read, quoted, nor approved, as proof of my Unitarianism! He has quoted from men called “*Christians*,” that repudiate me and have written against me: he has imputed their sayings to me! Such injustice and immorality I have rarely witnessed from any man professing to fear God, and to believe in a future judgment.

To cap the climax, after having rummaged some seventeen volumes which I

have published, unable to find in them all one single period which he could quote to prove me Unitarian in my views or statements, he would close the door in my face, and shut me out from the possibility of defending myself from such malignity, by informing his readers that although I should produce passages from my writings and those, of my brethren in which we speak of the deity or godhead of the Messiah, in which “he is spoken of as Divine, as God,” &c. —yet we do not mean what we say: nay, the pious readers of Mr. L.’s review are “guarded from being entrapped by the equivocal phraseology of a disguised Unitarian;” and thus I must be forever doomed, without the possibility of explanation or defence, to endure the false and nefarious imputations of a recreant calumniator.

Now I have no more doubt than that I write this sentence, that Mr. L. knew when he wrote his review that I am no more *Unitarian*, in the sectarian acceptation of that word, than Professor Stuart of the Andover School—in fact, that I both believe and teach the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus, if I may be permitted to use a scholastic phrase.

But I have repudiated certain words and phrases as barbarous, as unintelligible, as unscriptural—indeed, as consecrated nonsense: such as ‘trinitarian,’ ‘Unitarian,’ ‘eternal generation,’ ‘eternal filiation,’ ‘eternally begotten,’ ‘eternal procession,’ ‘eternal Son,’ ‘consubstantial.’ I reject these words, and all of the same category, as of the language—the corrupt dialect of Babylon the Great I do not profess to be Arian, Socinian, Unitarian, Trinitarian, Sabellian, Arminian, Calvinian, &c. I am a disciple and an humble follower of the Sun of God: I believe him never to have been created by any being: I believe him to be the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth: I believe that “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made: and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory: for all things were made by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist:” that he had a glory with his Father before the world was: that though he were rich, he made himself peer: he is the Alpha and the Omega—the First and the Last—the Beginning and the End—the Root and the Offspring of David—his Son and his Lord: “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest: they all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shall thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.” “I heard ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing! And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing,

and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever! And the four living creatures, full of eyes before and behind, and the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshipped Him that liveth forever and ever.” To all which I say *Amen*, and *Amen!!* Is this Unitarianism or Trinitarianism? I care not: it is my *ism*, my religion, and my joy.

I have on many occasions, two of which occur to my memory at this moment, fully expressed my’ dissatisfaction both with Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, as falling short of the glory, and honor, and majesty of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—an essay on the phrase, “THE WORD OF GOD,” *Christian Baptist*, p. 333, Burnet’s edition; also, a letter to Elder Henry Grew, *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. iv. p. 134, and subsequent correspondence with him on this subject. I shall quote a single passage from my letter dated April, 1833. To arrest attention it is headed “Trinitarianism, Arianism, and Socianism:”—

“I must be born again, and be endowed with ether reasoning powers, and have another revelation, before I can become an Arian. I will give you one reason out of a hundred, and but one, because I feel that it alone, if I had not another, would forever preclude the hypothesis: it is, in one sentence, Because the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly.

“If I am asked to explain how this can be, I refuse not. The Arian toils and sweats, and taxes his ingenuity to show what a glorious creature the Son of God was in his pre-existent state. He fancies and represents the Son as filling some intermediate rank more than midway between the Arch Seraphim and the Deity. He thinks he devoutly consults the honor of the. Son, when he finds for him some vacant throne, near to the Self-existent and Eternal, beyond the aspirations of the cherubim and seraphim. There he places him, a sort of sub-deity, whence he descends to become incarnate. Yet, strange to tell, when this first and high-born One, of unrivaled glory amongst the creatures of God, appears in human flesh, *he gives him nothing to do, which the son of Joseph could not have done as well!!!* Was ever folly more consummate! What is folly, but the adoption of inadequate means to ends’? Is it not folly to give a diamond for a straw?—to raise a tempest to move a feather?—to discharge the artillery of heaven against a worm?—to hurl the thunderbolts of Omnipotence against a fly?—to despatch the Arch Angel on an errand which the son of Joseph could have as well performed?

“What creature could do more than Abel, Moses, John the Baptist, Stephen, Peter, James the Just, or Paul did—tell the truth, the whole truth, lead an exemplary life, and as a martyr offer up his soul to God!*

“What, let me again ask, is folly, if this be not folly’? To waste resources, or squander means, is as foolish as not to provide them. He who provides the materials for a palace, and builds a cottage, is as very a simpleton as he who

attempts to build a palace out of the materials of a tent. Could not Gabriel, who waited on Daniel on the banks of Ulai; nay, could not Paul himself, do as much for the redemption of the world, as the Arian Son of God? When some philosopher appears, who with a dash of his pen can blot out sin, or show me that the tears of the penitent, or the blood of bulls and goats can wash it from the universe, then, but not till then, will I turn Arian.

“For the same, or a similar reason, I cannot be a *Socinian*. This is but a new edition of the fable—the mountain’s in labor, and a mouse is born. Heaven taught sages, legislators, kings, prophets, priests, and seers, for four thousand years, filled with the spirit of wisdom and revelation, exhaust all the similitudes, analogies, and imagery of this creation; impoverish the eloquence of heaven and earth, all figures and forms of speech, to raise the expectations of mankind in anticipation of a wonderful child, on whose shoulders the government of the universe was to remain, whose name was written, “Wonderful Counsellor—the Mighty God—the Father of Eternity—the Prince of Peace—Immanuel:” yet when the prediction is accomplished, Mary travails, and the carpenter’s son is born—a Son of God, it is true, as Adam was!!!

“With me, consistency must precede faith. I must see types, figures, prophecies, promises, harmonizing; I must see the means and the end correspondent; I must see wisdom, power, goodness; justice, mercy, love; condescension, truth, and holiness, shining in all the splendors

* “We cannot give one reasons *in extenso* for any of the more important conclusions suggested in these remarks. On this point we shall offer one. In our judgment it matters not whether we regard the sacrifice of Christ as a mere display of love, or as a sin offering, that God might be just in justifying him that believeth. On either hypothesis, the Arian or Socinian system is wholly at fault. For should we, with the Arian, imagine that Jesus as to his pre-existent state, was a creature, however exalted, it avails nothing, because the distance between any creature and his Creator is so immense (infinite I was going to say,) that all the creation might stand between, and yet no nearer approach to Deity. Now if Jesus never was, as to his celestial origin, more than a creature, he could, as a sin-offering, effect nothing more than any other creature: his life and death were all due to his Creator on his own account. Gabriel never can do more than his own duty. But on the other hypothesis, that his death was a mere display of love, in what, let me ask, does this love consist? To Omnipotence and Omniscience the creation of any one creature is as easy as another. It required no more or greater effort on the part of the *Almighty* to create Gabriel than an eagle—this most illustrious creature than a sparrow, and how would the text read, ‘God so loved the word that he gave-----for its redemption!!!’ May I not infer, then, that the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly? The Socinian, who calls Jesus *divine*, and some others who call him a *divine* person, because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on him, might, in their interpretation of the word *divine*, find room for Balaam’s ass; because that ass was under such plenary inspiration as to have the words suggested, and to speak with the gift of tongues, when it reprov’d the madness of the Prophet and preached reformation to him. Assuredly it was in *their* vocabulary a *divine* ass!”

of Divinity, before I can subscribe to any proposition touching the personal dignity and standing of my Lord the King.

“It will not suffice to puzzle me with hard questions about how this can be, since my faith has in its infancy to master the master truth of revelation—to admit that God is *Jehovah*; or, that God was, and always is, the self-existent, immutable and eternal, never-began-to-be, the eternal inhabitant of eternity. Believing this, I find no difficulty in believing that there was, and is, and evermore shall be, society and plurality—a literal *I*, and *thou*, and *he*—a *we*, and *our*, and *us*, in *one divine nature*. This to me is as easy as the idea of SELF-EXISTENT; yea, more easy when *I*, and *thou*, and *he* deliberate on creation, providence, and redemption. I cannot, for my life, even fancy a nature destitute of *I*, and *thou*, and *he*. I am certain it is not the human—I am certain it is not the angelic—certain, too, that it is not the divine.

“In our nature there is no more than I, and thou, and he, as respects primary relation. There is no more in the angelic, and the Bible reveal§ no more than I, and thou, and he in the divine. But not, turning aside to answer objections which are anticipated, be it observed that I make not this a matter of inference only; for there is an association of the name of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the revealed relation of the three persons, I, thou, and he, and Justin the dignity of these three. “I send thee,” “I and thou send him,” “Jehovah and his Spirit has sent me.” On this principle the Christian economy is arranged and developed. So I read the volumes of revelation.”

After reading and pondering upon the above extract from a work read by many thousands, published several years since, what faith can be reposed in such men as Messrs. Jennings and Landis! I call the attention of Dr. Peters especially to this article; and demand, in the name of eternal justice, amends for the injury he has done me, in wantonly endorsing for such a presumptuous calumniator as Mr. Landis.

I am now at the last item in this most veritable and Christian review—

**“THE TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ADOPTED BY THE
CAMPBELLITES.”**

This part of the review is stamped with a falsehood on its forehead. There is no translation *adopted* by the people so nick-named, except that of King James. I appeal to every man of common sense and common honesty, if, in speaking of Campbell’s Gospels and Macknight’s Epistles, I should say, ‘The Gospels and Epistles adopted by the Presbyterians,’ I would tell the truth or a falsehood, because Presbyterians had given those new versions. Mr. Landis would be the first

man to say I falsified in such a case. Well, then, *nomine mutato fabula narratur de te*. As he would affirm in my case, so all will affirm of him. We read in our families and churches various translations, but have adopted none as *authoritative* in deciding any question of faith or manners, except that used by all Protestant parties.

Much is said about a mistake which occurred on the title-page of the first edition of the new translation. Having always heard Jonathan Edwards, President of Princeton College, and Philip Doddridge quoted, approved, and adopted as Presbyterian authorities, I placed Doddridge on the title-page with Campbell and Macknight as Doctors of the Church of Scotland. I believe that they were communicants in common with all Presbyterian churches. Technically, however, it was an error. Still as the Congregationalists of New England were component parts of the Presbyterian church of these United States until last year, and sat in their Assembly, I hold it to be according to their own usage to identify them as members of one ecclesiastic community. I, therefore, without the slightest suspicion of any umbrage to the Presbyterians, and without any conceivable interest or advantage to my views, had, as aforesaid, placed him on the title-page with the Presbyterian Campbell and Macknight as members of the same church; much in the same way as they had placed Jonathan Edwards at the head of a Presbyterian College, as I supposed.

But why assail my motives and arraign my moral character for so doing! What gain or interest had I in this affair¹! Mr. Landis will tell you: —“After Mr. Campbell had proclaimed Dr. Doddridge to be a Presbyterian, he cites him as an important and weighty authority; and one, of course, whose candor had got the better of his Presbyterian principles, to sustain the rendering which his book gives of *ekklesia*— viz. *congregation*, instead of that given in the common translation.”

Let us now honestly examine this matter. We took but the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse from Doddridge; the four Gospels from Campbell; and the Epistles from Macknight. We quoted Doddridge *once* in a critical note upon the word *ekklesia*; but we also gave Dr. Campbell in the same note in sustaining the same view of the term; as also Thompson. I did not, indeed, at the time know the particular views of Doddridge on ecclesiastical government: I simply regarded him as a Calvinist whose works were every where read and commended by Presbyterians. As to any gain to my views from his remarks on *ekklesia*, I do not hold myself or my readers indebted to him the millionth part of a grain. For, as my readers are often shown in my notes, I regarded Doddridge as of little or no critical authority— generally, if not always, preferring Drs. Campbell and Macknight to him, in passages which they had in common translated.

I had, then, in fact no motive nor temptation under heaven to assign Doddridge any other branch of the church than that which he occupied. Nor is the New

Version in the least indebted to his peculiar views of church polity for a single sentence that is not sustained by Presbyterian authority. After this candid statement of the matter, now listen to Mr. Landis:—"In what estimation can the Christian public hold a man, who will, for the sake of promoting the sale of a book, be guilty of such dissimulation." I request the reader to ponder well upon the preceding question, with an especial reference, not only to the history I have given, but also in regard to Mr. Landis himself.

In the same paragraph he says, "It was not until Mr. Campbell had published several large editions of this book, that he would consent to correct the false statement in its title-page, declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland." Now, with the above question in his eye, what will the reader think when informed that this is a downright and wilful falsehood! *It was corrected in the second edition!* Yes, believe me, courteous reader, but one single edition of some two thousand copies was issued from the press till the error was corrected. Before the close of the second edition I ascertained the fact that Dr. Doddridge, though a Calvinist, and orthodox with Presbyterians, communed especially with what is now properly called the New School— then the Congregational branch.

May I not now ask, How could any man fearing God and regarding truth, write and publish in the *American Biblical Repository* that Mr. Campbell would not consent to correct the above statement "until he had published *several large editions* of the book"? Christian reader, what think you of this, coming from a man who would make one an offender for a word, and seek to blast his reputation for integrity? I protest I would not have my name to such a wilful falsehood as the above for all the new versions in America. In the name of outraged truth and common decency, what could have tempted this man to invent such a fable, when, in the *errata* to the *SECOND edition*, published in 1828, the correction is made? If any one can reduce this attempt to injure my character to a better category than deliberate dissimulation and falsehood, I shall be thankful to be relieved from the unhappy feelings which such daring presumption has called into existence.

But he is not content with this nefarious thrust at my reputation; but proceeds to say—"As our examination must seriously affect the moral character of this gentleman, we invite attention to another point before we take up the subject directly." This shows what his calculations and intentions were. Now the point and drift of some three pages is to show that "corrections and improvements in style, *as alleged by us*, have been made in the original works of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, incur last editions of the New Version—"yet still retaining its original title-page. " This "retaining of the original title page" he calls "a dishonest artifice"—"a crime in no way differing from actual forgery"—"for the sake of speculating upon the credulity of the public." Worse and worse! Not content with the invention and publication of one palpable falsehood, our *Reverend*

Reviewer becomes more and more fluent in the work of detraction and wilful misrepresentation. In one word, three entire pages of unmeasured abuse are based upon the falsehood that certain alleged improvements are found in the various late editions of the work—still issued under, and “retaining its original title-page.” Any one may see that there is no foundation for this mistatement! The facts known and read of all men who choose to examine, are—1st. In the *errata*, to the 2d edition Dr. Doddridge is declared to have been a Congregationalist; and, 2d. in the next edition and every subsequent one a NEW TITLE *is affixed to the work*. The original title never extended beyond the second edition!! O truth! O honesty! whither, whither have you fled! This is the gentleman who says it is “insane” and “indecent” to impute to the pulpit immorality and crime!! Reader, open the 3d edition and compare its *title* with the original one. Observe that it adds to the original title the following: “*With various emendations.*” Besides, to the appendices are added, “Critical Notes on the Language, Geography, Chronology, and History of the New Testament; and Miscellaneous Tables,” &c. “By A. Campbell: 1832.” These attempts at assassination—at the massacre of my reputation, are so diabolically perverse in appearance, that until some person arises who can explain them upon some honorable principle unknown to me, I can look upon the author of this review with no other feelings than those of unaffected scorn and contempt. Still, as Dr. Peters has endorsed for Mr. Landis, I shall go on to review hie review of the text of the New Version.

Mr. Landis next collects from my pocket edition of said Testament the *spurious readings*, which, on the authority of Griesbach and others, are rejected; and, without any ceremony, reiterates his former slanders. He would fain impress his readers that Mr. Campbell “has followed in the steps of the Unitarian editors of the Improved Version.” The venom of the Old Serpent may hereafter be expected in all that is said of the New Version. After what has appeared, we are prepared for any thing. We have neither time nor necessity to justify a particular reference to these readings. I will only say, that there is not one spurious reading rejected from the common text that even squints to the pending controversies between Trinitarians and Unitarians, that is not regarded as spurious by some of the most learned Trinitarians, living and dead, who have spoken of these things.

The motive of Mr. Landis to fix upon myself and the New Version an uncertain character, is so obvious that he who runs may read. His use, or rather abuse of the spurious readings enumerated in the Appendix, is dictated by this benevolent desire. He has, however, found that the table of spurious readings is larger than the actual excisions from the text; a matter of which we may speak more fully at another time. Errors of this sort are found in all the Bibles in the land. Even in the single Epistle to the Romans, from the Andover press; and after the most patient supervision of Professor Stuart himself, and the most accomplished

proof-reader, an entire verse is left out; and, if I mistake not, it has not yet been noticed by any one of that school. From whatever motive typographical omissions and errors are corrected, I am always glad. It is fortunate in this case that the omissions noticed by Mr. Landis are in favor of the common version.

On the subject of spurious readings Mr. L. is manifestly not the most competent authority in the world. He has yet to learn that while we have a standard royal translation, there is no standard royal original. The common version is not according to any one ancient manuscript— is not according to any standard or received original in the world. It is a translation of a patch-work original. “It is,” says one deeply learned in biblical criticism—a truly enlightened man on such questions—“it is a very singular anomaly, that, although we have, by public authority, a standard English version; yet there exists no standard Greek text for the *original of that version*. No principal printed editions of the Greek correspond exactly throughout, and none of them have been printed *verbatim* from any ancient manuscript; but each has been varied by critical alterations of its learned editor, on his own responsibility; on which account all the great collators of manuscripts have judged it necessary to apprise their readers, in the first instance, by what particular printed edition they have made their respective collations. Thus Birch states, *in limine*, that he collated by *Stephens* 3d edition, 1550; Bentley’s collations were made by the text of Erasmus, 3d edition, 1522, as reprinted at Strasburgh in 1724, by W. Cephalaeus. Other collators have also specified the editions by which they compared. One of the most ardent defenders of the common version, and much more learned than Mr. Landis, has been constrained to admit this fact in “The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, and Ecclesiastical Record.*”

Before we treat at large upon spurious readings, it were desirable to decide what text ought to be translated; and that the commonly received Greek text is not of that character is very obvious now-a-days to

* London, July, 1837, No. 43.

all learned and candid men. “Reception,” says the same distinguished critic—

“Mere *reception* can impart no real authority whatever. *Reception* can cause the currency of a false coin, until it is discovered; but it cannot ever communicate *standard value*. It is the same in the case under our consideration: ‘*Quod a principio validum fuit, tractu temporis non convalescit.*’ It is delusion in sacred criticism to appeal for evidence to an ‘*editio princeps,*’ or to the ‘*most ancient printed editions.*’ We know that Erasmus’s *first edition* of the Greek, printed in 1516, is the ‘*editio princeps,*’ and basis of the ‘*textus receptus;*’ yet we also know that that first edition was only a transcript from one of the few manuscripts he was able to procure, not one of which was an *uncial* manuscript; or older than the tenth century: ‘nos, in *prima* recognitione (he says,) *quatuor* Graecis adjuti sumus; in

secunda quinque. That first printed text, successively corrected by himself, by R. Stephens, by Beza, and finally by Elzivir, according as more and more ancient copies were discovered and consulted, constitutes the common or '*received text*?' but it became '*received*, ' not from the establishment of a final and decisive authority, but altogether from the necessity of the case. However venerable, therefore, Erasmus's first edition may appear on a shelf, as a monument of the first printing of the Greek text. we know perfectly well that it is the *worst* edition; because, he altered its text in each of his four succeeding editions, in the last of which he had obtained only eight *junior* manuscripts. The same reasoning is to be applied to all the 'early-printed editions:' they cannot have more authority than the manuscripts on which they are founded, and whose contents they echo; and we *now* know those manuscripts.

"The case, therefore, of the New Scriptures, with respect to printed authority, is exactly the reverse of that of all classical works. The manuscripts from which the latter have been printed are very few, and still fewer have been discovered since the first editions were printed; so that the succeeding editions have been almost entirely reprints from the first editions. To those first editions, therefore, appeal is reasonably made, as possessing an *ultimate* authority, or the nearest to the manuscripts which are practically inaccessible. The '*princeps*,' and earliest printed editions of the *New Testament*, were also printed from few manuscripts; but, since they were printed, a multitudinous store of other manuscripts have gradually and openly disclosed themselves, in almost every country of Christendom; some of them far more ancient, and therefore more authoritative, than those which produced the first printed editions; diffusing a continually increasing light over them, and exposing numberless defects in each of them. The *princeps* edition, as we have seen, was formed on *four* manuscripts of no great antiquity: by the latest census, we now have knowledge of between *six and seven hundred* manuscripts of the whole, or portions of the evangelical Scriptures; which were unknown to the digester and editor of the *princeps editio*, or even to the digester of the *textus receptus*. It is rendering no service, therefore, to scripture, or to truth, to strive to maintain a leading merely because it is a "*received*" reading; such pertinacity is of nearer affinity to bigotry and blind conformity, than to sound judgment, and an earnest anxiety for the truth."

The accessions to the stock of ancient manuscripts have opened immense sources of biblical criticism unknown to James' translators in 1611. A flood of light in Greek literature and biblical criticism has burst upon the world since those days: —

"The only printed editions of the Greek, at the date of the last authorized revision, in 1611, were those of Card. Ximenes, printed at Complutum in 1514, published in 1522; Erasmus, printed and published in 1515, '19, '22, '27, '35;

Stephens, printed and published in 1536, '49, '50, '51, '69; Beza, printed and published in 1565, '76, '82, '89; and the several editions printed from these.

“The first of the Elzivir editions (which are regarded as the general standard of the *received* Greek text) was not printed until 1624; that is, thirteen years after the publication of our present authorised English version; so that the latest printed Greek text which its revisers could have consulted, was that of Beza; consequently, it has not received the benefits of the editions of Elzivir, Mill. Wetstein, Matthaei, London Polyglott, Bengel, Griesbach, Birch, &c.; and yet it is by these later editions only, that we have at length acquired a thorough knowledge of the *actual state of the original text*.

“And this consideration supplies a commanding reason why a new translation, in our present knowledge of the actual state of that text would not only be advisable, but would be a positive waste of time and labor; which reason is this, that there is no printed Greek text that affords a certain standard for translation.”

Is it not strange that notwithstanding this influx of light, we should be superstitiously walking by the comparatively feeble glimmerings of the slender tapers of some three or four manuscripts of the tenth century. Such, however, is the fact. There is a most singular adhesiveness to the faults and errors of the common version, and a reluctance to have them removed, bordering upon the obstinate bigotry of a Jew or a Turk. We are really degenerating in this department since the days of James I; for, from the days of Tyndale's version, in 1525, to that of King James, the translation, was *revised* four times by public authority, “as the Reformation opened new stores of manuscript documents, giving a new revision for every twenty-two years: whereas during two hundred and twenty-eight years, the interval from 1611 till now, (within which time a far greater number of manuscript documents, and of higher antiquity and greater authority, have been disclosed to the Christian world,) no new revisal or correction has been undertaken by public authority.” I wonder how such men as Mr. Landis and Dr. Peters contemplate such facts as these, or whether they contemplate them at all. If they do, surely they could not have so exposed themselves in this rash and perverse review.

But what is the head and front of my offending? I know no better now than when I issued the first edition of the New Version. Had I courted reputation or profit from this undertaking, I would not then have sinned against myself by translating *baptism* by *immersion*. This word *immersion!*—Oh! what an offence against the decency and pride of Presbyterianism! A sin that can never be expiated, not even by massacring my reputation—making me Unitarian, and I know not what, or how many other infamous things! This, I doubt not, is the secret of the whole matter.

Mr. Landis cannot possibly believe me Unitarian. After having eagerly, but in vain, examined my writings for grounds and evidences against me, I am persuaded he cannot for a moment entertain such a thought. I have found him misquoting, perverting, mutilating, and changing even the quotations from the New Version, as well as boldly asserting most gross and palpable falsehoods, until, I am sorry to say, I can have no confidence in his honesty whatever. I could not in a volume expose all his efforts at fraud and imposition in his strictures on the New Version. For example, he represents me as studiously expunging from the text of the Apocalypse, chap. i. 11., "I am Alpha and Omega," in order to destroy the deity of the Saviour; because in that place I allege it an interpolation, —whilst he must have known, had he looked, that *twice* in the same book, and in the same sense, that same phrase is found in company with the Lord Jesus; chap. xxi. 6. xxii. 13. Many such frauds may be detected on his pages.

This is not the time, nor the place, to propound arguments in favor of a new and improved version, or of a review of the common version of the inspired volume. The *fads* already stated on these pages furnish good, and, in my judgment, conclusive reasons for such a revision.

We have no standard Greek text, nor have we a translation made from the "received text." Wickliffe translated the *Vulgate* in 1380; Tyndale translated from the Greek through the Latin, and often followed the *Latin* where it deserted the common Greek, in 1526; Coverdale, in 1535, added Tyndale's Testament to his Bible, somewhat improved; John Rogers published a new revision under the fictitious name of Matthew, 1537; Cranmer's revision appeared in 1539; in the same year another revision by Faverner appeared, and in 1611 issued from the press the common version, falsely called "a new translation." James' *translators* revised Cranmer, with the assistance of Beza; Cranmer revised Rogers; Rogers revised Coverdale; Coverdale revised Tyndale; Tyndale revised Wickliffe by the Greek; and Wickliffe translated the Latin. This is a short, but true history of our versions, translations, *alias* revisions.

How little we have yet excelled Wickliffe, may be seen by the following comparison: —

Wickliffe's Version, A. D. 1380.

"Begynnen we therefore eftsoone to preise us-silf! or whether we neden, as summen, pistils of preisyng to ghou or of ghou? Ghe ben oure pistil writen in oure hertis which is knowen and red of alle men, and maad open. For ghe ben the pistle of Crist mynystrid of us, and

writen, not with enke, but bi the spyryt of the lyvyng God: not in stoonene tablis, but in fleischli tablis of herte. For we han such trist bi Crist to God; not that we ben sufficient to thenke ony thing of us, as of us, but oure suffiencie is of God, which also *made us able mynystris* of the Newe Testament."

Authorized Version, A. D. 1611.

“Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some *others*, epistles of commendation to you, or *letters* of commendation from you? Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men. *Forasmuch as ye are* manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written, not, with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. And such trust have; we through Christ to God-ward: not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing, us of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath *made us able ministers* of the New Testament. ‘

I believe much more in private than in public versions. There is too much of the spirit of concession—of going for your translation of a particular passage, if you go for mine. Every one knows this that knows any thing about conventional proceedings. Compromise and concession are indispensable in making Translations as in making Constitutions: therefore, one man like Dr. George Campbell—candid, learned, impartial—is, with me, better authority than the King’s “*forty-nine*,” with the King himself, who is said to have been the fiftieth, and sometimes to have had a casting vote, at least on some difficult points. I have much to say on this subject, and the times and the seasons seem to require it; but we must defer it to another occasion.

But to return to the Unitarianism of the New Version. I have courage, I presume, in the estimation of all men who know me, to divulge and maintain whatever I believe to be divine truth, at any risk or hazard. One that could, at the age of 24, renounce proud, opulent, and popular Presbyterianism, in the midst of the thickest and strongest Presbyterian population in America, and sit down with a dozen or two poor obscure persons, and break the loaf among them for many years, in the midst of the continual fires of proscription and persecutions could not, one would think, now be easily intimidated to profess candidly and above-board his convictions of truth, even however unpopular it might be. If I disbelieve in the existence of the Deity, or personality of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit,

or in the absolute necessity and all-sufficiency of his sacrifice for our sins, I would avow it in a moment in the presence of Dr. Peters and Mr. Landis, and all the Divines and Colleges in America.

The efforts of my old uncandid and unappeasable brethren to prostrate my influence as a teacher of truth, and a pleader for reformation, by these violent and unfounded assaults only demonstrates my invulnerability on my own principles. Could they meet the real A— C—, they would not have to create a more vulnerable one. But when they have killed the fictitious—the Arian, Socinian, Unitarian A— C—, I would have them know that the true and real A— C— yet lives and triumphs, unscathed, unhurt by all their puny and malevolent endeavors.

It would be wholly out of place to enter into an exposition of the spurious, or of the various readings of disputed passages found in the common version and rejected in the new. One concession made by Mr. Landis himself, shows how little is lost to the cause of orthodoxy itself by the rejection of all the spurious and disputed passages of the book. “It is admitted on all hands,” says he, “that no doctrine is essentially affected either by the rejection or retaining of all the readings of Mill, Griesbach, &c., put together.” According to all the oracles of common sense, then, may I not ask the reader to notice how thoroughly Mr. L. has refuted his own efforts to fix upon the New Version an injurious character by the rejection of those passages to which he alludes; when he admit? that the rejection of all the readings of Mill, Griesbach, &c., “essentially affects not any doctrine in the book.” Well then, if, as he alleges, I have not rejected even all these from the text, it would seem that the New Version is perfectly safe to all readers, so far as Unitarianism is concerned, Mr. L. himself being judge. Thus Mr. L. has neutralized his own anathemas, by affirming that these expurgations cannot essentially affect the doctrine of the Trinity or any other cardinal doctrine of the Christian system.

His attempts to blast the reputation of Griesbach, or to hand him over to the Unitarians, is as weak as it is wicked. The world is, perhaps, more indebted to this learned and distinguished professor and critic, than to any other critic on the long list of collators, interpreters, and editors of the New Testament. He would unceremoniously hand him over to the Unitarians, because his honesty occasionally breaks in upon some proof-texts of my very learned reviewer. No man of learning and candor, known to me, acquainted with Griesbach’s labors and character, has ever suspected him of Unitarianism. For my part, I know of no evidence of it; nor does Mr. Landis produce a single proof of it. I have a very poor opinion of that Christian morality which so unceremoniously assaults the reputation of every man who happens to dissent from our favorite dogmata. Such a character is not that of Thomas Hartwell Horne, in whose “Introduction” Griesbach fills so large and conspicuous a place.

I am, indeed, of opinion, to use with approbation the words of Mr. Landis, that “all the alterations contended for do not affect, either *pro* or con, one single article of the Christian system.” I have gone farther: I have said that I never saw any version or translation of the Christian Scriptures, Latin, German, French, or English—Romanist or Protestant—ancient or modern, from which any honest man of plain common sense might not learn the way to heaven, to holiness, and happiness with unerring certainty, if he applied his mind to it. They all name the same persons, places, and events—record the same facts—narrate the same parables, comparisons, conversations, and deliver the same precepts and promises. They may, indeed, differ much in their plainness, perspicuity, and easy intelligence; but the same story is told in all its characteristic attributes and circumstances. Like different witnesses, whose testimony exactly agrees in all the facts, even to the most minute. A, B, C, and D has each his own way of telling it to the court and jury; but there is one of them whose perspicuity and precision make his testimony more intelligible and comprehensible than that of all the others. So in translations: one greatly may excel another in all the attributes of clearness, simplicity, and general intelligibility.

As respects the underived godhead of my Lord and Redeemer, on the expiatory power of whose blood, as a real sin-offering, my soul reposes with ineffable delight, I rejoice that the most thorough expurgation of spurious readings—of interpolations and mistakes which I have ever seen, weakens not the evidence, detracts in no wise from the assurance given of it in the volume of inspiration. Indeed, as Macknight has shown from Calvin, Beza, and others of high repute with Protestants; some of the passages regarded as spurious now, on which many have leaned with so much confidence, were not, when fairly construed, logical proofs of the proposition in whose support they were alleged. Of this sort is the often quoted passage of 1 John v. 7. Benson and Wall both affirm that whatever may be learned from this verse may be learned from other portions of scripture, and therefore neither Trinitarians nor Arians can argue any thing peculiar from it. “These three are one *as respects the. unity of their testimony,*” is not only the interpretation of Macknight, but of many of the most orthodox who were never suspected of Arianism.

Indeed, the most violent efforts to force such passages into the service of a partizan view, greatly discredits the learning, the judgment, or the sincerity of its advocates. When every passage that is justly deemed spurious, or even doubted to be genuine, and when all the torturings and wresting of proof-texts are abandoned, if I cannot prove the pre-existence of the Messiah—the underived divinity of the *Logos* --that in his divine nature “he created all things”—is “before all things”—“upholds all things”—was ineffably “*rich* before the world was”—was with God before time began—was “from everlasting”—is “the Alpha and the

Omega,” “the First and the Last,” “the Beginning and the End”—“David’s Son and David’s Lord”—“the Word that was in the beginning with God—that was God”—that “was made flesh”—was “God manifest in the flesh”—“the Mighty God”—“the Father of Eternity”—“the only begotten of the Father”—“the brightness of his glory”—“the express image of his person”—“Emanuel”— “God with us”—“Jehovah”—“Jesus”—I say, if I cannot demonstrate that these names, titles, honors, in their fullest, loftiest, and most sublime import, are truly and rightfully applied to the Son of Mary— the Son of God—Jesus of Nazareth, I can prove no proposition whatsoever.

Had he not been as divine as his Father—as human as his mother, he could not have offered a real sin-offering, he could not have “magnified the law and made it honorable;” he could not have justified God in justifying man; he could not have “finished transgression, made atonement for iniquity, terminated sin-offerings, and brought in an everlasting justification.” He accomplished an “eternal redemption.” By one offering up of himself he has forever perfected the sanctified” —“them that obey him.” To do all this is super-human, super-angelic, and divine. This is not the work of a mere creature—finite, limited, dependant; but of the supreme, unoriginated, eternal Self-Existent; humbled indeed, incarnate, in the form and capacity of a servant, the Son of God, the Son of Man. the Woman’s Seed. Truly for us “a child has been born—a son has been given,” whose name deservedly and appropriately is called “Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.” “The government of a universe is now on his shoulder,” of “the increase of which there shall be no end.” Such are a few of my views of the Divine Master, and of his incomparable work.

In a work just now issuing from the press, called “THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM,” &c, in that portion of it written this summer, I have endeavored to condense into a very small compass what has been spread over many pages on the revealed distinctions of “God, the WORD of God, the Spirit of God;” or, in the New Covenant style, “The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” In reference to human redemption, I am persuaded that this revelation of Father, Son, and Spirit, is not only the frame-work of the whole remedial economy; and essential to atonement, reconciliation, and the remission of sin; but to such a display of divine perfections and excellencies as fully reveals the glory of God to all the intelligences of the universe, and makes him infinitely lovely, as well as supremely good and powerful—immutably true, inflexibly just, immaculately holy—as well as full of mercy and compassion, in the esteem of all who know him. This development of the Divine Being and perfections will perfect the bliss of heaven, and the misery of all that have despised and rejected the counsels of redeeming love against themselves.

The sacrificial system is itself the frame-work of the gospel. *No shedding of*

blood, no remission of sin, is the plainest and most fully and emphatically developed oracle in the Bible. "A body was prepared" for the "WORD that was in the beginning with God"—"the Living Word that was God," for the purpose of putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself." No sin, no incarnation—no sin-offerings, no expiation—no expiation, no remission—no remission, no salvation; and, therefore, no distinction of FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT, NO redemption of man. To deny the doctrine of three names—of three relations—of three participants in one godhead is to deny the possibility of saving sinners, and of putting down sin forever.

There have, indeed, been many ignorant, conceited, blustering Trinitarians, who have nauseated many, very many persons of good understanding and of good morals, by their uncouth, barbarous, unmeaning jargon on this subject; and by the cruel persecuting edicts by which they have sought to sustain it and to put down inquiry, or even thought upon the subject. Thus Arianism was begotten and born. Thus came Unitarianism, and Socinianism, and Sabellianism, &c. &c. These are extremes. Hence no man well read, in sacred scripture, can approve of Trinitarianism as taught in the schools, any more than of its rivals for public favor. For my own part, I have long since abandoned the corrupt style of every human system on the subject. But while I repudiate the Trinitarian as well as the Unitarian vocabulary, I do not by any means reject that style because of Unitarian predilections, or Trinitarian antipathies. I have neither: I never had. There is not one word of divine honor or glory uttered by Prophet or Apostle, concerning my Redeemer, that I would mines or interpret in a subordinate sense, more than I would in their application to God the Father, I have no idea of sub-deity or subordinate Divinity, nor of mere honorary titles in reference to the Messiah. Such quibbling is, with me, profane trifling with sacred things. The words which the Holy Spirit has sanctioned or inspired are honest words, full of meaning, and not to be feloniously interpreted. When I am told that "all the fulness of the godhead" dwells substantially in my Saviour, I do not understand a subordinate, or partial, or imperfect fulness, but simply "*all the fullness of the godhead,*" or divinity.*

Just at this place I opened Professor Stuart's Letters to Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., of Princeton, on the doctrine of "eternal generation."— Dr. Miller goes with Turretine Gerhard and those who teach an eternal generation, or emanation of the Son from the Father, and accuses Professor Stuart of leaning to Arianism, because he denies that doctrine. Professor Stuart handsomely returns the compliment to his brother professor in the following words, which, because they are so apposite to my case, and treatment by Mr. Stuart's party, I now quote them with approbation:—

"I am unable to see any *approximation* in our opinions to Unitarianism. We do believe, there is a distinction in the Godhead, the nature of which, as you yourself justly state, p. 84, *the*

Scriptures have not explained. On this distinction, (which we can hardly venture with you to explain as merely a *threefold mode of existence*, p. 84; but which we suppose may be something more than *mode of existence*,) are founded in various appellations and exhibitions of the Godhead, in the Scriptures We believe that the Logos is truly divine; divine in a *supreme*, not in a *secondary* sense; and that the Logos did unite himself with “the holy child, that was called the Son of God,” so as to form, in a manner inscrutable to us, one person; of whom could be predicated, with equal truth, a nature human and divine

‘Does your sentiment, now, offer any advantages to those who believe in the essential divinity of Christ, either in comprehending this truth, or in defending it, which are not offered by the sentiment which we embrace? I confess, for myself, I cannot help feeling, that the idea of a *derived* God is, in reality, a vastly greater approximation to Arianism, than that which we adopt; and that the antagonists of Arius had much less reason to dispute with him than they apprehended. For one, I am altogether inclined to say, with good Irenaeus, “There is nothing in God which is previous or subsequent, or more ancient; consequently no emanation of this kind can take place.” (Lib. ii. c. 13.) I cannot but rejoice, at finding in the disciple of Polycarp, the intimate friend of the Apostle John, ideas of God which appear to me so rational and Scriptural.

“The fathers in general, nurtured in the bosom of heathenism and emanation philosophy, and being concerned with those to whom an *emanated* God would not be objectionable, do not appear to have apprehended any thing repulsive in the doctrine of generation as to the divine nature. I am unable to accord with them here. The pure, and spiritual, and immutable nature of God, (a truth equally consonant with the Scriptures and with reason,) is so deeply impressed upon me, that I feel an instinctive repulsion to any approximation toward such an idea of the Godhead as interferes with these essential predicates. And I must confess, that with the views which I now entertain, if I could be persuaded that the doctrine of eternal *emanation* or *generation* is true, I should feel that the first step was taken towards embracing the Arian system.

“I am no *Subordinarian*, in any shape whatever, as it respects the Logos, previously to the incarnation, and in himself considered. A *subordinate God* is to my mind, a contradiction of terms; unless the word God is used in a metaphorical sense. I believe in the *full, proper, supreme divinity of the Logos*; that he is *self existent, uncreated, unbegotten, not emanated*. Is this approximation to “denying the Trinity and divinity of the Saviour?” If it be, I am greatly in error, and wholly unable at present to discern it.”

To return to the translation. Had Mr. Landis been actuated by a truth-loving, a truth-honoring, and a truth-telling spirit, he could have shown—nay, he would have shown, that in the spurious readings

* See the “Christian System,” now issuing from the press, for my views on these cardinal points.

rejected on the authority of Griesbach and others, we have repudiated those acknowledged by all to be favorable to our views, as well as those supposed by Mr. Landis to be unfavorable to them. We have, indeed, no favorite view. The whole Bible, with us, is a favorite, and all its views are ours. But we have already fully shown that nothing of this sort could be expected from one who has most wantonly accused of very glaring and flagrant errors, not only without a particle of proof, but in the face of the most clear and definite declarations to the contrary of his imputations.

It is no part of my present intention to defend the New Version, or sustain its various emendations, as we call them, that have in the course of a few editions offered themselves to public examination.—Mr. Landis has not attempted to show that they are not in truth, and in fact, emendations and improvements. He aims at putting down both the version and myself by other arguments than the merits of the “alterations” of which he speaks. His main effort consists in affirming that “the Campbellites have *adopted* a new version of the Christian Scriptures”—as, of course, more favorable to their views than the common one. 2d. That “it was not until Mr. Campbell had published *several large editions* of this book that he would consent to correct the false statement in its title-page, declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland.” 3d. That Mr. C. had, “while retaining the *original title-page*, made many alterations in the version, and thousands of times departed from the three Doctors aforesaid.” On these three arguments he rings the changes to satiety. By these he would demolish both my reputation for honesty and the character of the book. This is a short, but summary method. In reference to Mr. Landis and these assertions we shall again quote the words of Professor Stuart. In a letter to William E. Channing, D. D., 1830, he says, “*I do know that the accusations which you stand pledged to support are NOT TRUE. I aver that they ARE NOT before heaven and earth.* That they are accusations of a hurtful tendency need not be said. They go to destroy all respect for us—all confidence in us—all prospects of our usefulness to society or in the church, just so far as you are believed, and to render us the objects of suspicion, of scorn, and of hatred. As an injured man—as injured in a manner that is highly unjust and cruel, we call you (Messrs. Landis and Peters) either for reparation, or else to support your charges. *These charges are allegations as to matters of fact*, they are not matters of opinion merely, or the deductions which may be drawn from opinions. As *matters of fact* you are bound to support them. According to all demands of propriety and justice, you have no liberty to retreat by professing disdain of your opponent: you must either support them or take them back, or stand before the public as those who have abused and maltreated their fellow-being—as a reviler and slanderer of your fellow-citizen.”*

I say, gentlemen, with Professor Stuart, in a case by no means so palpably flagrant, cruel, and unjust, you must make amends in your American Biblical Repository, or depend upon it you must answer for it before another tribunal. You are not privileged to calumniate and abuse a large, respectable, and rapidly increasing community: nor maliciously to asperse and destroy my character to serve your purposes, You have no right to call me “a Unitarian,” or to say that I am practising “a crime in no way differing from actual forgery” in my manner of publishing the New Version. You have blasphemed my character with all your readers; and you are in duty bound as publicly to take back the false charges you have printed, published, and sold to me† and against me. I will give you an

opportunity of doing it, if you can honorably to yourselves. But gentlemen it must be done. You have both violated the law of Moses, the law of Christ, and also the laws of the States in which you reside; and it behooves you to repent immediately and do works meet for repentance, or perchance you may repent when it is too late.

A. C.

*Letters to W. E. Channing, D. D., page 37

†I have been a paying subscriber to your work from the first number till now.