

THE  
GOSPEL ADVOCATE,

CONDUCTED BY

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB.

VOLUME III.

NASHVILLE:

CAMERON & FALL, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS, CORNER COLLEGE AND UNION STREETS.

1857.



STATE

# GOSSIP ADVOCATE

GOSSIP ADVOCATE

TRAINING AND REFORMATION

VOLUME III

WASHINGTON

GOSSIP ADVOCATE, PUBLISHED BY THE GOSSIP ADVOCATE COMPANY, 1000 EIGHTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.

1911

## INDEX TO VOLUME III.

Almanac and Register, Disciples'	90	Close of the Volume,	398
Adventure in the Tomb of David,	399	Co-operation,	410
Bad Picture,	236	Dancing, --	13, 151
Baptist Experience,	260	Deep Groans of the World,	5
Bible and our Creed,	108	Desultory Reflections,	46
Bible-Reader What he Thinks,	358	Disciples of Christ, Will they	
Bible Revision,	101, 321	abandon the Truth?	263
Birth of Spirit,	144	Editorial	320
Call for Preachers,	25	Editors of Papers and Periodicals,	221
Call to Ministry,	365	England, Mission to	149
Campbellism Demolished,	168	Essay, Elley's Notice of	54
Christ, Submission to	11	Evangelizing in S. C., 92, 94, 112,	302
Christianity, Progressive Character of	88	Evangelizing in Texas,	335
Christian Church, 1st and 2nd Temple Typical of	74	Evangelists, Support of 154, 157,	257
Christian Economy,	231	Extremes Meet,	151
Cherokee Nation, Mission to	360	Explanatory,	238
Church of Christ near Castalian Springs,	217	Expedients, Religious,	161
Church, Corruption of	82	Faith and Obedience,	292
"    in Nashville,	70	Female School, Mrs. Fanning	235
"    Sufficiency of	50	Franklin College,	269, 320
Church News,	62, 124, 235, 410	Franklin College Commencement,	192, 235
Circular,	332	Franklin College, Changes in	192
Communion, Open and Close	54	Faith Alone—How the Apostles	
Consolidation,	110	Addressed Enquirers,	379
Contradictions, Apparent	141	God and Christ, Appellations of	118
Controversy, Spirit of	223	God and Mammon,	38
Co-operation in Arkansas,	27	Gospel Advocate,	28, 48
Co-operation Mountain District,	16, 301, 354	Happiness and Usefulness,	351
Co-operation, Smith Co., Tenn.,	52	Heart, Life and State, Change of	327
Co-operation in Texas,	123	Hindering Causes,	31
Co-operation, South Ala.	122	Human Organizations,	44
Co-operation, Report of Ky. State	43	Human Creeds Among Disciples,	142
Co-operation, North East Texas,	363	Irenæus Essay, Remarks on,	88
Co-operation, Notes on G. W. Elley's Essay on	214	Indian Mission,	330
Correspondents,	28	John T. Johnson is no more,	29
Converting Power,	377	John T. Johnson, Death of	53
Course of the Christian Age, and Elder B. Franklin,	396	Justification by Faith Only,	134

Letters of Encouragement,	336, 361	Queries,	234, 356
“ from C. Kendrick,	361	Reports of Evangelists, 28, 301, 334,	
“ “ B. F. Hall,	361	365.	
“ “ G. W. Elley,	138, 210	Reports from Ark.,	233
“ “ S. H. Millard,	121	Reports from Texas,	360
“ “ J. S. Robertson,	121	Religion in Modern Times,	120
“ “ Jas. Holmes,	354	Religious Success, Secret of	132
“ “ J. P. Smith,	266	Remission of Sins,	145
“ “ Sample Orr,	267	Revelations and Miracles,	353
“ “ J. H. Dunn,	24	Richardson, Prof. R., Philoso-	
“ “ J. A. Clark,	29	phy 172, 181, 196, 202, 241, 251,	
“ “ A. Kendrick,	30	273, 278, 305, 309, 337, 343.	
“ “ Canada,	96	Savior, our	116
“ “ P. F. Southern, -	410	Scripture Selections for Chris-	
“ “ E. H. Darter,	410	tians,	152
“ “ J. H. Dunn,	412	Scraps,	56
“ “ T. W. Brents,	408	Spirit, Operation of	266
Lines in Memory of Miss E.		Spirit and Word,	228
Ramsey,	125	Speculations,	54, 357
Locke,	365	Suggestions,	147
Meeting, Tent	331	Science and Bible,	163
“ at McMinnville,	117	Sunday Schools, Books, etc.,	166
Metaphysical Discussion,	1, 33	Spiritualism North,	151
Misrepresentations,	168	Slander and Slanderers,	59
Milligan's, Prof. R., Replies,	20, 22	Supporting Evangelists, No. 3	401
Missions and Missionaries,	129	“ “ No. 4	404
Missionary Society, American			
Christian,	43	Tour in Mo.,	288, 346
More to Think About,	119	Tour South, Bro. Campbell's	150
Mothers, a Word to	303	Texas Department,	31, 126
Natural Theology,	193	Tribute of Respect,	127
New Life, How to Procure	49	Truth, the Conquest of	296
Opposition to Truth in Ky.,	300	Truth—a Gem,	304
Obituaries, 31, 55, 64, 127, 239, 268		The Philosophical Essentiality	
366, 412.		of the Word of God,	372
On our way to the Indian Mis-		The Gospel of Christ,	384
sion, by J. J. Trott,	409	“Union of Christians,”	29
Pardon, Terms of	225	Witnesses, Three	97
Passing Thoughts,	153	Worship, Fashionable	104
Patriotism, Morality, etc.,	57	Word of God,	398
Personal,	141, 256	Word, Proclamation of	41
Piety, Domestic	160	“Whats in a Name,”	369
Perfect Man,	192	Young, Tracts for	112
Preachers,	51		
Portraits of Brethren,	28		

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, JANUARY, 1857.

NO. 1.

---

## METAPHYSICAL DISCUSSIONS.—No. 4.

IN our third number, on speculative philosophy, we intimated that we would notice its bearings upon the Christian religion. At the opening of the discussion it is of the utmost importance for the reader to see clearly the ground occupied respectively by modern philosophy and religion. The subject is plainly expressed by Henry James of New York. He says in his *Miscellanies*, p. 247, "The natural theologian (philosopher) contends, that we know God's character sufficiently by the light of nature, to understand our duties towards him; and that any additional revelation can only prove conformatory to this one. The advocate of revealed religion, on the other hand, maintains that nature does not convey a clear intimation of the divine character, nor consequently our relations to it; and that some additional light is therefore needed to instruct us at once in our duties and destiny."

The same thought is still more forcibly expressed by the famous theological infidel, David F. Strauss of Germany, in his "Life of Jesus," vol. 3, p. 441. He says, "The church refers her Christology to an individual, who existed historically at a certain period; the speculative theologian to an idea which only attains existence in the totality of individuals; by the church the evangelical narratives are received as history: by the critical (infidel, Ed.) theologian, they are regarded for the most part as mere mythi." This is the very quintessence of transcendentalism, or modern philosophy as taught in all the schools. It is a singular fact, that the doctrine of nature's possessing ability to teach us the character of God, and our relations to him, is taught in every Sunday school of the land, and is vociferated from almost every pulpit; yet this is an enlightened age!

"Christianity, on the contrary, claims to reveal facts, a knowledge of which is indispensable to the moral and spiritual well-being of the world, and to offer in attestation of the truth of those facts, the only satisfactory proof, the authority of God, evidenced by miraculous displays of his power."

Explanatory thoughts on this subject are unnecessary. The examples we may offer cannot fail to impress the idea on the heart, that Christianity rests solely upon miracles and supernatural administrations, whilst philosophical religion—natural theology—rests exclusively upon nature—in the style of Spinoza, "The laws of nature are the laws by which God is bound, nature and God being the same, and, therefore, laws from which nature or God can never depart." But more of this when we give the system of this German atheistical teacher.

With our statement of the question, thus standing out on the canvass, we feel that it is due to our readers to give them a brief historical sketch of modern speculation.

Our first author is *R. Descartes*, who was born in 1596, and who was the author of modern philosophy. Perhaps it would be better to say, that he revived Hindoo and Platonian speculations in modern times. He took his stand point upon the principle of *universal doubt*—admitted nothing as true; yet the doubting he admitted as a fact, and, therefore, the act of thinking he considered as indubitable evidence of his own existence. Hence the maxim, "*I think, therefore I exist.*" In the further development of this hypothesis, he maintained that the mind is conscious of two sorts of ideas, viz., thought and extension. Extension has relation to matter—substance—he said, but thought to mind—spirit. The world contains, according to this theory, two classes of beings—spirits and bodies. He maintained further, that thought is the very essence of spirit. Consequently, our thinking proves us spiritual, or that the power of thinking is pure spirit. Hence, he said, "The intelligence possesses the idea of the Infinite." This idea he argued was not acquired, but is *innate*. It may be necessary to explain what he meant by *innate ideas*. We employ his own words, "When I say, that any idea is born with us, or that it is naturally imprinted on our souls, I do not mean that it is always present in the thought, for this would be contrary to fact; but only that we have in ourselves the faculty of producing it." This it will be observed is the doctrine of Leibnitz, who advocated an inherent or native activity of soul and mind capable of originating all the moral light that we need in this life. It will not be forgotten that this is the identical doctrine of So-



ocrates, who pleaded for an ever present demon to guide him, and of Plato, whose notions of ideas are equivalent to the guiding divinity of Socrates, or self-consciousness of Descartes.

It must be perceived, that this system most perfectly precludes the idea of knowledge from *without*, and consequently it denies the necessity of revelation. If we possess a thinking divinity within, a self-consciousness, capable of evolving all truth, without external aid, we need no other guide, and consequently supernatural revelation is useless.

We will next call attention to the system of Benedict Spinoza, who was born at Amsterdam in 1632, and died in 1677. He was a Jew but affected a conversion to Christianity.

Although a disciple of Descartes, Spinoza maintained but a single principle in his philosophy. In the words of Schwegler, he maintained, that "There is only one infinite substance, that excludes from itself all determination and negation, and is named God, or nature." It is a well known fact of history, that Spinoza employed the word *nature* instead of God; and after his death Doctor Mayer, his editor, changed it, so as to read God for nature. In his whole system there is no such an idea as a personal God, and indeed he declares that his notion of a Deity differs widely from Christians. He denied that understanding and will are attributes of God. His notion was, that there was but a single substance in the universe, which he called nature or God, whose operations were not from will, but necessity; and, of course, that all existences and phenomena are but various manifestations of nature or God. It will be noted that this is the essence of pantheism. The world is a vast machine which moves from an inherent necessity, and consequently right and wrong are not in the category, and as to a religion to improve the world it is utterly useless; for "*whatever is, is right,*" and needs no improvement. It is something remarkable, that all our modern spiritual systems are built upon Spinoza's God of necessity or nature.

But we have said quite enough to give an idea of Spinoza's system, and we design nothing further.

We think it important, however, to give two other statements of philosophy, viz: The views of Locke, and those of modern German, French, English and American speculatists.

John Locke, the *real* author of the Baconian philosophy and all correct thinking in England since his day, was born in 1632.

There are but two ideas in his system of philosophy. He main-



tained that all of our knowledge comes through *sensation* and *reflection*. His notion was, that the mind is a blank sheet upon which may be written impressions according to external influences, and moreover that all of our information is from without. Secondly, he believed the mind capable, by what he called *reflection*, to manufacture the material thus received through the senses, into correct thought and ideas; that form and consistency are given to whatever comes into the mind through the senses, and that beyond these sources we can gain no knowledge.

We would take this occasion to give it as our candid opinion, that although by abuses of Locke's teaching, the French, and perhaps others, during the last century, became materialists, and his system has been repudiated generally by speculative writers; if Locke were now alive, or could explain to the world his teaching, he would not differ very materially from Kant, who has two conditions of knowledge, viz: External influences are, as he says, the *a posteriori*, and the internal, or *a priori* power of shaping the material of thought furnished from without into beautiful systems. It is a little singular, that whilst most, if not all, modern writers oppose Locke, they admit that his modes of thought and investigation are correct.

We think it entirely proper in this connection to give an idea of what is known throughout the learned world as "*Transcendental philosophy*." This embraces most modern speculative systems. It may be in place to say, that Kant of Germany was its reputed author; and furthermore, it is admitted difficult to give the idea with sufficient perspicuity for casual readers to see it. Indeed, Germans say, that the English and Americans are scarcely capable of appreciating the thoughts of modern philosophy.

Kant maintained, in reference to religion, that "The death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, cannot be available to religion within the limits of pure reason." Regarding the Bible, he argued that "Revelation must be interpreted in a sense which will harmonize with the universal rules of the religion of reason." This view at once makes null and void an authoritative religion, independent of man, revealed directly from Heaven, as is represented in the Scriptures. A recent German author says, Kant maintained that "Reason is in religious things the highest interpreter of the Bible." Again he says, "The transition of the faith of the Church to the pure faith of reason is the approximation to the kingdom of God." But not to be prolix, the idea of Strauss and all of the transcendental school is, that the

sooner we abandon the idea of a personal Christ, as Savior, a visible church, and binding ordinances, for an absolute or imaginary religion, the better. All the facts of the Bible are regarded as mere *mythi*—that is, representations of real facts, for the sake of the vulgar world, which never existed. Thus the Savior, a personal Father in Heaven, a church of Christ, the ordinances of the New Testament and every bond of society are cast out, for an ideal religion of something called “pure reason.”

This is called transcendental, because it transcends the real and enters into the phenomenal. In the whole system there is no church; really no God, no ordinances, no Bible to be respected as containing revelations from our Father in Heaven, and there is no hope of immortality above the dreams of Hindoos regarding a final reabsorption into the great soul of the universe.

It is also right and proper to suggest, that this transcendentalism has prevailed in political circles, North and South. It has been but a short time since a “*higher law*” authority within every man, whose right it is to contravene the constitution and legislation of the country, was advocated in the Congress of the United States, with an audacity not becoming citizens of our mild, most lenient and most abused government. This insolence before heaven and earth may not always be endured.

In Tennessee, and amongst the disciples of Christ, we have heard the doctrine advocated, that whatever a man thinks is right, is right to him. Feeling is thus regarded the guiding divinity, and the religion revealed in the Bible consequently is repudiated by all of this school. We have suffered much from this species of unbelief. More, however, upon this subject may be unnecessary. We think we have shown, that all views save that of receiving the Bible as a book of authority and the ordinances of the New Testament, with the pure life required as the only conditions of eternal life, is grossly infidel.

T. F.

---

### THE DEEP GROANS OF THE WORLD!

MAN is but a shadow upon the earth. The seasons revolve around, and leave their mark upon him! The world is his school, and *Time* and *Eternity* his lessons. He is himself a walking, thinking, smiling, weeping, and deeply plotting *mystery*! He studies the multitude, and the multitude studies him; and oh how dissimilar their results! He

blunders from the first step of life, and blunders on to the last day thereof, and bears the marks of scars and bruises on his person; but the soul that lies within the body can only show her hidden wounds in faint lines upon the countenance. Suffering is the furnace of the soul, and trials and conflicts bring out the hidden virtues of the heart, which might otherwise waste unseen and be to time unknown.

In reading the last works of one of England's greatest literary artists, for there there are authors by profession, I was made to wonder how the knight of the pen becomes a painter, and makes all the touches stand out before you like a picture. Thomas Carlyle, in his "Latter-day Pamphlets," has come out the avowed enemy of Revealed Religion. Not as Macauley would have come out, had he crossed the Rubicon, into the airy regions of speculation, with a fair and square avowal of the fact, in plain and readable English; but, in his own round about and regular marolish manner, in a kind of half funny and spasmodic sarcasm and cutting satire, of which he is a fearful master! He is deeply in earnest against all "shams," and is fascinated with reality, with work and its grand results, either of the hands or of the brains; and is greatly in favor of "hero-worship;" but all the time quarrels with what the world admires!

The truth, in his case, seems to be this, that he has bowed so fervently, and so long, before the heroes of speculation in Germany, that he comes out a many-sided man, made up in parts of Hegel, Schiller, Goethe, Richter, and Fichte! And, in an Englishman, a most remarkable result is, that he has inhaled from them their unbelief and their deadly hostility to liberty and popular sovereignty! "Ballot-boxes," popular "Parliaments," "Stump Orators," "Exeter-Hall-philanthropy" and "religion" come in alike for his most biting sarcasm and his bitterest scorn. Some one once said to Coleridge that Klopstock, the poet, was the German Milton. "Yes," said he, with a loud roar of laughter, "*a very German Milton!*" So it seems that Carlyle has become a German freethinker, and he is truly a very *German* freethinker.

In a queer and most laughable jumble of the queerest things I ever read from any mortal, on "Hudson's Statue," he has the following hard hit at religion: "You have renounced fealty to Nature and its Almighty Maker; you have said practically, 'We can flourish very well without minding Nature and her ordinances; perhaps Nature and the Almighty—what are they? A phantasm of the brain of priests, and of some chimerical persons that write books?'" "Hold," shriek others wildly, "You incendiary infidels; you should be quiet infidels,

and believe! Haven't we a Church? Dont we keep a Church, this long while; best behaved of Churches, which meddles with nobody, assiduously grinding its organs, reading its liturgies, homiltiics, and excellent old moral horn-books, so patiently as Church never did? Can't we doff our hat to it; even look in upon it occasionally, on a wet Sunday; and so, at a trifling charge of a few millions annually, serve *both* God and the Devil? Fools, you should be quiet infidels, and believe!"

In another piece on "Jesuitism," where Ignatius Loyala & Co. meet with, perhaps, the most severe dressing they ever received, he quotes with approbation from, "A Yankee friend," the following compliment to Christianity, "Church, do you say? Look eighteen hundred years ago, in the stable at Bethlehem, an infant laid in a manger! Look, thou ass, and behold it; it is a fact,—the most indubitable of facts: thou wilt there learn innumerable things. Jesus of Nazareth, and the life he led, and the death he died, does it teach thee nothing? Through this, as through a miraculous window, the heaven of Martyr Heroism, the "divine depths of sorrow," of noble labor, and unspeakable silent expanses of eternity, first in man's history disclose themselves. The admiration of all nobleness, divine *worship* of god-like nobleness, how universal it is in the history of man!

But mankind, that singular entity mankind, is like the fertilest, fluidest, most wondrous element, an element in which the strangest things crystallize themselves, and spread out in the most astounding growths. The event in Bethlehem was of the year One; but all the years since that, eighteen hundred of them now, have been contributing new growth to it; and see, there it stands—the Church! Touching the earth with one small point; springing out of one small seed grain, rising out therefrom, ever higher, ever broader, high as the heaven itself, broad till it overshadow the whole visible heaven and earth, and no star can be seen but through *it*. From such a seed grain so has it grown; planted in the reverences and sacred opulances of the soul of mankind; fed continually by all the nobleness of some forty generations of men. The world-tree of the nations for so long! Alas! if its roots are now dead, and it have lost hold of the firm earth, or clear belief of mankind,—what, great as it is, can by possibility come of it? Shaken to and fro, in Jesuitism, Gorham controversies, and the storms of inevitable Fate, it must sway hither and thither; nod ever farther from the perpendicular; nod at last too far; and sweeping the eternal heavens clear of its old brown foliage and multitudinous rook's-nests—come to the ground with much confused crashing, and *disclose* the diurnal



and nocturnal upper light again! The dead world-tree will have declared itself dead. It will lie there an imbroglia of torn boughs and ruined fragments, of bewildered splittings and wide spread shivers, out of which the poor inhabitants must make what they can!"

Now this poor pedant of a Yankee *Carlyleling* has made himself very merry, and shown himself *very wise*, and very eloquent, *almost*, over this "World-tree!" The world-tree is not in as bad a predicament, for its perpendicular, as the orator was in coming down from his lofty height of airy regions, when he stood stammering out such nonsense as the following: "Come to the ground with much confused crashing." Very much "confused" *speaking*, that! And choking withal; when an *eloquent* stands breathless for a graceful finish, and it will not come! This dead "world-tree" besides, is possessed of the faculty of speech, for the *eloquent* says, for want of something better to say, "The dead world-tree will have *declared itself* dead!" Stand aghast ye *eloquents* of old, see what a freethinking orator can utter; ye "eternal silences," will you be silent any longer, when an old dead-tree can declare itself dead? Then, again, this tree when it has fallen with such "confused crashing," will not be done with its wonders, for *Mr. Eloquent* says: "It will lie there an imbroglia of torn boughs and ruined fragments, of bewildered splittings and wide spread shivers." Most astonishing old tree, that! What critical cruelty to dwell so minutely on an old tree that itself declared to the world, it was dead! This torture of the old tree is the unmistakeable feelings the orator had, for that it represented in his fevered brain! Hence these "torn boughs"—oh dreadful! these "ruined fragments." Can it be possible? And last and best,—these "bewildered splittings." They were that! sadly *bewildered*, positively! "and wide-spread shivers." Think of that ye Fichtes, ye Hegels, ye Holyokes, ye Strauss's and ye Carlyles! I wonder that when the old tree had to die, and found its end approaching, it did not collect all those who had helped to kill it, and, like Sampson, bow itself beyond its perpendicular and fall upon them and give them the fun of a "confused crashing," and "bewildered splittings!"

That such passages as these should be quoted by Carlyle with approbation is a proof of decaying power, and an evidence that the time of his end draws near! He is a master in the use of words, but his pupil of a Yankee, I pity *him*! These apes of greatness are a stench in the nostrils of common sense—these ugly toads that swell their tiny selves that they may reach the dimensions of an ox are unsufferable by their stupidity. The whole passage is a piece of nonsensical

grandiloquence almost beneath the dignity of criticism. Infidelity will prove a bad job on the hands of its vaunted abettors and defenders, if this is the best it can do. What contemptible twaddle this, to oppose against the teaching and works of Jesus! What a farthing candle for a madman to carry through the streets of Bedlam or of Babylon in the midday sun?

But, again, as of old, and as ever, these men have no power but against the corruptions of Christianity. What Carlyle says, in amount, has been said by brother Campbell and by many advocates of the current reformation. I have often said that the Established Church of England, and the strife and battles of Dissent would make England infidel to a great extent. Good men there begin to see it and deplore it. Almost all writers on Prophecy and the Apocalypse have looked for a great increase of infidelity just before the dawn of the Millennium.

In that noble work, "Christian Theism," by R. A. Thompson, we have the great difficulty truthfully depicted. Speaking on this topic Mr. Thompson says: "Speculation has, in fact, been the bane of Christianity, and has crippled the energies of the church, and restrained its proper influence from the earliest age." "But it can hardly be questioned that the history of Christianity upon the whole is too much a history of dogmas and dissensions; too little a record of moral triumphs and of social progress." Again, he says: "One obvious result of doctrinal speculations is the incessant division and subdivision of churches and sects. Many have been engaged, of late years, in seeking anxiously for 'the Church.' It is rightly assumed that Christ left One Church in the world. All the creatures of God are originally one; one in Divine order, one in Divine communion. And, no doubt, the visible Church on earth would still be one if the work of God were not perpetually defaced by the sin of man. But as human sinfulness broke the harmony of the first creation, so it long since broke the harmony of the Church."

According to these utterances we are forced to the conclusion, that the world will not be converted until Christians are united. What poor glory is there in maintaining division! How noble to sacrifice opinion, and pride and every thing but truth and principle for the salvation of the world. Alas! to see men, good and noble men, led off from the religion of their fathers, because they see such a contradiction in the professors of religion; talking about love and living in hatred and bickerings; talking about humility, and exhibiting pride; talking about converting the world, and building up party walls and abusing



and misrepresenting one another! Who that believes in Him that prayed that all his disciples might be one, in order that the world might believe that God had sent him to be the savior of sinners, can hesitate as to his duty? It is time for Christians to awaken and consider their mighty responsibilities at this particular time. Nothing will save mankind from anarchy, infidelity and ruin but pure, primitive, New Testament Christianity.

JAS. HENSHALL.

### THOUGHTS ON BROTHER HENSHALL'S REMARKS.

It is seldom that we find better hits at modern infidels than in the suggestions of Brother Henshall. Thomas Carlyle is, however, but one of a thousand of the fascinating writers of the times who scoff at the Christian religion. Literary men go out of their way to attack the religion of Jesus of Nazareth; but we should fear much more professed Christians, who advocate systems subversive of spiritual truth. It is more than remarkable, that many who write upon what they are pleased to call the *Evidences of Religion*, only confuse and bewilder the mind. The last witness to be consulted on the subject of evidence is John, the beloved disciple. With him the testimony was sealed up. We have been led to make this statement from Brother Henshall's exclamation, "*That Noble Work, Christian Theism, by R. A. Thompson!*" The style might lead us to infer that Mr. Thompson had done something most valuable for the world. Be it remembered, that he was required to find "*Evidence of God, independent of the written revelation.*" To accomplish this, he adopted the old doctrine of Leibnitz, "*Of a spontaneous activity of the mind*" penetrating to the invisible. Such a view leaves no place for supernatural revelation, and hence even "*Christian Theism*" should be classed amongst the works of speculative ignorance and unbelief.

Mr. Thompson, it is true, said some good things after he finished his speculations, but the work as a whole is not well adapted to uncritical Christians. I presume, however, that Brother Henshall and I perfectly agree in regard to German and English infidelity, and I very respectfully offer these thoughts to caution the young particularly, in the words of Sir William Hamilton, against "*learned ignorance.*"

T. F.

## SUBMISSION TO CHRIST.

THERE is in the Christian religion such an idea as the giving up of the whole man to Christ. It is in fact the very foundation of gospel obedience. In the *world* men are the servants of the world, the flesh and the devil. In *Christ* they are the servants of Christ. The notion that men or women can profess submission to the authority of Christ and not yield to Him the entire control and direction of their lives is most destructive of every thing like Christian life. In the days of Christ and the Apostles, men were either for Christ or against him. There was no middle ground. The Savior himself draws the line which does not permit any half-and-half sort of life. "He that is not for me is against me, and he that gathereth not scattereth abroad." No class of mere *assenters* were known at that day. We read of no such mongrel race. This class of men belongs to an age which has endeavored to obliterate the old land-marks of the Truth, and to tear down the glorious building of Heaven—even the church of the living God. They are the foster children of that religious service which exhausts itself in the eloquent harangue of some flippant talker, under which men can sit as blocks and stones from year to year and not once think that their whole duty as responsible beings is not fulfilled. Men could not thus act when Peter or Paul or Philip or Stephen spoke to them. They were compelled either to receive the truth, or in mad defiance reject the whole as an imposture, and bring upon its proclaimers the most cruel punishments in their power—oftimes even death itself. What a shame it is that we of this day have become so timid, shrinking and fearful in the proclamation of the same truths of life and death, that the people can from week to week hear what is termed the preaching of the gospel, and still remain indifferent! What a picture it is of our inefficiency and want of earnestness in the work of Heaven!

But I set out to call attention to the matter of submission to Christ on the part of those who profess to be his followers. The same influence that leads men to the belief that a mere assent to the facts of the gospel without any submission to its requirements, is all sufficient, operates with equal force in the church. Men and women profess conversion to Christ, formally submit to him according to the gospel, and still they are far from being in Christ. Paul says, "if any man be in Christ he is a new creature; he has crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." But how many who profess to submit to the Lord Jesus in our day are *new* creatures? How many in reality put off the old man with his deeds? How many have ceased to serve the flesh

and have taken the Lord Jesus as their master? How many are there who do not still delight in the ways of sin and folly and pride in preference to the paths of righteousness and holiness? Instead of setting our affections upon the things above, the world with its allurements to vice and defilement claims all our affections. Instead of consecrating to God our powers of mind and body, that we may possess rich and abundant rewards on high, the insane thirst for the wealth and honor of earth continually crushes and stifles every better feeling of our hearts, and finally sinks us to the veriest slavery of mammon. Instead of being ever ready to bestow of the means with which God has blessed us at any demand of His cause, we cling to a few dollars as if these were treasures to be laid up for eternity. Instead of the worship of the assembly of the people of God, and the exhortations, admonitions, prayer and praise of the Lord's house being a source of pleasure, yea, of joy unspeakable and unearthly, to how many are they not a sore burthen and task, and by them neglected at the suggestion of any feeling of fleshly ease or worldly care? I think I am not beyond justice in these matters.

I know not what other explanation to give to the many complaints, particularly in reference to the weekly meetings and service and fellowship of the brethren, if these things are not so. I cannot for the life of me see how we as a people should lack for means to carry on the work of the Lord, if we were engaged as true-hearted men and women in the service of our master. We hear of continual complaints that those who labor in the gospel are not sustained; and again the cry comes, we lack preachers. We have schemes and plans of all sorts, from raising means "*ad valorem*," "*specific*," "*direct taxation*," and I know not how many others. Again, to supply the other want, educational fund societies, and associations of all orders are devised to train men for the work of the ministry. They have failed, and must fail. None of them reach the evil. None of them can cure the disease. They are human devices put in place of God's appointments. There is but one remedy. There is a single point to which we must come. That is unreserved submission to Christ. The giving up of the whole man to his laws. Personal responsibility on the part of every member of his body is the foundation of the whole Christian life. Short of this nothing can be done. Professions are of no avail. Unless we are engaged actively with body, mind, soul, and all we possess in the universe of Heaven, I can see no meaning in the Christian religion. The notion that men will be rewarded for deeds never performed and for sac-

rifices never made, is but a mockery of the name of justice. If we cannot give up the world and be content to bear hardships and sacrifices of comfort in this life, we have no right to expect any reward hereafter. We have no business in the Church of Christ unless we are willing to take its Head as our head and submit without a murmur to every requirement of the gospel. It is all a matter of duty, personal, individual duty, to God. If a sense of duty to Him does not bring us to his house with his people, and lead us to the performance of all His commands, I see but little hope for us. If we cannot, as a matter between ourselves and our Maker, be induced to give of the means with which he has so abundantly blessed us, we have no part nor lot in his kingdom. If appeals must constantly be made to worldly pride, or we need constant coaxing to bring us up to the clearest injunctions of the gospel, it seems to me that we had better give up the whole matter. We can be but stumbling blocks and hindrances. But if we love the truth and are determined to obey our Lord, cost what it will, let us do so cheerfully and manfully. In so doing we will be blessed and the cause of our Master run and be glorified.

W. L.

---

For the Gospel Advocate.

### DANCING.

*"Be not conformed to this world."*—ROM. XII, 2.

Christians should not spend their time in following the fashions of the world. There are many well meaning professors who engage in these, believing there is no particular harm in them. If I should succeed in convincing such of the error of their way, I shall not regret my time and labor. We should ever take heed, lest we be led off by the error of the wicked. I know there is something in modern dancing, that is calculated to please the eye of the young; indeed, it is the lust of the eye, which the Apostle John says, "Is not of the Father, but is of the world"—1 John ii, 16; and those who engage in such things, please not the Lord. It is said that "dancing anciently, was a religious exercise—that Miriam, sister of Aaron, danced—David danced, and that Solomon says, there is a time to dance." I answer, that under every dispensation, God gave a law, regulating every part of acceptable worship, and, unless we can find a law authorising dancing, we are sure that it forms no part of the worship of God. Dancers seemed to act from the impulse of the moment on those occasions when

God's people triumphed. On the occasion of the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage, Miriam, sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand—all the women went out after her, with timbrels in their hands, and Miriam leads not only in the dance, but in the song also; and the first dancer starts the song, "*Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously,*" &c., and it seems all the women, both old and young, joined in the music and the dance. No promiscuous dancing here of male and female, as in modern times.

There was some seriousness and much devotional feeling manifested in those cases, which are never manifested in modern dancing. Well, David danced—yes, sure enough, he did, and had no one to help him; and it seems it resulted in the alienation of his wife's affections from him. No hint that God approved of his dancing. Admitting that dancing was right under former dispensations, it does not prove that modern dancing is right. It is wholly unlike the ancient dance. Then the men were to themselves, and the women to themselves; but that would not suit modern dancers. But, I am asked, does not Solomon say, "there is a time to dance?" Yes, and whenever the circumstances call for it, and God commands it, then we may dance by his authority, and not before. It is said the Prodigal Son danced. There is not a word of proof that he danced; but, suppose he did, is that any authority for modern dancing?

I will now call attention to a few passages of Scripture, where dancing is expressly forbidden: "Neither be idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, 'the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.'"—1 Corinthians x, vii. Here the Apostle condemns the very thing that we are fighting. He says do not be idolaters, as the Jews were. What was their idolatry? He says: "The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play"—(Dance.) This was their idolatry. Here is a positive command against it. If we set down to eat and drink, after which to engage in a dance, we are idolaters, just as were the Jews. But it is said: "Their dancing was around the calf." We do not dance around such things. What is the course pursued in modern dancing? There is a time appointed, a feast is prepared, they set down to eat and drink, rise up from the table, step out on the floor, the music starts, and the dance begins. This is what the Apostle condemns—can any christian engage in such things? Paul speaking of the works of the flesh, mentions "*revelings and such like, of the which I tell you now, as I have also told you before, in times past, that they that do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*" Revel-



ing, is carousing and dancing; and Paul says, "they that do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God." Who dare contradict the Apostle, and say that we may "practice such things?" "For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries, wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you."—1 Peter iv, 3, 4. Such practices are connected with idolatry. Is it not strange, that professed christians should engage in a practice that was condemned by the more moral portion of Pagan Rome? We have an oration of Cicero, in which he defends Murena, the Consul Elect, whom Cato endeavored to restrain from the office, partly on the ground that he had been guilty of indulging in this effeminate amusement. Cicero repels the charge. Cato calls Murena a dancer. If this report be true, it is a weighty accusation—if false, it is an outragenous calumny. Wherefore, Cato, as your authority carries so much influence with it, you ought never to snatch a charge from the mouths of the rabble, or rashly call the Consul of the Roman people a dancer, but to consider how many other vices a man must needs be guilty of, before that of dancing can be truly objected to him? No one ever dances even in solitude, or in a private meeting of friends, who is not either drunk or mad. Dancing is always the last act of riotous banquets, gay places, and profane pleasures. With us it may be the first act, instead of the last, in these places of gaiety and profane pleasures. It is shocking to hear a christian apologize for that which has never yet been separated from the most dangerous associations. The very manner of it, especially waltzing, cannot fail making impressions dangerous to virtue. The above was that kind of dancing in which the gay engaged to gratify profane pleasures. If the Pagans objected to it for the reason that it was connected with banqueting, and gay and profane pleasures, surely we ought to object to it; not only for these, but because it is forbidden in the Word of Truth. We should object to it, for the reason that it causes the dancer to forget God.—Job, xxi, 11. "They send forth their little ones as a flock—their children dance—they take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ. They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave; therefore, they say unto God, depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways—what is the Almighty, that we should serve him?" This is the effect it has upon the mind of the dancer. He says unto God, "depart from me,



for I desire not the knowledge of thy ways." We see that modern dancing has that very effect—it alienates the affections from God and the brethren. This is manifest by their neglect of the ordinances of the Lord's house. You will scarcely ever see a professor come to the meeting of the church soon after he engages in the dance, and then he will take a back seat, away from the brethren—will not join in the singing, and when the emblems of the body and blood of Jesus are placed on the table, he will slip out of sight. It is said that "dancing is an innocent amusement, to pass off the time." Then, I suppose, we have done so much for the Lord, that we have purchased a little time, and will just step over into the devil's empire and please ourselves awhile, and revel off the time in gay and fashionable practices. Thus we pay no regard to what Paul says—"Redeeming the time, because the days are evil." It is said that it is right to send our children to the dance and fashionable parties—to teach them etiquette. I would suppose, that if parents understood their duty to their children, they would never teach them what pampers pride and worldly-mindedness, or what has no tendency in any way to elevate the affections or purify the heart. How can a christian send his children to a dance or fashionable party, without violating his obligation to raise them in the nurture of the Lord? I have never known a teacher of this kind of good manners, who was not a drunkard—I never knew one who made any pretensions to christianity; yet these are the persons to teach our children. I met a dancing-master one day in the street of —; he had just closed his dancing school, and he said, "Sir, I am engaged in bad business." I asked why he did not quit it—he replied, "I never expect to teach another dancing school." If the teacher says it is a bad business, surely we are acting badly to send our children to such places. Many have entered the ball-room with pure and spotless characters, and left it corrupted, disgraced, and ruined forever. How many parents have brought down their own gray hairs with sorrow to the grave, for being so unwise as to encourage their children to go to those places of gay pleasure, where "evil communications corrupt their good manners?" Perhaps their children will blame them for being so foolish as not to have restrained their young minds, and directed them in a proper course. It may be said, that to attend balls and parties, affords a pleasant recreation to the young, and we must not restrain them. Recreation may be found at gambling parties, in drinking crowds, or at any other sinful practice. Did you ever know any person injured by not attending those places of mirth and hilarity? Does it make them any

wiser or better? I answer no. The experience of thousands of christians testify that no good can result from it—surely those who wish to honor God and his cause, will not go over to his enemies, and eat and revel with those “who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Let every young disciple turn away from such amusements with disgust.

“Be not conformed to this world,” is a precept, in obeying of which we will not be living after the flesh, for says the Apostle, “If you live after the flesh, you shall die; but if you through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, you shall live.” I have known some of our churches almost ruined by their members conforming to fashionable vices around them, and rather than give them up, wound the feelings of the more pious brethren, and with apparent indifference see the Church of Christ bleeding at every pore. I conclude by giving an extract from Adam Clarke, on dancing. Matth., xv.

Clarke says: “The diversions of the world, feasting and dancing, are but too commonly the occasions of sin. We doubt whether balls are not snares for souls, destructive of chastity, modesty, and sometimes even of humanity itself, and a pernicious invention to excite the most criminal passions. How many on such occasions have sacrificed their chastity? Fix your eyes on that vicious mother, that prostituted daughter, and especially on that murdered ambassador of God, and then send your children to genteel boarding schools, to learn the accomplishment of dancing, where the fear of God makes no part of the education.”

JAMES GILLILAND.

CHESTNUT BLUFF, *December 2d*, 1856.

For the Gospel Advocate.

### SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land, there seems to be a manifest desire for a better organization. All the delinquencies of churches and individuals, are charged to bad organization, or the want of organization. While I admit our organization is not perfect, still I think there are other causes that retard our progress; and if the reader will bear with me, “I will give my opinion of at least some of the causes. I think I see a manifest disposition with some, to adopt a system of organization that will create hireling priests and a clerical dominion. I venture the assertion that those who are loudest in their

complaints and clamor most for organization, are those who have made the least sacrifices in support of christianity, and would be the first to accept the gown and salary. Such are always deploring our lukewarmness and inefficiency, and lauding the order, zeal, and progress of some of the sects. That there is some departure from Gospel purity and relaxation in devotion by the brotherhood, I think requires but little sagacity to discover. But I think it is not wholly attributable to our organization; it would, perhaps, be well for us, if we would do as students at school often do, go back and review our lessons, and in doing this, I think we will be better able to detect our errors and faults. A quarter of a century back, all were truly Bible students, the preachers confined themselves to the Bible, and there were more argument and Scripture in one discourse, than we now have in half a dozen, and then in all the social and family circles, it was one continued investigation of the Scriptures; not an idea advanced, or position assumed, but what was sifted to the bottom, and the result was, all were intelligent in the Scriptures, hence they obtained the appellation of Bible Christians. I have often observed, that just in proportion to the Bible knowledge of any people so were their love and devotion to its institutions, and just in proportion to the love and devotion of any people, so would be the progress of truth in that community. This being true, it is easy to see why we are not now advancing in the same ratio that we then did. It seems, we have now entered a new chapter in this swift age; I fear we have run out of the old apostolic boundary. From the press we often see something like the following, "*Doctrines of Christ*;" "We want no discussion;" "We have become tired of First Principles;" "We want short and practical articles;" "the age requires something suited to its taste," &c. &c. And from the pulpit it is a rare thing to hear the Gospel preached; I heard not long since a prominent preacher say, he had not preached on the subject of remission of sins for a number of years." I replied, "and just so long you have not preached the Gospel;" now if there are many such preachers, it is not hard to account for the want of knowledge, zeal and increase among us. I have ever suspected that brother, who is popular with sectarians and the world, for they will not applaud any teaching, that is subversive of their own principles and practice. Partisans and the world will love their own; said our Lord, "you are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you." "If you were of the world, the world would love you." Now whenever I hear that the religionists are fulminating their anathemas against a brother, I at once infer, that he is a fearless advocate for the

truth, and has formed no alliance with error. At the present time, there is but little opposition from the press or pulpit. Why is this so? Is it because partisans love us better than they used to; or rather is it not because we have slackened our energies and ceased to throw destructive missiles into their camps? Some may think this would be unnecessary, seeing they have withdrawn from the contest. If they have, it is only to intrench themselves more surely, and to allure the unsuspecting, but as yet, not a single camp has been taken or a flag struck.

Now so long as the world stands, when the Gospel is preached in its purity and simplicity, so long will it be opposed by all antagonistic powers. If opposition to the Gospel should cease, it will be either because there is no world, or because its professed friends are recreant to their profession. But why are some tired of hearing the Gospel? Because they do not like it, and the yoke of the Lord has become burdensome and galling to them. I would not have the Gospel preached constantly to the churches, the churches should unremittently edify themselves in all the science of christianity, and send out the gospel to the world; for it was designed for the world. "Repentance and remission of sins, were to be preached in Christ's name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." But some think this is not now important, seeing it has been done, and published in our papers and books, and accessible to the people. To this we reply, it might have been said with as much propriety twenty-five years ago; the people had access to the Bible, and it contains all the truth necessary to salvation. If a necessity then existed, for a bold and fearless advocacy of the Gospel in all its length and breadth, it now exists. Suppose we number a half-million in the United States, this is only about one sixtieth of the whole, so there are fifty-nine to one; and look again at the ten hundred million of souls on earth, and we but a little over a half a million, and shall we say there is no necessity, for an uncompromising defence of the Gospel, so long as "it is God's power to salvation to every one who believes it;" and if it is true, that "faith comes by hearing the word of God," and without a knowledge of the Gospel there can be no faith nor salvation, is it not incumbent on the church to preach the Gospel in order to faith and salvation. But some may think, we are urging a point that is not questioned by any; there is no doubt but there is preaching enough, but it is questionable whether it is the Gospel or human speculation that is preached. If it is not preached as Peter and Paul preached it, the Gospel is not preached at all; and it may be a perverted Gospel,

or something about the Gospel, but the Gospel of God it is not, and I cannot see that we are commanded to preach any thing else, for the command was, "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature," and Paul, says "I determined to make known nothing among you, but a crucified Saviour." If we do not preach the Gospel unconnected with human philosophy and speculation, we need not look for success to attend our labours, and I would have our papers to pursue the same course now that they did twenty years ago. There is the same necessity, the great mass of the people are in the same condition, and the same means employed, would produce similar effects, and if a few thousand then made such rapid progress, what could a half million do, with the same means and energy? Why should we cease to preach faith, repentance and Baptism for remission of sins? In relation to the intimation, that our papers are not as scrupulous for the purity of the Gospel now, as formerly, I had intended to offer a list of specifications, but it might excite the authors, and do no good. I had also intended to make some exceptions.

Let none think that I am opposed to scriptural organization, or that those who labor in word and doctrine, should not be supported, for I am in favor of both. With these thoughts, I leave the reader to his own reflections.

S. B. GILES.

*From the Millennial Harbinger.*

## REPLY TO PRESIDENT FANNING—NO. II.

BROTHER FANNING:—I am sorry that our interchange of views on the subject of Christian polity, is not likely to lead to a successful issue. As we advance in our investigations, our lines seem rather to diverge than to converge. After the first reading of my article on "the Permanent Christian Ministry," you say in the February number of the Advocate, "*Our kind impulses inclined us to publish all he had written without a word by way of note or comment.*" And it was not till after a brother, for whose judgment, you inform us, you entertain a very high regard, had urged you to give it to the public in the form of an extra, that you discovered any fallacy in either my premises or conclusions. But having then carefully re-examined it, you say, "*While we find so much that is wholesome, good, and most valuable in it, and which we would be pleased to give to our friends, there are some points which we think should be better understood before the subjects can be pronounced exhausted.*"



Such is the result of your second reading. Your third is not quite so favorable. Waiving the real questions in debate, and forming a side issue on a merely incidental remark, the meaning of which depends wholly on the assumed standard of comparison, you finally reach the limit of opposition. You say, without any restricting word or phrase, "I suggest, however, with a good deal of respect for Professor Milligan, that *I find not a single scriptural position maintained by him.*"

This does not look much like Christian union. Still, however, I am not without some hope, that we may yet see eye to eye, even on these grave questions. My reasons for cherishing this hope does not arise from anything expressed in *our* correspondence; unless it should be in an allusion which you make to a very worthy enterprise of certain "*more thoughtful and successful brethren.*"

But it is astonishing how even some highly educated minds are influenced by the various lines, angles, and stand-points of observation and comparison. In your reply to brother J. T. Johnson, in the October No. of the Advocate, you say, "*I am inclined to have confidence in both individual and co-operative labor, but one should not be adopted to the rejection of the other.*" And again, "Let each member do what he can for others, and let each church consider attentively her obligations, and if any work should be suggested too great for the performance of one congregation, the Scriptures authorise the co-operation of any number of churches for accomplishing it."

These admissions, brother Fanning, are pregnant with the elements of all the organizations for which we plead. Carry them out to their legitimate results, and you will soon have not a society of Masons and Odd-Fellows, but a church "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part," and laboring individually and collectively through an efficient organization of deacons, elders, and evangelists, as well as in every other possible way for the edification of all its members, and for the conversion, sanctification, and salvation of the world. To suppose that any number of deacons, elders, evangelists, or churches, can co-operate in any important business, without even appointing a president, a clerk, a treasurer, or any other functionary, is certainly one of the most palpable of all absurdities. Such a case of co-operation, has never been witnessed in any dignified, orderly, and efficient body of men, since time began; and is in the very nature of things practically impossible.



My views on the paramount importance of the Church as the medium of Christian philanthropy and benevolence, have been fully expressed at different times; and particularly in an address published in the September No. of the Harbinger. And as this is the only point in your last communication which seems to require any notice, I will, at least for the present, respectfully dismiss the subject.

Yours in Christian love,

R. MILLIGAN.

---

#### NOTES ON PROFESSOR MILLIGAN'S REPLY TO PRESIDENT T. FANNING—NO. II.

BROTHER MILLIGAN:—I trust our labor in attempting to correct each other's errors will not be in vain. If truth is our object, it occurs to me that we may find it. The points in our examinations are not speculative, but are solely matters of authority, to be decided by the Scriptures of truth. I will notice a few items in order.

1. You attempt, my brother, to find a contradiction in my remarks. Suppose you had done so? You have certainly paid sufficient attention to Logic to satisfy yourself, that such a course of argumentation is most fallacious. Should a disputant prove an opponent a thief, it by no means establishes his own honesty. We were not discussing any system of *mine*, but your *peculiar* views; and in all fairness you are bound, as a Christian, to sustain your teaching or abandon it. The very fact of making tilts at me is evidence to all discerning and candid minds that your position is not impregnable.

But as you have introduced the subject, it may not be improper to see if I have contradicted myself, although contradictions in me have nothing to do with the subjects under examination. You represent me as being well pleased with your essay at first; somewhat displeased upon a second reading, and as finding nothing true in the third examination. Nothing of this character, it occurs to me, is found in my remarks. With many of your thoughts and suggestions I have been pleased from the first reading of your essay. "*My kindly feelings towards you,*" from your position, from your agreeable manner of writing, and from Brother Campbell's endorsement, inclined me to publish what you had said without a word of comment; but your *system* I regarded false and pernicious from the first moment I noticed it.

And now, Brother Milligan, since you have taken the liberty to at

tempt to involve me in contradictions to sustain a most unscriptural system, you will please permit me to present what I consider contradictions in your essays.

1.  
Prof. Milligan says: "In our present condition we can, *as a church*, do but little for the salvation of the world."

2.  
Prof. Milligan says: "If we want to supply our country with Bibles we cannot do it as a church."

3.  
Prof. Milligan says: "If we want to send a missionary to Jerusalem we cannot do it as a church."

1.  
Prof. Milligan says: "The church was organized to convert the world and educate the new converts." "It is her solemn and special duty to convert all the nations."

2.  
Prof. Milligan says: "Let the church be their Bible Society."

3.  
Prof. Milligan says: "Let the church be their (the disciples) Missionary Society."

I will not multiply such remarkable statements. It seems to me, however, it would have sounded much better, Brother Milligan, if you had satisfied yourself that your teaching in relation to the *weakness and inefficiency* of the church was not correct, to have said so plainly. In one essay you make null, void, and useless the church, by human organizations, as "bodies of necessity," and in your educational address you make the church God's agent in conversion, in distributing the Bible, in Missionary operations and in every good work. Now, my brother, I can give no conjecture as to your real belief, in regard to the relative importance of the church, and the frail institutions of mortals.

2. In your quotations from my remarks to Bro. J. T. Johnson, regarding the co-operation of churches, to show that I do not differ very far from your views of human co-operations, you surprise me very much. Co-operation is not the point in dispute. You had taken the ground, that "*We can, as a church, do but little for the salvation of the world,*" that "*Associations, (human) for specific ends, for which the church, as it is now organized, furnishes no corresponding medium,*" must be maintained. My position is, and was, that through the church alone Christians should exert all their influence; and because I thus, in sincerity of soul, pleaded the Christian co-operation of churches, you conclude that I am with you in your unauthorized, unchristian and worldly institutions. I hope Brother Milligan that you will admit the point in discussion.

Should you, my brother, repudiate your teaching in your essays relative to the necessity and transcendent superiority of worldly organizations and unqualifiedly maintain the honor and dignity of the church, and above all, her true agency in the salvation of the world, we may proceed to examine minor questions. Till you do this, I shall feel that any effort at discussion with you will not prove very edifying.

Yours in the love of the truth,

T. FANNING.

---

#### LETTER FROM A. M. DEAN.

DALLAS, TEXAS, Oct. 17, 1856.

DEAR BRO. LIPSCOMB:—According to promise I now sit down to write you. Our prospects here are very good at this time. Our congregation now numbers seventeen of as respectable men and women as our county affords.

The cause is prospering here, and all the brethren that take your most excellent paper manifest an unusual degree of zeal for the cause.

Your paper is doing much good in our country; and all the brethren here speak in praise of it. Your selection and manner of discussing intricate questions is such that it is calculated to elicit the deepest inquiry.

We have had several very interesting meetings lately, and several additions.

I will assist you all I can in getting subscribers next year.

Yours in the one hope,

A. M. DEAN.

---

LONE MULBERRY, ALA., Nov. 26th, 1856.

*Beloved Bro. Fanning:* I arrived at home last evening, from Mooresville, where I commenced preaching on Saturday night. I was much rejoiced at the arrival, on Lord's day morning, of our well-known and highly esteemed Brother, McDonald, of Moulton, Ala., who preached on Lord's day morning, and left in the evening on the cars for home. I continued the meeting until Monday night, which resulted in seven noble additions—six by confession and baptism, and one reclaimed. Praised be the Lord for the triumph of truth.

Your brother in the bonds of truth,

J. H. DUNN.

## A CALL FOR A PREACHER.

I will bind myself to furnish decent clothing, at least as good as I wear myself, and all necessary travelling expenses, to any well recommended Christian Brother, capable of teaching the plain and simple Gospel of Christ, who will devote his heart and time in pleading the cause of our common Lord and Savior in North Alabama at least for one year.

Moreover, if such a Brother should not have a horse to ride, he shall have one to use as long as he devotes his time as above.

There are at least eight large Counties densely populated, and not a single Evangelist in all that large space pleading the cause of the Bible and the Bible alone. There are more or less good Brethren in all these Counties, but I cannot promise how much they will do towards the support of an Evangelist. But I will state one fact within my own knowledge.

I could name several of our ablest men in the gospel, who would have done and did devote whole years to the Lord's cause with much less assurance of support than the above proposition; but they expected better pay than clothes and a horse, and even money added.

If any Brother should feel any interest for this County, let him write to

C. McDONALD,

Moulton, Lawrence County, Ala.

## REMARKS.

We most heartily commend the earnest zeal of our veteran Brother, McDonald, but it evinces a lamentable state of affairs in the churches. If the congregations were walking in the light of the Lord, the Evangelists would be sent forth without the least care as to clothing, travelling change, a horse, or with regard to the things of the morrow. It is shameful that christians have to be reminded that their servants—the Ministers of the Gospel—can not live without food and raiment. Who thinks of working his ox, his horse, or even his dog, without feeding him? And yet, is it possible, that the Disciples of Christ in the nineteenth century, will permit men to minister to them “spiritual things,” without a reciprocation in worldly things? This affords evidence that we are deficient in the very first lessons of christianity. The fact that members of the church talk about “salaries,” or how much, or what preachers shall have, argues that there has been but little correct thinking on the subject of supporting men who give themselves to the Gospel.

T. F.

## MOUNTAIN DISTRICT CO-OPERATION.

The Co-operation Meeting of the Mountain District of Tennessee, was held in McMinnville, Nov. 21st and 22d, 1856.

After prayer, Bro. W. D. Carnes was appointed to preside over the meeting.

The following Churches were officially represented: Woodbury and Pleasant Ridge, Cannon Co.; Ivy Bluff, Fountain Springs, Philadelphia and McMinnville, Warren Co.; Salem, Franklin Co.; Spencer and Antioch, Van Buren Co. Delegates from four Churches brought letters, which were read to the meeting.

Reported one hundred and thirteen additions within the bounds of the Co-operation the present year. The Churches contributed as liberally for the support of the Gospel for 1857, as they had done in former years.

As appointed, Bro. Carnes delivered a Discourse on the Office of Bishops; and Bro. Huddleston addressed the meeting on the Duties of Evangelists.

A Committee was appointed to ascertain who, of the Preaching Brethren present, were willing to Evangelize in the Mountain District the ensuing year, and to designate their fields of labor. This Committee reported that they had secured the services of Brethren Murphree, Campbell and Seitz, who will labor in Cannon, Warren and Van Buren Counties. Bro. Eichbaum will labor in Franklin County.

Unanimity of feeling and a christian spirit pervaded the meeting in all the deliberations, and the brethren seemed fully determined to labor more zealously to extend the Gospel of the Saviour into the destitute parts of the country.

Done by order of the Meeting.

A. P. SEITZ, Secretary.

N. B. The Churches of the Mountain District appointed a meeting for mutual edification and christian enjoyment, to be held at McMinnville, commencing Thursday night before the second Lord's Day in May, 1857.

---

It was our good fortune to be present with our brethren of the Mountain District at their annual meeting, and it is a pleasure to us to bear testimony to the uniform good feeling and Christian bearing that marked the deliberations of the brethren. Upon the whole we think the meeting was one of much profit to those who attended. While there was no special discussion of church co-operation, still we think



that the disposition manifested by many of the brethren was clearly for the supremacy of the Church of Christ in opposition to all other organizations. There are some few of the brethren I think who do not yet see exactly how they can get along without a little human machinery, but we hope that these will soon see the way clearly. Our brethren of the Mountain District are no doubt as much devoted to our Master's cause as any in the State, and we were particularly pleased at the spirit of earnest zeal that fills their hearts. One suggestion we would make. We think the labors of their evangelists are confined too much to the beaten tracks. Their efforts I think have not been enough directed to the destitute regions within their bounds. Plant and build up new churches, brethren, and it will impart fresh life and animation to the older. The very idea that we can see from year to year how the cause has prospered in our hands and how the borders of Zion have been extended, will inspire the brethren with energy, and bring up to the discharge of the gospel requirements with renewed activity and spirit.

W. L.

### ARKANSAS CO-OPERATION.

DEAR BRETHREN:—Our District Co-operation came off, according to previous appointment, on the Saturday before the second Lord's day in this month, at Steep Bank Church, in Lawrence County, Ark.

The following churches were represented: "Steep Bank, Blue Spring, Mill Creek, Stony Point, Christian Union, South Fork, Mud Creek, Glaze Creek, Rocky Bayou, Red River, Point Remove, Greasy Valley and Rocky Point.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Brother Adam Henderson. Brother Daniel Kose acted as Chairman of the meeting. The membership of the churches represented was 594, and the contributions for evangelizing was \$370 75.

Bros. John M. Lemmons and John Saylor were chosen to labor as evangelists for the ensuing year.

The next Co-operation Meeting was appointed to be held at Mill Creek Church, in Izzard county, on the Friday before the second Lord's day in October, 1857.

The meeting was adjourned by prayer by Brother Brown.

JAS. H. MUMLINIKS, Sec'y.

October 24th, 1856.

## THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

MUCH more than thankful to Heaven are the conductors of the Gospel Advocate for the promptness of the beloved brethren in circulating the work. Our plan of renewing subscriptions has worked admirably well. It tends very much to excite the brethren to habits of punctuality, and places the paper on the proper basis.

We are also very thankful to God for the encouraging manner in which our brethren write to us regarding our preference for the church to modern institutions. But for this encouragement, and the confidence that the work is exerting a most beneficial influence, we should feel no disposition to write. We respectfully suggest to our brethren, that by very slight exertion we presume the Advocate might be introduced amongst sincere inquirers after truth, of the world and of the denominations, with good effect. No one can tell how much good he can do but by trying. Dear Brethren, let us work together to promote the cause of Christ. Never were men and women honored in the advocacy of such a cause?

Let us know, brethren, without delay, how many of your friends wish to read the Gospel Advocate. T. F. & W. L.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE are most anxious to hear from our brethren in all sections of the country, and hope there will be no hesitancy in writing to us freely. The epistles and communications of the saints always cheer us, and we have lived to satisfy ourselves that every one knows something which would profit others. Send us religious news, brethren, and let us have all of your good thoughts. We need each other's encouragement.

T. F.

---

PORTRAITS OF THE BRETHREN.

Brother James Challen has sent us a very exact and admirable picture of himself; and informs us that he will soon have one out for Brother Campbell, and perhaps for others.

Address James Challen & Sons, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

REPORTS OF EVANGELISTS.

Brother John N. Mulkey, of Bowling Green, Ky., reports 248 additions in the "Warren and Barren co-operation," Ky.

## JOHN T. JOHNSON IS NO MORE!

Brother Geo. W. Elly writes to us from Lexington, Ky., under date of December 24, 1856, that information had just reached that place to the effect, that Brother John T. Johnson departed this life on the 18th of December, at Lexington, Missouri, from an attack of pneumonia of some ten days existence." One of the best and greatest men of the age has fallen. Brother Johnson was practically an earnest advocate of the truth "as it is written;" and his great goodness was manifested from his long and untiring devotion to the cause of Christ. The idea of failure never found a place in his heart; and his success, for some twenty-five years, in his labor of love, we suppose, has been equalled by no man of our country. There was an earnestness of manner in his preaching, and an undoubting confidence evinced in the inspiration of the Scriptures, which never failed to reach the heart.

We sincerely sympathise with his relatives, but Christians should regard the fall of Brother Johnson as a great and irreparable calamity. Whom will the Lord raise up to take his place? T. F.

## "THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS ON CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES."

BY WALTER SCOTT.

*Published by James Challen & Sons, Philadelphia.*

THE above is the style of Brother Scott's work on "Union," as given to the public by Brother Challen & Sons.

This book has been approved by the brethren generally. The indefatigable Brother C. has published it in both a handsome and cheap form. We will be glad to send orders.

Prices. Paper cover 30 cents, \$3 per dozen; Muslin 40 cents.

MIDWAY, MADISON CO., TEXAS, Nov. 10, 1856.

BRO. LIPSCOMB:—I am pleased to see that "The Gospel Advocate" is extending its circulation in this State. I shall take pleasure in doing what I can for it. Owing to a scarcity of evangelists in my section of the State, my field of labor is extensive. I have, during the summer and fall, labored in the counties of Grimes, Walker, Houston, Free-stone, Limestone, Leon and Madison; in which there have been fifty accessions. I find the brethren liberal in contributing to the support of the gospel.

We want more preachers. Good, common sense, practical men. Men who practice what they preach.

Yours in the Lord,

J. A. CLARK.

HARDIN COUNTY, TENN., Oct. 31, 1856.

BRO. FANNING:—The youngest son of brother John A. Sharpe, Tolbert Fanning Sharpe, died on yesterday at 2 o'clock, P. M. He was eight years of age, and I have never seen such manifestations of serious and profound devotion in any other child. I never heard him laugh, and his countenance was most innocent, and lovely. We knelt by his coffin to-day before putting him in his little grave, to rest till the resurrection morn.

His niece, a sweet child of four years old, who died at two o'clock, A. M., of the same day is laid near him.

He heard she was about to die, and said to his aunt, "Tell her farewell for me." In twenty-four hours both children had departed.

They left us weeping—bitterly weeping. Is it not strange we mourn that the Savior has taken the precious lambs to his fold? Has transplanted the sweet flowers to bloom in the garden of Life? Can you not say something to soothe the sorrows and bind up the bleeding hearts of your old friends?  
A. KENDRICK.

---

HARDIN COUNTY, TENN., Nov. 27, 1856.

BRO. FANNING:—"Who has not lost a friend?" I wrote you of dear little Tolbert's departure,—his sister, Ann Eliza Sharpe, aged 14 years, 1 month and 19 days, left this morning to embrace him in the land of happy spirits.

Your old friend, sister Ann Sharpe, and her oldest daughter, Rachel, are yet very low—but not afraid of death. I am overwhelmed with sympathy for Brother Sharpe, who remains under his heart-rending afflictions, sleeplessly vigilant, ever ready and ever resigned to the calls of his family and to the will of his God.

The beloved Ann Eliza has for weeks desired to be freed from the corruptions of earth that she might live with her Savior. She frequently spoke of her lovely little niece, Ann N. Fraly, and her sweet brother, Tolbert, and longed to be with them in Paradise.

Death had lost its sting, and eternal spring, with boundless fields of unfading flowers, seemed to open before her. Oh! that we too may be ready!  
A. KENDRICK.

We most sincerely sympathize with these friends of our youth. The Lord will sustain.  
T. F.

---

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

## PHILANTHOPIA INSTITUTE, PALESTINE, BEAVER, ETC.

Being delayed at Palestine by unusual interest in the Church, we did not reach this place till the first instant. Now, safely at home, we are arranging for winter quarters and the labors of the future. This is a country post office, surrounded by an excellent neighborhood. The land range, building rock, water and health could hardly be surpassed. The timber is good and abundant two to five miles distant. I expect to commence a family school here first of January next, and have engaged one of the best teachers, by whose labors I expect not to be confined to the school so as to hinder my preaching. Those received as boarders will be such as are recommended as good boys and young men, who will submit to strict parental discipline. Such as are willing to work may, in some instances, be able to pay part or all of their expenses by their labor. I have four sons, and will expect others to abide their fare and usage. The course of study will be mainly elementary at first, and as thorough as desirable at last.

Many persons cannot send to college—many students should not be sent. May we be preparatory, and thus auxiliary to older schools of learning. *Usefulness* will not be lost sight of, or compromised for success, or for any other reason.

The churches at Palestine and Beaver, in Anderson county, are in a most flourishing condition. I never knew the Christian cause more triumphant. Paul and Barnabas labored some three years in and near Antioch, and then the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul," to go to other fields, because that one was supplied so as to do without them. May I hope that the cause is established in my former field of labor? Certainly the disciples there are able to maintain it themselves, and more than able to sustain any they may choose to aid them from other fields of labor. Hence, the responsibility is upon them. It was hard to leave them. I never was more severely tried. But I am now at home, I trust for the remainder of my days. The blessings of God be upon them!

C. K.

Salado, Bell County, Texas, Nov. 8, 1856.

---

TWO HINDERING CAUSES.

ALL my experience and observation convince me that, according to the Holy Book, our greatest hindrances are, *first*, from a want of dis-



discipline in the churches; and, *second*, from *bad management* when it is undertaken. Without strict discipline, managed with heavenly wisdom, (*prudence*,) no cause can succeed well. We need, above all things, good overseers. Many, ah! very many, of our evangelists need them and their most vigorous Christian labors. The church is the school, and preachers are, to a large extent, the teachers—and yet they too often need to be taught! What shall be done?

Such preachers and overseers as do see and feel aright, and are able to work, should not spare their hand. Many of the teachers to be taught, and all the minors—surely this is no child's work, and who is to do it? Ah! this is the question. I can only answer now—*those who can*. Let each one try. Truth is powerful within itself, and the Lord is on its side. Who will be *popular*, and who will be *useful*? Who will work on *their own* plan, and who on the *Lord's* plan? To the law and the testimony.

I rejoice very much that our editors, whether for one cause or another, seem to have learned that personal acrimony is not *tolerable* amongst the brotherhood. Success is not in sarcasm or wit. How delightful the heavenly rule, "Let all your things be done with love." More soon.

C. K.

---

### OBITUARY.

CRAWFORDSVILLE, MISS., October 15, 1856.

BRO. FANNING:—Brother A. J. Swepstone departed this life on the 18th June last, after an illness of only a few days. He was born in Danville, Va., April 6th, 1826, removed thence to North Mississippi, obtained his education at Franklin College, Tennessee, returned to Mississippi, married in Aberdeen, and has been engaged in teaching ever since either in the neighborhood of that city, or near and at this place. He had procured a nice little home near this village and had a flourishing school at the time of his death. He has left a devoted wife to mourn his loss, and two little girls to whom he was greatly attached. Bro. Swepstone was a man of a very vigorous discerning and sound mind, of fine judgment, a good scholar and excellent teacher. Few men have so much energy, and can overcome so many obstacles as he was able and did surmount. He was devoted to his family, was an excellent husband and kind father. He became a member of the Christian church while at Franklin, and remained so until his death. He was a good Bible scholar and indeed a remarkably well informed man every way. While he admitted he had not been as zealous as he might in the christian cause, yet his confidence in the Saviour and hope of happiness were unshaken. Let us therefore "not sorrow as those who have no hope." Kindly yours,

P. B. LAWSON.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

---

VOL. III.      NASHVILLE, FEBRUARY, 1857.      NO. 2.

---

## METAPHYSICAL DISCUSSIONS.—No. 5.

WE have endeavored to set forth in plain terms, the chief speculative systems of our times, but we have not attempted a discussion of the merits of any one of them. Neither do we regard a critical examination of any theory necessary for our present purpose. We are frank, however, to state, that we have had, and still have, two prominent objects in view, viz: We have desired to show that speculative systems may be reduced to a few very simple ideas; and, secondly, we have been anxious to give our readers confidence to look all false systems fully in the face. We take this occasion also to remark, that no man can think correctly on any subject, unless he has a correct standard of thought. If there is no standard of truth, then there can be no discussion of any question. All systems are either true or false, as men may fancy conclusions. The fact is, that in matters of religion it is quite remarkable, that nine-tenths of the people of the age have no supposition that there is any infallible rule of right. The general supposition is, that all religious systems amount to about the same thing, and hence in the language of modern infidelity, "As to the how of religion it makes no difference." The Egyptians who worshipped bulls, cats, almost all the brute creation, were as devoted in the sight of Heaven as the most devoted disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such, to say the least, is a most *brutal* idea of religion.

As we intend this essay as a sort of summing up of systems of speculation, our readers will bear with us for repeating in order the most important theories. This course will leave the whole subject fresh in the mind.

1st. Philosophers of almost every grade, and religious theorists generally, agree in maintaining the doctrine of deriving all knowledge of God and things divine, from the *external world*. This is called the *a posteriori* argument; or the argument from effect to cause, taking for granted that all men, unenlightened as well as the enlightened, would conclude that the world and all its parts are results and not causes. This is the doctrine in all the philosophical books; it is found in every Sunday school under the name of natural religion, and it is preached from Protestant pulpits generally. There are, we believe, a few individuals in the respective denominations who doubt its truth. Without any hesitation, we pronounce the doctrine of Natural theology, in all its shapes and bearings, *false, deceitful and subversive* of the Christian religion. We admit the translators of King James' version of the Scriptures believed the doctrine and really endeavored to warp and twist the Bible into its favor. But admitting they did so, they only involved the sacred writers in contradictions and many injurious absurdities. Paul says: "*The world [by wisdom (philosophy)] knew not God. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.*" Again he says, there are certain persons "*Without hope and without God in the world.*" With these declarations before us, we see not how any one can prove by the Bible, or otherwise, that nature is a teacher of heavenly things, without involving the authors of the Bible in very gross contradictions. We would, however, knowing the strong predilections of some of our able writers on this doctrine, respectfully invite them to give a single scriptural or other argument in favor of its truth. This is the proper way to get at the truth. Our columns are open to all communications of merit becoming the subject.

At another time we may be inclined to examine the doctrine of nature's revelations on its own merits. Suffice it for our present purpose to say, that if true, supernatural revelations, as represented in the Bible, are unworthy of our confidence, and every one is left as the lower animals to follow whatever impulses nature and the circumstances in which we live may prompt.

2d. The doctrine *a priori*, from cause to effect, or which says, we possess in our constitution either the elements of all spiritual truth, or the natural power to *originate* knowledge, heavenly and divine, has been maintained in most of the speculative systems from the *Hindoo vedas* to modern Spiritualism. It is by no means difficult to state it, and a child can comprehend it quite as well as the profoundest thinker. The forms, however, in which it is expressed are without number, but it must be borne in mind the idea is one.

The Hindoos spoke of *Bram*, who filled all things, and constitutes the better parts of our inward being; the Chinese advocated the same doctrine in a different form; Socrates pleaded for an inward *demon*, which was a part of himself to guide him; Plato's doctrine of ideas being one with the Divinity amounted to the same thing; Leibnitz's theory of nature's within, capable of forming ideas, and Descartes' notion of *infallible thinking* varied not; Newman's "*direct knowing*," and our "*higher law doctrine*," in the United States, differ but in name. It is somewhat remarkable, that this doctrine prevails in all the schools and colleges of the land, or if there are exceptions, (save F. C.,) we know not of them. They all use the books which advocate the *intuitive divine knowledge of feeling*, which is above the understanding. Some call it, the "inner light of the conscience, that enlightens every one that comes into the world;" some as before intimated, "the higher law of our nature," and others again, clamor loudly for something they call "*pure reason*," which draws conclusions infallibly correct, without the help of external aid. But who does not see that there is nothing new in these forms of expression.

But worst of all, this is the doctrine of the pulpit and the religious press generally. Even at Princeton a work has recently been published on "*Aesthetics*," which if it does not flatly contradict the Germans who are the reputed authors of the doctrine in modern times, must maintain the theory of natural ability of determining moral questions without assistance. We regret most seriously to notice a very strong tendency even amongst the disciples of Christ, who profess to take the Bible alone as their only standard, to adopt the doctrine of inward spiritual ability to grasp the truth, without help from God or man. We were much surprised in reading the August number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, to notice an address by one W. J. Russell, of Missouri, who on graduating delivered one of the most infidel productions we have seen. We had hoped to see a rebuke from Brother Campbell, but none has reached us. To give the reader some idea of the production, we will notice a few expressions. "*The manifesting power is the Spirit.*" "*We rely, as the foundation of all our knowing, upon these infinite manifestations within us.*" "*Mingled with our thoughts and manifesting a part of them, are inspirations of the infinite mind.*" "*Spirit, either our own, or that of God, acting within us is the only cause of the effect which we call intelligence.*" "*Genius is God's message to the world.*" "*High instincts before which our mortal nature doth tremble.*" "*We are forced to find the evidence of God in the soul.*" "*It leads the worshiper*

into the temple of his God—into the soul." "The voice of the heart is the voice of God." "We shall not wait for time and place to worship, but adore always and every where, for the universe, and every atom of it, is the utterance of God."

With this vain, pompous, empty, and pantheistic style, many of our readers are quite familiar. They well recollect the deceit and very mean apostacy of the Ferguson family. Such jargon is quite a sufficiency to set our face against all such impertinence, and if our brethren will continue to encourage such writers and preachers, we have ample cause to fear much evil.

Universalists and modern Spiritualists, in addition to the above swelling style, speak grandiloquently of "nature's laws," and frequently of their inflexible character. It is indeed strange, that after all the boast of spirits and people making revelations, the adepts of the craft admit that the *spirits* and *appearances* are intended for the grosser beings of earth; but say they, when we can perfectly abstract ourselves from the world, we can hold direct converse, through the inner man, with God, or the soul of the world. Descartes remained most of his time in bed, in order to free himself from the world, and that his mind might act directly. Swedenborg adopted a like view, and it is said that Andrew Jackson Davis, the chief soothsayer of the times, is now preparing divers works for publication, without *media*, by direct intercourse with the god within, the soul, "the temple of God," in the words of our infidel young hero of Missouri. But this is not the worst; the papers say the notorious "Ned Buntlin," who was hung in Nashville for seduction and murder, but saved by cutting the rope just before his little divinity left these mortal shores, is a convert to the *a priori*—to the direct spiritualism of the soul, and is making singular developments. God anciently did not select money thieves or slaves of the flesh as media of his divine communications; and the very fact that many renegades of this age and country possess wisdom above what is written in the Bible, renders the subject of direct knowledge from within very doubtful.

We state in much confidence that the two theories, viz: Knowledge from the external world, and knowledge from our supposed inward spiritual nature, in our judgment comprehend all the professed philosophical systems of the world.

There is, however, another view of the subject to which we think it proper to call attention.

3d. From the year 325 to the present day, most professed Christians



have regarded it their privilege and duty to assemble together in order to philosophize as to the meaning of the Bible, to decree the best articles of faith, to adopt the best constitutions and by-laws, for religious co-operation; to regulate schools and publications, to select agents, and determine all questions for the members of the church.

It is admitted that these ecumenical councils were not known in the first, second or third century; they began their operations in the fourth, and it can scarcely be doubted that they have caused all the differences in religion to this hour. Some forty or fifty years ago a number of good men, in various parts of the United States, concluded that they could reject all the discoveries and improvements made by these councils, and fall back on the original constitution and by-laws of the church of Christ with great safety. The effort proved successful beyond all calculations, and a better religious impression has been made upon the world by it than has been witnessed since the apostacy under Constantine the great.

It may be in place to suggest, that recently many, apparently good brethren, have been disposed to philosophize as to the best co-operation systems, the best mode of educating and paying preachers, and, indeed, the best mode of doing all that is to be performed by religionists.

We offer no argument against this course of things. The brethren in due time will examine all the "departures and bearings" of the speculative. We merely state, that the course is quite a humiliating admission, that we have no creed, no church government, no organization or church co-operation in the Bible, and we are left to concoct such rules of action as may best suit our taste. But we show unto you "*a more excellent way.*"

4th. Man in his origin was frail—liable to temptation—he sinned—was driven from the garden of delights, and has been a wanderer, a trembler, (as was said of Cain,) and a speculator ever since. In no age have the sons and daughters of earth been capable of directing their way. By following their impulses—the flesh—instead of taking wholesome advice from the Heavenly Father, they brought down the flood, and all the sufferings of earth have been in consequence of sin.

At no time have the wisest manifested capability to originate a single moral idea, or principle of government. In the fullness of time God sent forth his Son, born under the law, to redeem all men who could or can be saved by moral means. Through his Son has the Father communicated his will to a lost world. This will is A PERFECT CREED, better adapted to our wants than any interpretation of it. "The church

is the pillar and support of the truth," and as it is impossible for any human being to speculate correctly, or learn any thing above what is written, all that remains for us to do, in order to obtain eternal life, is to cease from man whose breath and whose divinity is in his nostrils, and believe implicitly *what is written*, in the words of the Spirit, and not in the words of man. This course will bring all the candid to the unity of the faith in the bonds of peace; will enable individuals and churches to co-operate for good throughout the world, and will save us from vast labor in endeavoring to construct systems of belief, and of co-operation in the churches, and by it we may learn what training the Father requires to make us good and useful.

T. F.

### "YE CANNOT SERVE GOD AND MAMMON."

THE age in which we live is essentially a time-serving, mammon-loving age. The value of every acquisition, of every avocation of life, is estimated in dollars and cents. When the youth plants his foot upon twenty-one, the threshold of his manhood, and surveys the wild field of busy, bustling life spread out before him, the question of most moment to him, in general, is, "In what channel shall I direct my energies in order to become rich?" The answer to this vital question frequently determines his destiny for time and eternity. How solemn the thought, that the decision of a moment may tell upon the destiny of the deathless spirit, when earth and time, and the things thereof shall have been buried in the oblivion of the long past!

"Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," said the Great Teacher; yet how many are in practice endeavoring every day to reconcile the service of the two! How many professed followers of Christ, who expect to stand acquitted before the Tribunal of the High Court of Heaven, are striving with more earnest devotion after "the meat that perishes," than "for that meat which endures unto everlasting life; taxing all their energies, both of body and mind, in concocting and executing new plans by which they may get more of the dear "filthy lucre." The religion of such is a mere Sunday, church-going religion, and a very selfish concern at that. Their Christian arithmetic is substantially the same as the arithmetic of their business life—*Addition, Interest, Loss and Gain*. The object of their *true* devotion in this world; but in as much as they are assured that they must ere long journey to an unknown country, whither they cannot carry the good things of earth; and in as much as they have been taught to believe

that their condition in the future world, without an interest in the Christian salvation, will be most lamentable indeed, they deem it expedient to take a sufficiency of stock in heavenly treasure to save their souls in eternity. This makes religion a mere matter of trade and speculation—an insurance, bought with a price, to secure its beneficiaries against the fire of hell.

The besetting sin of the age, particularly in our own country where golden harvests may be reaped from so many fields, is inordinate love of the world. Among the various churches, we hear often the complaint of deadness, coldness, want of spirituality. Their vital energies become so completely frozen up that it requires a whole camp-meeting, with repeated doses of sermons, as red hot as if indicted with a pen of flame in Tartarus itself to unfreeze them. This condition of things frequently gives rise to the cry for "preachers, preachers, send us preachers or we die!" How oft is it said, "We have had no preaching for some time, and *therefore* the cause is languishing!" as if the life of the church was dependent upon electricity, generated by the friction of perpetual sermonizing!

This lukewarmness, this indifference is a practical illustration of the truth spoken by the Master, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." We become worldly-minded. We serve mammon, with earnest zeal, six days in the week, and as a necessary consequence are illy prepared to serve God on the seventh. The service of the one we perform with alacrity and pleasure, our hearts being enlisted therein with true devotion; that of the other with reluctance, as a grievous task—a matter of duty, considered merely as such. Thus our worship, instead of being a heartfelt, soul-full anthem of praise to the God of the universe, becomes a mere matter of form and lifeless, spiritless ceremony. How strange the delusion, when persons persuade themselves that such constitute the worship of God! Far better would it be, both in time and eternity, to make no pretensions to Christianity; for this poor, niggardly life-service cannot but be an abomination in the sight of God. To serve him acceptably the heart's purest, warmest, best affections must be enlisted in his cause. It was never intended that the service of God should be a sort of drudgery, performed against our inclinations; and the very fact of one's regarding the performance of his Christian duties as a perpetual cross to be borne, is evidence that the religion of Jesus has not exerted its wonted influences upon his heart. It is true that the requirements of Christianity are often diametrically opposed to our inclinations—to the instincts of the flesh; but "pure and unde-

filed religion" is competent to subdue the rebellious heart that comes under its influences, and to bring all the discordant elements of our rude, untutored nature to sweet subjection to its heavenly rule. The heart without Christian culture is like the rude stone in its native home. When first taken from the mountain quarry, it opposes to the chisel rough surfaces and angularities; but these soon yield to the chisel strokes of the skillful artisan, and the uncouth, unsightly ashlar becomes a polished, comely, *educated* stone. So the influences of Christianity were intended to "block off" the rude projections of our stubborn human nature, and to polish, educate and build up, as "lively stones," in the Spiritual Temple of God.

While it is true, therefore, that our acts should not always be the result of our feelings and inclinations, it is equally true that proper feelings and holy, heavenly aspirations will be the result of our acts, when performed in accordance with the will of God. When we pray with a fervent spirit in the congregation, or in the silent grove under the dome of Nature's broad temple, realizing that we are in the presence of the great God, we cannot but be benefitted by our service. But if, on the other hand, we pray, like the Pharisees, to be heard of men, our prayer, however eloquent in diction, will be an abomination before heaven, and we cannot but be made worse by our service. So when we sing, if our song is the fervent offering of a grateful heart to the "Father of mercies," we will be made stronger and better and happier by our service. But if, on the contrary, our music is more in concert, intended to produce an *operatic* effect upon the ears of men, however finely it may be executed, it will be discord in the ears of him who is pleased only with the melody of the heart; and we cannot but be injured by the hypocritical performance.

If then we would enjoy true spiritual blessings; if we would attain that preparation of heart indispensable to fit us for the society of God, and of angels, and of the hosts of pure and exalted spirits, who have escaped the pollutions of earth and "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb;" we must carry our religion into the practical concerns of our every-day life. Our lives should be so permeated with the Spirit of Christ, that while we are "not slothful in business," we may ever be "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." A community of Christians so living will never have cause to complain of a want of spirituality or of preachers. But if, on the contrary, they are devoted heart and soul to the service of mammon, the preaching of a Paul, of an Apollos, would utterly fail to keep them alive.

F. M. CARMACK.



---

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE WORD.

PREACHING the gospel is literally proclaiming that word which the apostles declared to the world, beginning at Jerusalem. It is the appointed means of Heaven for the conversion of men. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Paul declares the gospel to be the power of God unto salvation. Consequently there is no power unto salvation but the word which the apostles preached. To advocate the idea, that there is any other power able to save but the truth—the word of God—evidently betrays a disbelief of the gospel. None are saved by it, but those who believe it and obey it. That which is not effected by the word is not of God. Those who be heirs of salvation, and attribute the change of their minds and lives to any other power but the gospel of Christ, virtually refuse to give God the honor of that change.

When the Savior prayed for all them that should believe on him through the word of the apostles, (which he afterwards commissioned them to go and publish abroad,) he manifested no recognition of any other influence through which men would believe on him, but that gospel which they preached. Let us hear Paul in reference to preaching the word: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we (the apostles) have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Nothing but that gospel which the apostles proclaimed to the people must be preached. Nothing foreign, nothing speculative can be included, nor nothing therein given can be omitted with impunity. Nothing gathered from the prolific fountains of human philosophy, nothing borrowed from the glittering stores of worldly wisdom can add to the power or wisdom displayed in the word of revelation. Nothing but its own inherent truth, its own intrinsic power can reclaim the sinner from his lost estate and bring him home to God. Jesus said to his apostles when giving the commission, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believes and is baptized shall be saved; he that believes not shall be damned." None can obtain salvation but through the belief of the gospel as proclaimed by the apostles. Therefore, if the word must be believed just as recorded, how indispensably needful that it should be preached with the same undeviating adherence to the language given by the Holy Spirit to the apostles. They that believe it not cannot be saved. If it is not understood it cannot be believed. Hence we see that salvation is dependent upon a full and literal apprehension of the whole gospel truth. The Savior gave the



apostles promises that the Spirit should guide them into all truth. From this it is evident that there was nothing more to be revealed, all direct communication by the Spirit was completed. Furthermore, it is evident that the whole truth, all that the Spirit taught, through the apostles, is indispensable to salvation. The word entire is the power of God. Hence the great propriety of the injunction, preach the word. Our Savior prayed that all those who should believe on him through the word or gospel, preached by the apostles, might be one as he and his Father are one. Their oneness in faith, in repentance and obedience unto life; their oneness in doctrine and practical usages; their oneness in hope, inspired by the promises of the gospel to the obedient, was referred to by the Savior as a living and perpetual evidence to the world through all ages that he was the Messiah—sent of God. The truth, the word of God, is uniform in its effect. All that receive its illumination, and come under its benign and saving influence, are of one heart and one mind. They are all baptized by the same spirit through the word into one body—are all built upon the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. The disciples of Jesus are manifestly known by their adherence to the gospel of the Savior's kingdom. Why then are not all who profess Christianity united? Why so many opposing sects and diverse parties? Perversion of the word has produced them. The word of life has been handled deceitfully. Many hearts have been shielded from the power of the truth. Human reason, bold and vainly confident in its own efficiency, has arrogantly assumed the liberty of interpreting, defining and philosophising on the word of revelation, by false inferential deduction, and behold now the fruit of their labors are seen in the countless number of conflicting theories and discordant systems that distract the religious world, dishonor God, deceive souls, and hinder the success of the gospel. The apostles had full as much right and authority to reject the teaching of the Spirit by inspiration and substitute their own imaginary views and fancied theories, and preach them to the people, as men have now to depart from the teaching of the Spirit, given to us through the apostles, and substitute any thing different from that which Peter, Philip, Ananias, and Paul with the rest of the apostles declared to the world. They who do not preach the word with full confidence—with all confidence in its power—are destitute of any and every degree of authorized confidence in God's power to save. Such would do well to meditate upon Paul's denunciation against those who pervert the word, the power of God, and hinder men from coming to a knowledge of the truth.

O that men would read the word and learn the truth, for the sake of truth, and preach the gospel, the whole gospel and nothing else, and teach with a view only to honor God and instruct the wandering how to find a home in heaven.

J. M. SELPH.

Madison, Tenn., Dec. 15, 1856.

### "THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY" AT CINCINNATI, OHIO.

It is, perhaps, known to all our readers, that the brethren at their annual meeting in Cincinnati, in October, 1836, "Resolved" to blot from existence the American Christian Bible Society, and the American Christian Publication Society, and to concentrate all their means in "The American Missionary Society, and the American Bible Union." The papers of the brethren, we believe, have generally given evidence of hearty support, and we have before us a very affectionate appeal from Brother C. L. Loos, to give the enterprise our support. In the circumstance we feel not at liberty to remain silent.

We most cordially approve of the efforts to *revise the Holy Scriptures*, and we feel confident that it is through missionary operations alone the perishing of earth must be saved, if saved at all. Why then, we are asked, should we not establish missionary societies in every section of the country, for the purpose of saving sinners? In answering this question it will be proper to show the ground we must occupy. We regard the Church of Christ as the only divinely authorized Bible, Missionary and Temperance Society on earth; and furthermore, we believe that it is in and by means of the church the world is to be converted, and Christians are to labor for the Lord. We can see no difficulty in churches co-operating in any and every good work as the churches of Jesus Christ did in "choosing a brother to travel," and in sending "messengers of the churches." 2 Cor. viii, 19-23. Our brethren may tell us, all they mean is the co-operation of the churches and members. But we ask, if it would not be better to *speak* of great works being conducted by the churches. Brother Loos speaks of "the Missionary Society standing alone amongst us to concentrate the liberality of the brotherhood." He says it should "not be a weak, partial institution, but as a strong, national one," "*for the conversion of the world.*" In all the efforts to do the service of the Lord through human institutions, it has seemed to us that the church is degraded, and rendered indeed useless. If the missionary society is to convert the

world, as Brother Loos intimates, and to concentrate the benevolence of the brethren, and send the "Barclay Family to Palestine, and soon establish other missions," it occurs to us that the church has proved worthless, she has waxed old, and is ready to vanish away.

While on this point, it will be respectful to Brother J. R. Howard to suggest that the scheme he presented, on the 370 page of the last volume of the Advocate, indicates as much wisdom as any human plan we have noticed.

He recommends, 1. "*District Co-operations.*" 2. These to form "*State Associations;*" and, 3. These to constitute a grand "*Convention.*" "Not like the disreputable one," says he, "that met at Cincinnati some years since." He advises the machinery to be got up "somewhat on the plan of the Methodist Conference"—"to make a set of rules to govern the members—to establish a '*Book Concern*'—take charge of our colleges, and send out general agents for the collection of funds." Brother Howard's plan is on a grander scale than any we have seen, but should we have to do all this, we think it would be better to be silent as to the church, and to save time and expense, we might take passage with our Methodist friends, or in some other modern craft, which has all the machinery which the brethren are endeavoring to construct actively at work.

But we desire at present to offer no argument against the *expedients* of our brethren, and we assure Bros. Loos, Howard, Milligan and all of our beloved brethren, that we desire to keep them company, and should we find that we can exert a better influence through "central unions," missionary societies, modern secret societies, district, State and general conference associations, than through the Church of Christ, we will exert all our powers to build up and strengthen such associations as we may deem better adapted to the wants of society than the Church of the Lord. Till then, we must prefer the church to direct our labor.

T. F.

### "HUMAN ORGANIZATIONS."

REPLY TO W. G. ROULHAC.

LEXINGTON, KY., Dec. 24, 1856.

BRO: G. W. ROULHAC:—After my respects and Christian regards, allow me to say, that I have this moment read your address, through the "Gospel Advocate," headed "Human Organizations *versus* the Church of Christ," in reply to a note from me to an unknown correspondent in the October number, specially in reference to the following

assertion: "We move in Kentucky with a steady step towards a hierarchy as unscriptural as that of Rome or England, and the preachers who seek to make themselves the church, appear to think all is well. It seems that some are endeavoring to degrade the church into an auxiliary to the more than foolish societies of our age and country." This quotation contains the sentiment to which I directed my reply, and your reply has by no means changed my position. The proof you now furnish, Brother R., appears mainly in the following question: "Is the State Meeting of Kentucky, with its articles numbered from one to eleven in its constitution, of Divine or human appointment?" I freely answer, that it was of human origin of course. Yet by this admission I by no means admit your reasoning to be that of divinity, or that you can claim to be justified in your assertion. The assertion which you make is not necessarily founded upon the facts of the case, but upon your opinion of the facts.

I deny that the State Meeting organization or work does in the least infringe upon any of the rights or the privileges of the churches of Christ; and I also deny that it is any more the work or movement of the preachers than the churches to which they belong.

All Christians can but admit, that it is the imperative duty of the church to convert the world, and that what one congregation ought to do outside of her immediate influence, in order to accomplish such a work, two, three or one hundred may unite, both in means, talent and labor to accomplish. Brother R. will not, I think, deny this. This, then, is all that our State Meeting has attempted. It possesses no ecclesiastical judicial power over any human being in or out of the church. Its only object is to receive the voluntary contributions of the churches sent to it by their own messengers, and direct the same according to their wishes.

It is purely a missionary society, yet you charge that "That society have labored to degrade the church into its auxiliary."

But you are also somewhat excited about our attempting to educate some persons for the ministry. Let me say, my brother, that all that is anticipated is simply to furnish to such persons of known reputation for piety and talent, who desire to spend their lives in the work, (but owing to their poverty are unable to do so,) the means necessary to a good literary education. As to theology, they learn that from the Holy Oracles and the church of God.

Would you think that when six congregations agree to contribute the means for such a purpose, and then appoint a committee of one



from each congregation to direct those means to that end, that they would degrade themselves by so doing? I can scarcely think that of brother R.

As to brother Burnett's discourse, it was distinctly understood when voted for publication that the State Meeting did not either approve or disapprove it, but simply give it for what it was worth. For myself I was opposed to its publication, fearing that some persons would regard it as authoritative.

May the Lord aid us in a becoming spirit to bear with each other, and jointly co-operate in the work of saving a world which lieth in sin, is my prayer.

Yours as ever,

G. W. ELLEY.

---

For the Gospel Advocate.

### DESULTORY REFLECTIONS.

JANUARY 14, 1857.

ANOTHER year has passed away, and been numbered with those "beyond the flood." And could the record it would present of the actions of men be written out, how various would it be! While many pages would appear in "characters of living light," the deeds and doings of the good, and righteous and holy, how many and how far would exceed the dark and the bloody pages of human crime, and suffering and wickedness! Alas for man that it is so; and good for him that the last are redeemed by the first from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the final conflagration; or how many hundreds of millions would be hurried unprepared to give their final account before the bar of God!—a bar from which there can be no appeal, and the decisions of which will remain unreversed through eternity! Our Savior while on earth told his apostles they were "the salt of the earth"—that which should preserve it—and the *righteous* are its salt now; and though not perhaps in the same sense exactly, yet were the world deprived of them all, it would soon come to an end! How few ever reflect upon this, in their opposition to the religion of Christ!

The year has passed away, and how many have passed away too, brief as it was! It is supposed, and with probable correctness, that at least one human being dies every second of time that passes. According to this about *thirty-one and a half millions* of human beings have died during the year 1856! What a vast number for one short year, whose eternal destiny is now fixed and unalterable! "As the tree falls, so shall it lie." Many of these have gone to render their



final account with joy, on the great day when all will have to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; but the great majority will appear with shame and sorrow, when their mountain heaps of unpardoned sins will rise up before them, and condemn them to an eternity of anguish, despair and fiery punishment and indignation of God! But their awful fate is sealed, and sealed forever; for there will be no averting it, and no way of escape from it! In the language of the poet:

"There are no acts of pardon passed,  
In the cold grave to which we haste."

How rapidly rolls away the stream of time! Since at the command of Joshua the Almighty stayed the sun in his fiery chariot, and caused the moon to pause in her silver car, time has been regularly, unceasingly moving on and passing away—too slow for some, and for others too swift and rapidly. The poet spoke truthfully when he said:

"Time on whose never ceasing wing,  
The varying moments *flap* or *fly*,  
Whose tardy winter, fleeting spring,  
But *drag* or *drive* us on to die."

While it thus drives or drags us, it is bearing us all on to the common goal—the final resting place—of all mankind—death and the grave! And were this all—did existence cease here—it would matter but little with man how he spent his life in this world, further than to prolong it as far as possible, except those who become tired of life, and hurry themselves out of the world, by cutting loose the thread of existence. But while time is thus carrying us onward to its end, it is also bearing us on equally rapidly to a *never-ending existence* beyond the tomb, where we shall "every man be rewarded according as his work has been" in this world. Brief as is the little span of life, the *fate* of man for this eternity of existence depends upon the manner in which he employs it. Short as it is, he has to form a *character* during it, that shall fit him for heaven, for the abodes of bliss; or, if he neglect it, he will leave the world with a character that will *unfit* him for heaven, and cause him to make his abode in hell, and share the punishment of the devil and his angels—the *second death*.

"Oh, what eternal horrors hang  
Around that second death!"

Let the sinner then—the alien to the government of God—make preparation for death and eternity, by submitting to that government, and then so living as to secure eternal life; for he knows not but *this* may be *his* last year, and that he may be *one* of the many millions to whom it will prove the last! We would then say to him, to all, "Prepare, oh man, to meet thy God."

J. R. H.

## CORRECTION.

OUR readers will remember that Brother F. M. Carmack, in the November number of the Advocate for 1856, suggested, in a most kind and respectful manner, the probable incorrectness of Brother J. Challen's admission regarding the statement of "Mr. Graham, Dr. Alexander's teacher." "He scouted the opinion," said Brother Challen, "that in regeneration there is any physical operation on the soul itself, and held that by the influence of the Holy Spirit truth is presented in its true nature to the soul." He adds: "This is the teaching of the disciples."

Brother Carmack understood Brother Challen to hold the doctrine of the spirit's presenting the truth *directly* to the mind. At the time we thought likely he might be mistaken, but we are candid in saying, that Bro. Challen's remark is by no means clear.

Again, Brother Carmack understood Brother Challen to agree with Dr. Alexander, in saying, that "*The Spirit of God by an instantaneous touch, prepares the soul to apprehend the truth.*" In reference to this point we are fully satisfied that Brother Carmack was *mistaken*, and we are glad, in justice to Brother Challen, to make the correction.

Brother Challen has written a lengthy reply, but should we publish it, we would be compelled to publish remarks from Brother Carmack, and we think there is no ground for a discussion. Therefore we hope this will be satisfactory to both parties.

T. F.

## REPORT OF THE KENTUCKY STATE CO-OPERATION.

Brother Joseph Wassen, one of the directors in the Kentucky State Co-operation, requests us to say, that "During the last year's co-operation, which closed October 1, 1856, Fourteen Hundred and three souls were added to the church of God through the efforts of evangelists employed by the board."

T. F.

## THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

WE cannot be sufficiently thankful for the liberal patronage to our paper, and especially for the many *flattering* letters from the brethren. We are happy to have the good opinions of the brethren, whilst we are confident it is on account of our religious position, and not from any personal partiality. We think we can see, that by very slight exertion the circulation will become larger. We promise to do the best we can for the cause.

T. F.

## HOW IS THE NEW LIFE PROCURED AND ENJOYED?

BY A DEAF MUTE.

It is admitted, that a person may succeed or fail in doing well according to the patient or diligent honesty, or impatient or lazy dishonesty of the enlightened heart in which he receives the word. If he hears, receives or believes and keeps the living word in his heart, it becomes a seed which remains in him.

God is the author of natural and Spiritual life. All natural seeds live by the Spirit or word of God; because God in the beginning of generation created, through Jesus Christ, all things by which all natural seeds lived and still live. So, spiritual seeds live by the Spirit or word of God, because God, in the beginning of regeneration, recreated, through Jesus Christ, all things by which all spiritual seeds live. Creation or birth is in reference to natural things. So recreation, regeneration or new birth is in reference to moral or spiritual things.

Life, seed. No life, no seed. Life is in the seed. Though the same life is in the natural or spiritual seed before and after birth; the birth changes the mode or habit of life. New life cannot be procured without the begetting change of the old habit of life, by the Spirit through the word. New life cannot be enjoyed without the new-born change of the old habit of life by the Spirit through water.

1st. The Spirit is introduced into the hearts of penitent believers by hearing and receiving the truth that they may be begotten of God, and by confession that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God.

2d. They are, on account of an evidence of their believing so in consequence of their confession, introduced or baptized into God's Son by baptism in water, that they may be born of water and of the Spirit.

3d. By this birth of water and Spirit they enter into the kingdom of God as well as become the sons of God.

4th. They become the sons of God, that God may send his Son's Spirit into their hearts, crying Abba Father.

5th. God sends his Son's Spirit into their hearts, that the Spirit itself may bear witness with (to) their spirit that they are the children of God according to the word proved, believed and obeyed.

6th. "And if children," then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

"For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons

of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it," etc.—*Rom. vii.*

Paul warns Christians by telling them, "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life."

P. H. NEILSON.

### THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE CHURCH.

LINCOLN COUNTY, KY., Dec. 26, 1856.

BRO. FANNING:—Your paper is just such a one as, in my judgment, is most needed. There are so many things advocated by the brethren contrary to what is taught, that I am at a great loss some times to determine what is right. It appears to me that a foundation is laying by some of the brethren that may finally produce a division amongst us. Witness the efforts at Danville in forming a Constitution for the churches, or rather a creed. (A more successful effort has been made at Frankfort. T. F.) Now I cannot help coming to the conclusion, that if one hundred brethren have the right to meet in convention and decree what they think is right and proper for a certain number of churches to do, another party can or may meet and form or decree what they may think right and proper for others to do. Hence there will be no end to such a course of action. Now I think the Bible, and the Bible alone, is sufficient for the Disciples in every thing. I do not care to be a better man than the Bible will make me, provided it is obeyed from the heart. Therefore I hope you will continue as you have been doing, to contend for the good old book. It requires much independence for men to discharge faithfully their duties and oppose things that appear popular. Our brethren have been much excited about organization, and there are many who would be little Popes if they could. I had thought that we had fully settled these things, and that the churches were the highest tribunal on earth, but suddenly a cry is heard from Kentucky and Michigan, that the Evangelists are to

form a new order, and shall determine the duties of the churches. I understand you oppose such usurpations of power. If so, I trust you will still have the courage to go forth and do battle for the Bible.

With the best wishes for your success in defending the Bible, I subscribe myself your brother in the faith,

JAMES R. WARREN.

REMARK.—We think it right for the Evangelists to have the general supervision of the churches; but our position is, that we have no scriptural right to employ foreign agencies, and unauthorized societies to do the work of the church.

T. F.

## PREACHERS,

BY ELDER ISAAC ERRET.

SEVERAL very excellent brethren have urged us to publish Brother Isaac Erret's essays—which have appeared in most of the papers of the brethren—upon the subject of Ministers of the Gospel, their labor, sufferings, support, etc. We assure our brethren that with Brother Erret's remarks, relative to the value of the labor of preachers, and, indeed, regarding many of their duties, we are much pleased, but we most seriously object to Brother Erret's *system*, and, therefore, we cannot encourage the brethren to adopt his plans. With this suggestion we feel constrained to state, in much frankness, our chief objections.

1. Brother Erret advocates the plan of the churches having regular "pastors;" or each church having its pastor, as the denominations founded in the wisdom of men. We think we cannot be mistaken on this point, and should the disciples adopt this system in practice, we should regard it as exceedingly unfortunate. The Bishops of the congregations are all the pastors known in the New Testament.

2. He fully supports the regular salary system.

3. Brother Erret advocates the view of manufacturing preachers in regular "Theological Schools," instead of training them in the church, and only school of Christ. Such teaching we regard as subversive of the New Economy, and, therefore, we can have no respect for it. We repeat, however, that we are pleased with many things said by Brother E., but this much we can conscientiously say of divers Romish and Protestant works, while the systems advocated by them we deem derogatory to the Christian institution.

T. F.



SMITH COUNTY, TENN., Sept. 13, 1856.

DEAR BROS. FANNING & LIPSCOMB:—I send you our minutes for publication in the Gospel Advocate.

The District Co-operation Meeting assembled at Red Hill on the 13th of September, 1856. Present, Brother Padget, delegate for the church of God at Wiley's neighborhood, Brother Callahan, delegate for Woodville congregation; Brother J. D. Wright, delegate for the congregation at Creagle's Spring; Bros. Terry and Pendergrass, delegates for Union Church; Brother Piles delegate for Red Hill Church.

Brother Kuykendal was called to the chair, and Bro. J. D. Wright appointed Clerk.

The delegates came forward and reported each separate amount to employ Bro. E. Sturman as Evangelist for the next year.

Union Church,	\$67 50
Creagle's Spring,	61 00
Red Hill,	70 50
Wiley's Neighborhood,	35 50
Woodville,	54 00
Sand Flat Church,	60 00
	<hr/>
	\$348 50

It was then moved that a committee be appointed to determine on the amount to be paid to Brother Sturman as Evangelist for the ensuing year.

Names of the committee, J. D. Wright, John Piles, John Padget, James Calahan and Wm. Pendergrass.

September 15.—Committee reported. All agreed that Brother Sturman be allowed the sum of \$500 00 for his services as Evangelist for the ensuing year, and that he, Bro. Sturman, be requested to open subscription, and keep open until the said sum of \$500 be subscribed. It is further agreed, that if there can be more than the sum of \$500 made up, that Brother Sturman receive all as his due for former services not yet compensated.

*Resolved*, That Brother Sturman take in two congregations not represented in this meeting, to assist in this district co-operation.

*Resolved*, That the next district co-operation meeting be held at Union Meeting House, at 4 o'clock, P. M., on Friday before the fourth Lord's day in November, 1857.

*Resolved*, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Gospel Advocate.

It was moved that the minutes be approved.

J. D. WRIGHT, Clerk.

DEATH OF ELDER JOHN T. JOHNSON.

LEXINGTON, KY., Dec. 29, 1856.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Kentucky State meeting, held on the above date, the death of Elder John T. Johnson was announced, and the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1st. *Resolved*, That the meeting have heard with deep regret and unfeigned sorrow of the death of our highly esteemed and much beloved brother, Elder John T. Johnson, lately one of our State Evangelists.

2d. *Resolved*, That this Board have especial reason to deplore the death of Brother Johnson, from the fact of his having been connected with us, more or less, since our organization, as one of our most efficient, laborious, and devoted evangelists; ready and willing to sacrifice ease and comfort that the gospel might be preached and sinners converted to God.

3d. *Resolved*, That in the life of Brother Johnson, from the time he put on the Lord Jesus Christ until the day he ceased from his labors, we have an example worthy of imitation, and to which all praise is due, specially in his cheerfully and promptly relinquishing his flattering prospects and growing influence as an American statesman for the cause of his Lord and Master, and that he might preach to perishing sinners salvation through the blood of the Lamb.

4th. *Resolved*, That in the death of Brother Johnson the cause of primitive Christianity and the Bible alone as the only divinely appointed rule of faith and practice, has lost one of its ablest, most fearless and devoted defenders.

5th. *Resolved*, That although we are called to mourn the loss of our well beloved brother in Christ, yet we sorrow not as those who have no hope, but rather rejoice in the consolation that he died as he lived, a soldier of the cross and faithful follower of the Lamb.

6th. *Resolved*, That the immediate relatives of our deceased brother be furnished with a copy of these resolutions and a tender of our condolence in this their sad bereavement, and that the Millennial Harbinger, the Christian Review, the Gospel Advocate and the Christian Age be requested to publish these resolutions.

OLIVER FARRER, Ch'n.

JOSEPH WASSON, Secretary.

---

 OPEN AND CLOSE COMMUNION.

It has been suggested to us, that there are some, even preachers, amongst us, who imagine that it is not really necessary to enter the Lord's kingdom in order to enjoy the honor of attending to the supper. This intimation must be exceedingly mortifying to all who love the truth of God. When we tell the men of the world, and such as stand near the kingdom, with the most ardent desire to enter it, to "examine themselves," and then partake of the Lord's Supper, we prostitute the church of Christ to worldly purposes. But it is worse than shameful for preachers of the gospel to impudently arrogate to themselves—as we have heard it done—the right to "invite" *well wishers* to the table of the Redeemer. Such men should be stopped, and if the brethren will support such preachers, the time will not be long till the church of Christ and the Christian religion will have no meaning. But we forbear.

Dear Brethren, think of this matter, before you run into the latitudinarian, misnamed charity and human wisdom of the times.

T. F.

---

 NOTICE OF BROTHER ELLEY'S ESSAY.

BRO. GEO. W. ELLEY admits that the Kentucky State Co-operation is a *human organization*. It would be well for the brethren to decide the question as to the utility of such organizations to keep the church alive. Can she perform her mission on earth without the aid of human legislation? Can the churches of Christ co-operate as churches without converting them into human establishments? This embraces all the controversies of the age. Settle this point and all sincere religionists will become one.

T. F.

---

 SPECULATION.

TEXAS, 1856.

BRO. FANNING:—It seems to me that the Gospel Advocate, above all others, is the paper for the crisis. Many seem determined to have other authority besides the Bible, and different organizations from the church. When I wrote on these subjects years ago in Kentucky, as may be seen in the Age and E. Reformer, I was blamed, but my position is yet true. We must return to the simplicity of the Gospel, or form ourselves into another "Protestant denomination."

JAMES L. THORNBURY.

## OBITUARIES.

SELDOM has it fallen to our lot to record a death in circumstances more trying.

Early in the month of December, 1856, from the partialities of the parents, we were invited to celebrate the rites of matrimony between sister Selena Campbell, daughter of Brother W. P. and Sister Susan Campbell, and Mr. Parks, of Franklin, Tennessee. We had known sister S. from childhood, always found her a fascinating girl, but at the wedding we thought we had seldom seen a woman possessing more charms. She and the choice of her heart, a most amiable young man, flattered themselves with perpetual joys. But, alas, our sister's constitution was too frail for the excitement and exposure of the occasion. Afflictions fell heavily upon her, and in one week from the wedding sister Selena Parks was not, for God had taken her.

We mourn not without hope. Seldom if ever have we witnessed deeper grief than was exhibited by the husband and parents. The Lord will remember his afflicted children who look to him. T. F.

DEAR BROTHER FANNING:—Our highly esteemed brother, Joseph Callehan, departed this life on the 14th of September, 1856, after an illness of eighteen months, at the residence of his mother-in-law, old sister Smith, in Barren county, Ky., where he received every kindness necessary. During his protracted illness he exhibited all that Christian patience and resignation that we have a right to expect in the close of a consistent Christian's life. Having become a Christian at the age of eighteen years, and soon after engaged in preaching that gospel which had freed him from sin, he honored his profession by a pious life. He leaves an amiable wife and two interesting children, a son and daughter, as well as many friends to mourn their loss; but we mourn not as those that have no hope.

At Home, Dec. 9, 1856.

JOHN N. MULKEY.

We knew brother Callehan intimately from youth, and we can state with much confidence that, to the best of our recollection, we knew no brother more devoted to the cause of Christ. He never entered into wild theological speculations of the times, or into worldly speculations, but he kept steadily on the even tenor of his way, in examining the word of God, and teaching it to his fellow worms of earth for near a quarter of a century. Now he rests, with the fathers, from all his labors, and his deeds will follow him. Sister Callehan has our sincere sympathy.

T. F.

Brother Henry P. Dyer, of Fannin County, Texas, writes, that "There are some thirty members in his county, but they are doing *nothing*."

If Brother Dyer is not mistaken we will never hear of these thirty members again. Christians cannot *live* without active employment.

Brother David Hamilton, of Selma, Ala., writes under date of December 19th, "Brother Hooker has been with us, preached three times and had two accessions. This is a source of much joy to me. My wife, who was twenty years ago a pupil of Brother and Sister Fanning, and my nephew are the accessions."

I rejoice with Brother Hamilton.

T. F.

---

#### OBITUARY.

BEDFORD, COUNTY, TENN., Oct. 7th, 1856.

Died on the 6th of August, 1856, after an illness of twelve days, my mother Margaret C. Woodward, wife of Jerman Woodward, Elder of the church at Liberty, Marshall County, Tennessee. She was born on the 11th of January, 1804. Made public confession of her faith in the blessed Savior and was buried with him by baptism into his death, in June, 1839, since which time until the day of her death in the 53d year of her age, she lived a consistent member of the Church, a confiding Christian and affectionate Mother. Although her sufferings were great, she bore them with fortitude, and died in the hope of a better world than this.

WM. WOODWARD.

---

#### SCRAPS.

God sent his Son into the world to proclaim peace to all who should hear and accept His offer. He came to encounter and overcome Satan—to offer up himself as a sacrifice—"the just for the unjust"—and to proclaim pardon not as if sin were a light thing in God's sight, but as purchased by precious and innocent blood. He came to "bind up the broken hearted—to preach deliverance to the captives"—and promises to come unto them that should love Him, and make his abode in them by his Spirit, that they might follow the bright example He had set them, and thus to live in peace with God—to become the sons of God, and after death to enter into His eternal rest—the reward which He and not they had earned.

Good manners are a part of good morals.



## TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

## PATRIOTISM, MORALITY, PHILANTHROPY, PIETY.

A patriot, from *patria*, is defined by Bishop Hall—"One whose ruling passion is the love of his country." Patriotism is "love of one's country." So natural is this feeling, and so universal, that he who does not possess it, is regarded as an unfeeling and unworthy wretch. The love of one's *father-country* is akin to the love of his father. And then it is *cultivated* more, perhaps, than even the love of father or mother in very many instances. The ancient poets sung about it. Philosophers glorified it. Modern men of renown have placed it above every thing, and the people have put them above themselves for their devotion to it. If they hate all other countries, slaughter and oppress millions of our fellow creatures in *other* countries, all is well—even with professed disciples of Christ! Nay, we honor those who murder and grind down the people of other countries in proportion as they succeed, and without much regard to the manner or means they employed! How long has it been since it was a common cry throughout the land—"Our country, right or wrong?"

Patriotism is regarded as *the* theme for awakening men's passions, when all others have failed. Hence we hear often repeated, with a pathos truly stirring:

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead,  
Who never to himself hath said,  
This is my own, my *native* land!  
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned,  
As home his footsteps he hath turned,  
From wandering on a foreign strand?"

*Philanthropy* is the love of man, whether in our native country or elsewhere; the love of man as man, because he is our fellow creature, made in the image of God, and destined to exist forever; because he belongs to the same family, has the same Father, and is our common equal and companion. Philanthropy is not bounded by geographical or political lines. It loves none for his *country's* sake, but all for their own sake and for Christ's sake. It delights to do good, therefore, to the foreigner on our own soil, or the citizens of the farthest and wildest land, equally as to our own countrymen. It is God-like, no respecter of persons.

Patriotism makes wars; philanthropy stops them, and binds up the broken hearted, sets the captive souls at liberty, gives them "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." What a contrast! Patriotism is aspiring, discontented, jealous, unable to enjoy the prosperity of other countries. Philanthropy is quiet and zealous in doing "good to all men as it has opportunity, especially to them who are of the household of faith." Patriotism is of man; philanthropy is of God.

*Morality* relates to our actions and duties towards our fellow men. There is, recently, some controversy touching the *extent* of morality, but all allow that it refers to our intercourse with and duties to each other. If we include in it the manner in which we shall act towards each other, the particular form, etc., as laid down in the scriptures, both morality and philanthropy must reach as high as the Deity, because to the word of his grace. But we do not always so understand; and it will, perhaps, be better to refer morality to our actions towards each other, and philanthropy to doing good to man as man, without particular reference to the manner or form. Not that this is indifferent. Far from it. But it may belong, more properly, to another department. Still, there can be neither morality nor philanthropy in defiance of or disregard to the Bible. And it is only meant, that it may be safer to go with the general understanding as to the meaning of these terms, which I believe reach to the actions only, and not to their manner or form. I would, however, have no controversy with any one here; though it seems to me important that we should not differ with commonly received opinions without good and sufficient reasons.

*Piety* refers to our duties directly to God. It begins in and proceeds from the heart, and reaches far beyond all men—even to the Creator. As the greater, therefore, it includes the others—*true* patriotism, philanthropy and morality; and since the holy Father has revealed to us his will so fully, piety includes the very *manner and form* in which we shall worship God, and do good to man, which, indeed, is a part of our duty to God, for no man can love God with all his heart, without loving his neighbor as himself. No man can do his duty to God without doing his duty to man also, since God has made this a part of his duty to him. Thus, a man may be a very good patriot, according to the common understanding of that subject, and not be a philanthropist, not a moralist, and instead of piety, as profane as Satan can make him.

And he may be a considerable philanthropist, and yet very immoral—even profane. It is even quite possible that one may be quite—

perhaps *strictly* moral—doing no violence to his neighbor or his goods, using no improper language, etc., and yet be far from *pious*. But he cannot be *truly pious* without doing his duty to his country and to his fellow man every where. And so, a man may be many things, without being a Christian; but the Christian, the noblest style of man, belongs to every good society, and is every good thing it is possible for him to be. Piety is Christianity in practice. The others are severally parts. This is the whole without the possibility of an addition.

How sublime, then, the Christian religion! How ennobling the place and station of the servants of the Most High! Temperance, according to its present general acceptance, is a single item—only one round in the ladder. Piety reaches to the topmost round and includes the whole. The Christian is, therefore, temperate, moral, philanthropic, and *truly* patriotic. He is not dependent upon any form of humanism, nor could they, however they might entangle and embarrass him, add to his honor or his usefulness. He is a son of God, and his patrimony is eternal life. Made to be the companion and associate of the Almighty, and far nobler than the brightest sons of the morning, because in the image of God, he goes forth, the admiration of angels, to enjoy the fullness of the divine blessings! May we be *so honorable, so happy, so victorious*, at the last, as to share with the humblest sons of God!

If it is a disgrace, then, not to be a *patriot*, what is it not to be philanthropic, not moral, not pious?!! Alas! what ideas we have of honor and disgrace! What would the angels think of a rebel against God in heaven? Would he not be utterly disgraced in their estimation? The Lord give us correct ideas of honor, disgrace, of duty, and of true interest!

C. K.

### SLANDER AND SLANDERERS.

SUCH great subjects as are not well understood should be fairly presented in our papers, and otherwise, on the Socratic principle, that practical utility—the good or evil resulting from a principle or a practice should control our attention to it. There is, I believe, a general agreement amongst most people both as to what slander is, and as to its sinfulness. Still, it may be well to have these fairly before us.

Buck says: "Of all characters in society, a slanderer is the most odious, and the most likely to produce mischief." The great Massillon says: "It is a devouring fire, which tarnishes whatever it touches;

which exercises its fury on the good grain equally as on the chaff; which, wherever it passes, leaves only desolation and ruin; digs even into the bowels of the earth; turns into vile ashes what only a moment before had appeared to us so precious and brilliant. \* \* \* It is a world, an assemblage of iniquity, a secret pride, which discovers to us the mote in our brother's eye, but hides the beam which is in our own; a mean envy, which, hurt at the talents or prosperity of others, makes them the subject of its censure, and studies to dim the splendor of whatever outshines itself. \* \* \* It is a restless evil, which disturbs society; spreads dissension through cities and countries; disunites the strictest friendships; it is the source of hatred and revenge; fills wherever it enters with disturbances and confusion; and every where is an enemy to peace, comfort, and Christian good breeding." And if such be the enormity of its sinfulness, should we not be careful to understand what is slander?

Dr. Barrow says: "It is uttering false speech against our neighbor, to the prejudice of his fame, safety, welfare; and that out of malignity, vanity, rashness, ill-nature and bad design. The principal kinds of slander are these: 1. Charging others with facts they are not guilty of. 2. Affixing scandalous names and odious characters which they deserve not. 3. Aspersing a man's actions with foul names, importing that they proceed from evil principles, or tend to bad ends, when it doth not, or cannot appear. Perverting a man's words or acts disadvantageously by affected misconstruction. 5. Partial or lame representation of men's discourse or practice, suppressing some part of the truth, or concealing some circumstances which ought to be explained. 6. Instilling suggestions which create prejudice in the hearers. 7. Magnifying and aggravating the faults of others. 8. Imputing to our neighbor's practice, judgment, or profession, evil consequences which have no foundation in truth."

Presuming that these statements will not be called in question, however much more might be said of the same character, we may proceed touching these as concerning fixed facts. And may we not say, without enumerating them again, that *sectarianism* is habitually and every where guilty of almost, or quite, every one of the eight kinds of slander named? Take the first and last. Does it not charge us with a multitude of facts we are not guilty of? And is it not equally manifest that it charges us with causing divisions, while we labor intensely and mainly for union amongst all good people? How common, too, for it—or something else—to affix to us odious names—the name of a

man, instead of the name of Christ, as a leader! Is there, can there be, any *good design* in this? Whose actions are "aspersed with foul names"—such as "ducking," "souzing," etc., instead of immersing? Who is guilty of perverting his neighbor's "words or acts," or of "partial or lame representations of his discourse?"

"Instilling sly suggestions," and "magnifying the faults of others," seem to be common sins—*slanders*?—in which, often, the best part of society partake—perhaps, thoughtlessly, following the prevailing examples around them. "Well, I will tell *you*, but you must not let it be known." And somebody else is told in the same confidential manner, and somebody else, and somebody else again, and yet again others, by the first, the second, and the third, until if every one trusted with the secret is faithful to the trust, a very serious injury is inflicted upon the person talked about. "I would not injure the young man," said one, "but I will tell *you*." And yet by that single telling the young man's present prospects are blasted, his usefulness much injured, and, perchance, his soul greatly endangered. Now, if there was no *actual necessity* for the telling, the teller greatly sinned—very greatly—even if every word was true without the least exaggeration!

"Imagination is the Paphian shop,  
Where feeble selfishness, like Vulcan, came,  
Bids foul ideas, in their dark recess,  
And hot as hell (which kindleth the black fires,)  
With wanton art, those fatal arrows form,  
Which murder all thy time, health, wealth and fame."

How often do we even tell our very *imaginings*, and without suspecting that our desires may be father to the thoughts we as wickedly as foolishly utter?

True, we may consult others about persons and things relating to ourselves and others; and when it is necessary, that we have their advice, and it can do no injury to others, we may mention persons and events. But those who talk or write about others without a definite object—an object better than having something to talk or write about—are certainly sinners against the law of God—against others, and against themselves also: they are, at least, *liable* to be *slanderers*.

Of all the controversies amongst editors and others, how many are purely for truth's sake, and entirely free from personalities, selfishness, and other works of the flesh? If we, by wit, retort, sarcasm, or otherwise, weaken our opponent's arguments, is it for Christ's sake, for his sake, for the sake of others, or for our own sake?



Possibly we may sometimes have slander in our hearts, and not utter it for no better reason than that which often hinders the murderer and rogue—a fear of detection and punishment. Then man slanders before God, though society is, by this very fear, saved from its bad effects.

C. K.

THE propriety of the advance-pay system, and, perhaps, of a circular or extra I recently issued, calling for pay for the Christian Philanthropist, is manifest in abusive letters from those who, it appears, were not worthy of credit. By a sharp goad some are prompted to duty, while others are deeply mortified to find themselves classed with the unfaithful. "He that is unfaithful in the least" cannot be safely trusted with "the much." I hope those of my friends who desire to read the Gospel Advocate, will pay for it in advance. The Publishers are as worthy to be trusted as they are. I hope to make my department much more interesting another year, if the Lord will.

C. K.

### CHURCH NEWS.

BRO. J. S. PENDERGRAFT writes, from Polk County, Mo., October 25th., that two meetings in his vicinity had just resulted in *forty-five* additions to the good cause. Laborers, brethren L. Satterfield, Wm. Gregg, Arbucke and Davis. One was a *camp-meeting*. Ah, these good, old-fashioned, plain, simple-styled camp-meetings, in thinly settled regions, are just the thing. They are not, perhaps, either practicable or desirable when the real Kentucky *basket-meetings* can be held; but there is certainly something peculiar in remaining *together* for four or ten days, with no farther care for the things of time than to provide plain food—perhaps a sort of common table, and large common horse lot or pasture. Freed thus from the care of providing, to a large extent, of going and coming, etc., we can sit and talk, and read, and pray in real good old patriarchal or rather, perhaps, apostolical style! Who would not like to shut out the world for awhile, and get close up to the Holy Father and each other, as we may in a camp-meeting? We have a few of these meetings in Texas. Can we not have more? I fear some of us are getting rather *above* them—like the poor man got above his *anvil*. But we can do without all such; and we have no use

for the dashy, flirty, dressy, laughy, taylor and milliner-made *gentlemen and ladies* at such meetings, for *our* sake. I long to have my "spiritual strength renewed," and would go a great way to attend one of these meetings.

C. K.

A letter from Palestine states, that Brother S. R. M'Call had just concluded a course of twelve lectures, and that there were two additions.

Brother W. C. Wilhite writes from Savannah, Texas, November 24, 1856, that "Bros. S. S. Williams, Z. P. Goodman and James M. Biard closed a meeting there a few days ago. Much good was done. We have preaching every Lord's day, by brother Z. P. Goodman. The congregation at Old Union is of the right material. Brother, I am thinking that if the souls of the professors of the nineteenth century stuck as close to heaven or the cause of the great Redeemer as their *dimes* do their pockets, there would but few be lost. He who tries to preach now-adays, if he is not rich, must have an untiring perseverance. \* \* \* We are not of the world—we are chosen out of the world. We are the temple of the living God, in which the Spirit of God dwells. We are the lively stones that compose this heavenly building. Oh! may we not repine at the trials of earth. They will soon pass away and be known no more!!

Thank you, brother, for these suggestions. We all *need daily and earnest* exhortation. He who does not feel his necessity is in the greater need. Christian exhortation will never grow old, nor will it often be out of place.

C. K.

BRO. J. R. McKENSEY, of Wardville, Johnson county, Texas, a worthy brother, as I judge, writes very urgently for a preacher. That would, no doubt, be a good field for one to occupy who can sustain himself; and it affords a good opportunity for the rich and liberal to send and sustain one. What golden opportunities for eternal riches! and how unspeakably unwise if we do not improve them! Time things—riches, honors and pleasures; and eternal things—glory, honor and immortality! Who is the simpleton, the man who labors for these or for those?

C. K.

---

 OBITUARY NOTICE.

THE following letter will remind many, as it does me, of scenes in the past full of interest, and of our common mortality. May it lift our expectations and affections to the better land! Father Randolph was one of the most lovely men I ever knew. His very memory mellows my feelings, and makes me more religious. C. K.

---

MILL PORT, FAYETTE CO., ALA., Oct. 8, 1856.

ELDER C. KENDRICK:—Dear Brother,—My father, ELDER ELISHA RANDOLPH, fell asleep in the Lord on the 23d ult. *He lived and died a CHRISTIAN.* From my first recollection of him to the day of his death, his life was exemplary. It was his soul's delight to live out the holy injunctions of the Lord. As a father, a companion, a citizen, a disciple, an elder of the church and a minister of the gospel, he lived for the Lord. He was 71 years old. No more of earth, he is at rest.

In the Lord,

L. D. RANDOLPH.

---

REMARK.—When I was little more than twenty years old a congregation in West Tennessee desired to make me what they called an *Elder*. I told them nothing they could do could make me what that term imported. Though now over forty, I am rather a young man—at least not old. This is one of the errors of King James' translation, the custom of the times, and the readiness of men to give and receive unscriptural names, have burdened the churches with. If it is desirable to add a prefix why not use *Evangelist*, or *Ev.*? I have shared liberally (perhaps undeservedly) in both literary and scientific honors or titles, but the highest office and most responsible station I ever occupied, or ever expect to occupy, is that of an *evangelist*. I feel more honored by it, and would strive harder to honor it. But the term *Elder* is shared equally by the worthy and unworthy—women as well as men, and might be applied even to inferior things. It is, of itself, no honor to any person or thing. And to see almost beardless youths called *Elders*, simply because they are trying to be preachers, betrays something of the same feeling that gives *reverend* to the clergy—or a want of thought or information on the subject.

If we desire to signify the fact that one we address is a bishop or overseer of a congregation, *elder* will not do it. But I mean to direct attention to the subject merely, not to complain, or to argue the case.

C. K.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, MARCH, 1857.

NO. 3.

---

## THE LORD'S TREASURY.

WHILST the Scriptures teach that "*the love of money is the root of all evil*," without it nothing good can be accomplished. Money supplies the comforts of home, enables us to traverse the earth, and cross the seas, and although preachers declaim eloquently against the "almighty dollar," it is by means of gold they support and labor in the Lord's cause. It is money that forms the basis of our civil institutions, and without it not a benevolent institution could exist on earth. Our Bible and missionary societies are all built up by money, and without it neither human nor divine associations could exist. We have not only noticed the reports of various State and district co-operations amongst the brethren, but some of these meetings we have had the honor of attending, and in every instance the chief purpose has been to adopt ways and means to get money. The first and last question is, "How much will the various churches *subscribe*, or give to promote the various projects claiming support. In the Bible Union reports, the great matter is to excite a sufficient interest amongst the brethren and "lovers of pure versions of the Holy Scriptures" to raise the necessary funds to pay agents, revisers, etc. These laborers are not always even members of the association, and so soon as a certain work shall be performed, there may be no more use for the society. The brethren now have a Missionary Society, at Cincinnati, which the Secretary thinks is to be the great agent in converting the world, and which is to engross the benevolence of the universal brotherhood. But wishing to give our remarks a specific and practical direction we invite the brethren to the examination of some very plain questions.

1. *The Lord's treasury is an indispensable to the Lord's house.*

The apostle Paul not only gave an order to the churches of Galatia, concerning "*the collection for the saints*," but also said to the Corinthians, "Even so do ye." "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, (place in the treasury,) as the Lord hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings (collections) when I come." (2 Cor. xvi, 2.) There are several points to which we call the attention of the reader in this passage.

Money, or its equivalent in what might relieve the poor and suffering saints in Judea, was to be a matter of special study amongst the disciples at Corinth. It was not a subject to be treated lightly, or one to which the members might attend if they felt like it, or neglect it with impunity; but it was as binding as assembling, breaking the loaf, prayer, singing, or any other religious service. Why not? "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father consists in two items, viz: "In visiting the fatherless and widow in their affliction, and in keeping himself unspotted from the world." How can we relieve the fatherless and widows without bread, clothing and fuel—without money? The idea of men, women and children living in churches in good health without money, without the means of doing good, is most fanciful.

Every member of the church, not really rich, whether black or white, rich or poor, male or female, is under the most solemn obligations, not only to have money, but also to use it, to the glory of God. This obligation involves another question of equal moment, viz., the plan of securing the means to contribute to the necessities of the needy. A simple statement will explain our meaning. All Christians should have some industrial calling by which to make a support and to do good to others. There is no one in health, so poor as not to be able to make something every week to put into the treasury of the Lord. One half the amount spent by church members for tobacco, spirits, useless articles for the stomach and fancy dressing, would fill the treasury of every church in the land. But we forbear.

We learn from the passage quoted, that it is not only the duty but the privilege of "*every*" disciple to sacrifice to the Lord. There is certainly much wisdom in the injunction. When all the members contribute according to their ability, the burden does not fall upon a few members, who are so *imposed* upon in the most of the churches, that instead of being a pleasure to offer their sacrifice to support the church, it is a matter of reluctance, and frequently results in bitterness of spirit.



No church can be in health whose members—except the poor—offer not their oblations weekly.

2. *The first day of the week is the time designated by the Spirit for making our contributions.*

This is not a matter which requires an argument to one who appreciates the Divine Oracles. But we ask, what is more in place than for each disciple on every Lord's day morning to ask himself or herself the question, "How has the Lord prospered me the past week?" "If he has permitted me to gain two dollars, may I not in safety vest one dollar in the bank of Heaven?" This course makes it a matter of study, and consequently of cultivation. Thus, whilst we are determining our duty, we are gaining much in the cultivation of our benevolent feelings.

3. *We are taught that each is to sacrifice as the Lord has prospered him, or, as the Apostle said, "According to the ability which God gives."*

The man who makes a hundred dollars per week, can as well afford to put fifty into the treasury as he who makes two dimes can spare one. There should always be equality; that is, each is required to do according to what he *has*, and each Christian is to be *his own* judge of what he is able to perform. "*The Lord loves a cheerful giver*," but when there is an assessment made by elders or others, it is not a sacrifice or gift but a burdensome *tax*.

We have been told that this scripture refers to raising funds for the poor saints, and has no reference to general church expenses, or supporting evangelists. We reply, that the apostle was speaking of the order in the churches, and especially the duty of the individual members, in each contributing weekly, or putting by in the treasury as the Lord had prospered him.

The disbursement is another matter. In this instance we learn, that funds were to be sent to Jerusalem by persons whom the church could approve by letters. In another instance, a church sent "once and again unto the necessities" of Paul. (Phil. iv, 16.) The idea of a salary to a preacher, or to the poor—which would be quite as appropriate—was not known in the days of the apostles, but as the preachers or the saints had need, the churches supplied their wants.

Whilst on the salary system, it may not be amiss to state a few objects to it in plain contrast with the teaching of the Scriptures.

1. No people can adopt it, who regard in the least the authority of the Scriptures.

2. The salary system never fails to produce strife amongst the

preachers. For illustration, we visited a northern city some time past, and were invited to occupy the pulpit of a regular *pastor* on a salary. We preached in the forenoon, and we cannot be mistaken in the conviction that the pastor breathed much freer as we finished, and (as he supposed,) were about leaving without an invitation to speak again. We remember another case nearer home of a flippant young coxcomb of a pastor, who was scarcely ever known to invite a brother of respectable talent or decency of life to preach in "his pulpit;" but men of the lowest order of intellect, and lowest life, were frequently put forward, merely to show the pastor's transcendent superiority. Hence it is a rare occurrence to hear these hirelings speak well of each other.

3. The tendency of the system is to make preachers mere flatterers of the flesh. In turn they receive pay in large salaries, rich presents, and the flatteries of the giddy and corrupt. Remember Nashville and Lot's wife.

4. In raising a salary, the sole idea with nine-tenths of the people is to subscribe in proportion to their love for the pastor, and, consequently, their sacrifice is not to God, but to their own vicious appetites.

5. The system makes preachers a set of sycophants, always electioneering for place and money.

6. It also unmakes the gospel minister, and a preacher is not judged by his talent, Biblical knowledge, goodness of heart, or ability to reprove sin and reform transgressors; but according to his ability to collect a *crowd* of the indolent, most of whom will subscribe liberally to be flattered into a good opinion of themselves. Hence a preacher's points are discussed just as traders discuss the good points of a mule or horse. A few years ago we happened in Louisville, Ky., to hear, in a book store, some old wine-drinking elders discuss the good points of a preacher they had on trial, as if he were a slave they were about purchasing. His person, dress, walk, voice, were closely scrutinized, but we heard not a word in regard to his piety or any legitimate trait of a minister of Jesus Christ. This is the effect of the system.

7. Worse than all, upon this plan no proper pastors can be trained up in the congregations, and the worship is taken out of the hands of the members of the church, and let out frequently to pert boys and gossiping women. It is said the famous young Baptist preacher of London, Spurgeon, was "*pastor at seventeen.*" Truly the Lord said, "I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them." (Isa. iii, 4.) Corruption has brought it to pass.

But the system of the New Testament exhibits incomparable wisdom. The cardinal features are easily stated.

1. The Church of God is the only divinely authorized Missionary, Bible, Sunday School and Temperance Society; the only institution in which the Heavenly Father will be honored in the salvation of the world, and in and through no other agency can man glorify his Maker. It is not only the extreme of folly for Christians to talk of other benevolent institutions, but we see not, and never have seen, how it is possible for any people professing the Christian religion to attempt to do the work of the church through merely human agencies, such as Missionary Societies, Sunday Schools, etc., whilst we have so full provision for all spiritual labor in the body of Christ. Furthermore, we have not been able to see how it is possible for human institutions to engross our time, energy and money, without our losing sight of the church and her agencies.

2. Each congregation of the Lord should have a treasury, into which the disciples should cast their contributions upon every first day of the week as the Lord prospers them. Upon this system it would not be difficult for any church to keep an ample supply of means on hand to defray all incidental expenses of the congregation, to send relief to poor saints at a distance, and what is of vital importance, to sustain the minister or ministers of the body in accomplishing the service of God in the church and out of the church.

As some of the brethren have not *seemed* to understand our teaching, particularly upon the subject of *sustaining evangelists* and the *co-operation of the churches*, we think it in place to make a remark or two.

When a church, as Christ's school, has educated a member for performing the work of an evangelist, it is the duty of such church to have him consecrated to the work by the presbytery of the congregation, and to send him forth into the gospel field. Such an one is the preacher of the church that trained him, consecrated him and commended him to the work; and the church is bound to see that he and family are supported. No bargain need be struck, but when his wife and children need, their wants should be known by the *pastors*—under-shepherds of the flock—and supplied. Should the brother be in a foreign clime, and need aid, the church should send "*once and again to his necessities.*" Of course evangelists should make known their wants, and should a church fail to sustain a truly gospel minister, there can be no pardon, either in this world, or the world to come. The obligations resting upon a church in sending out an evangelist, relieves not

those for whose benefit he labors, from the most sacred obligation to co-operate in his support. This we may denominate church co-operation. In the apostolic age churches co-operated for various purposes, without thinking it at all necessary to form any new society to aid the co-operation; and we cannot for our life see any thing to prevent the congregations from co-operating in sustaining evangelists, relieving the poor, building up and supporting schools, or even in translating, publishing, and distributing the Scriptures, as churches and not as societies foreign to the Bible.

The purpose is for churches, upon consultation, to *agree* in carrying out any required work, and thus they can obey the injunction to "*be of one mind.*" If the beloved brethren will exercise a little patience in the examination of the subjects presented, all, we think, will see eye to eye, and speak the same thing. In our present condition it is of great moment to understand each other regarding the Lord's treasury, and the co-operation of the disciples and churches in the work of our Father.

T. F.

### THE CHURCH IN NASHVILLE.

IN answer to scores of inquiries, we deem it proper to give our readers a brief sketch of the cause of Christ in Nashville, Tennessee. Regarding, however, the whereabouts or whatabouts of the author of many sore evils endured by the disciples in this city, we are not able to answer the interrogatories. He is not here, and we wish not to excite the indignation of those who saw the end of his course from the beginning, or the fury of his personal abettors by mentioning his name. Suffice it to say, that he is the best of his tribe. After much hesitation and contradiction he openly cast Christianity overboard, which his more craven father and brother, for the sake of a few more loaves and fishes, have failed to do. A blight fell upon the vineyard in New Orleans, and wherever one of them has been permitted to insinuate himself, death and destruction have followed. We hope to be pardoned for this necessary reference.

Before giving our statement in regard to the past, we take this early occasion to say, that the brethren now have a deed for their meeting minutes to resume the work. God, and they have the prayers and good wishes of all the saints.

Believing that we often become wiser and better from recurring even

to our errors, as well as the brighter parts of our history, we will offer a very concise notice of the church from the beginning.

In the year 1827, the Baptist Church in Nashville *"resolved to reject all human creeds and confessions of faith, and to adopt the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice to be governed thereby; that they would, in future, in imitation of the apostolic churches, meet for worship every Lord's day, to break the loaf, unite in reading the scriptures, prayers, praise, and contributing for the support of the poor saints; and that all persons making truly the confession required by the apostles be received by immersion for the remission of sins into the church."*

Twenty-five out of twenty-eight persons, with the pastor, Elder P. S. Fall, voted for the declaration, and hence the origin of what has, most of the time since, been known as the Church of Christ in Nashville.

The order of worship indicated was studiously practised and the cause advanced in every conceivable view for many years. In 1831, the "*pastor*," Elder Fall, left his field of labor, but the worship was conducted by the elders of the congregation with great dignity, zeal and profit. Moses Norvell, Henry Ewing, Albert G. Ewing, Thomas Claiborne, and Robert C. Foster, all of whom, except A. G. Ewing, now sleep with the fathers, were prominent in the management of affairs, and a more intelligent, zealous, and happy church could not be found. Many others took part in the public exercises. When we first visited Nashville, in 1832, it seemed to us that if not all, at least most of the brethren were teachers, exhorters and men capable of conducting the worship of God. They read and *believed* the Scriptures—rejoiced in the promises of God—male and female, white and black, bond and free—and felt it to be their high privilege to sing the praises of our Father.

Men of the world, and of the denominations, admitted that the disciples of Jesus Christ loved one another. Whilst the responsibilities of the church rested upon the members, the cause prospered and the saints grew stronger and better.

Most of the time, from 1832 to 1836, Brother Absalom Adams and the writer were encouraged and sustained as evangelists and servants of the church. Thus, by the word sounding out from the Nashville Church, congregations were built up in various neighborhoods and counties in Middle Tennessee. During these four years an evangelist was not regarded as the "*pastor*" of the congregation, but was subject to the brethren.



In the spring of 1836, unfortunately for the cause of truth, the church hired a very insidious pastor—well calculated to throw fire brands in such a manner as to raise suspicions among friends and destroy the confidence and peace of the brethren. To be sure his sojourn was short, but he committed evils which yet cry to Heaven. His idea of what he called “the pastorate” was sufficient to make him a bad man.

Another experiment was made, in giving much of the labor of the congregation to a *single pastor*, in 1841. The result was not favorable. In 1842 the church in Nashville, with quite a number of preachers and others from various congregations, spent some ten days in re-examining her ground with reference to the Bible, and the position she occupied in 1827 was pronounced not only good, but very good.

It was then understood that a church of Jesus Christ has no right to admit *philosophy*, *opinions*, or *worldly policy* into her administrations; and that all points of religious differences should be decided not by a board of bishops, a “pastor’s” *ipse dixit*, or vote of the majority, but by the law of the Lord. It was taught that the labor of an evangelist consisted in preaching the gospel to the lost, in planting churches and enabling the members to do their own work—to keep house for God. It was understood that the pastor’s office devolved, of right, upon the older members of the church, and upon no others. Then the idea of beardless lads, flippant and impertinent orators, taking the oversight of venerable sages and matrons, was regarded highly ludicrous. But as strange as it may seem, in this same year of grace, 1842, Brother W. H. Wharton by some means, which we will not attempt to explain, became a sort of *single pastoral*, *evangelizing* bishop. This brother, in the sincerity of his heart, and the vividness of his imagination, undertook the Herculean task of acting as evangelist and bishop of the congregation, and general and particular physician wherever called. The effect was too obvious. He had undertaken what the Lord had not required—he was soon worked down, had no time to study—his sermons became too stale for ears that began to itch for *pastoral* novelties, and clerical nick-nacks, and the decree went forth, that in a “fashionable city” we must have not only a pastor of younger blood, to attract the members to the sermon, but one that *will please the world*, and collect together the giddy, gay, and light-hearted. Consequently one was found of exceeding popularity, and took charge as pastor in 1846. It is not too much to say that, except raising the funds and attending sermons, but little was left for the brethren to per-

---

form. We care not to enter into details, many of which would be painful. The young pastor flattered all, and was flattered by all in return. No member of the church could think of his own performances but with disgust. The preaching, the exhortations, the singing, the breaking the loaf, the prayers, the thanksgivings, the visiting the fatherless and widows, and indeed most of the service "*was let*" to persons, the most conspicuous of whom were not even members of the church.

So did matters continue till 1852, when it was clear the leader was a Universalist in disguise. He and his friends denied it bitterly, and denounced all that asserted it as slanderers. By the year 1853 his system had led him and his party into "*the absolute knowing*," or spiritualism of Theodore Parker, and other rejectors of the Bible; but very soon his plan ripened into the spiritualism of animal impulses. By the year 1856 the pastor, his cause, and the cause which we had denominated the cause of Christ, were all in a state of moral ruin. Even the house, which has since been restored by law, had gone from the brethren.

It will be in place to say, that during the controversies regarding the apostasy of the pastor, the worst of feelings were engendered amongst former friends. The leader possessed great alacrity in this work, and when a mind is falsely impressed, it is next to an impossibility to correct it.

His admirers construed every thing that was said into the vilest persecution, and loved to hate and abuse all that did not "come to the aid" of their favorite. It is with very great regret we admit, that many aged and respectable members of the church were found in this work of crimination. That the reader may form some idea of the excessive feeling, we state that P. S. Fall, who was mainly instrumental in establishing the church, received but *five votes* out of some 260 to become the pastor; and Alexander Campbell, who had sinned against no one, was publicly scoffed at by the party when he visited Nashville in December, 1855, and respectable members of the church would not speak to him on the street, or hear him preach. Such sins are hard to *plaster* over, and God cannot forgive them without repentance.

But we are asked, Why mention these things? We have an object. We cannot see how it is possible for any people to so far depart from truth and righteousness, and get back into place, without repentance, confession, or even an explanation in regard to their course. Those who have erred owe it to themselves, to their brethren and to God to correct the errors they have committed. The old leaven should be

---

purged out. It is of the utmost importance that the brethren should begin right in Nashville, but we have only a suggestion or two to make, regarding what we consider a correct course.

1st. Should the members determine to *hire* another pastor to come to Nashville to take charge of the worship of God for them, no better results can be anticipated than those already experienced. We pray the brethren to consider well this subject.

2d. The only Scriptural plan, and in our judgment, the only plan the Lord will bless, is for all who do really believe the word of God, and no others, to come together in humility and supplication for help from on high, and with the determination to keep the ordinances of the Lord's house. Let the beloved brothers and sisters read the word of the Lord together, sing the high praises of the Father, bow together frequently in humble prayer, commemorate the death of the Savior on every first day, attend strictly to the wants of the suffering, and last of all, let the members introduce family worship, and perseveringly attend to it.

Should the brethren thus start, we could but anticipate, in a very short time, a restoration of peace and good feeling amongst the members, and general prosperity would soon follow. Great evils may be overcome when we become humble before God. With the initiatory step correctly taken, it would be well for the church to encourage her members once more to exercise their gifts in the congregation, and she might safely invite evangelists to labor in Nashville. Indeed, we see not why several evangelists, able, faithful, and efficient, might not be kept at work all the time. By such a course Nashville and the whole surrounding country might be greatly profited.

These things we have said with the best of feelings, and we beg the brethren to measure well their steps in their very responsible position. A slight mistake now would prove fatal to the cause. Our brethren abroad look to our start with much solicitude, and the Heavenly hosts are not unconcerned in reference to the movements of the believers in Christ in Nashville.

T. F.

---

## THE FIRST AND SECOND TEMPLES TYPICAL OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THAT there is a *typical* connection between the Mosaic system, with the Tabernacle, its courts, divisions, vessels, etc., and the Christian Institution, is shown by Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, and is obvi-

ous to every intelligent reader of the Bible. But there is one between the two Temples, the first and second, and the Christian Church, not as easily perceived, and which has been but little noticed, at least by the general reader. We cannot say that it is *accidental*, for it is too striking for this; and we know that God, who can "bring good out of evil," can so shape human events, by his providence, as to make them conform to his designs and purposes, in the great scheme of human salvation and redemption. Of this character was the death of our Savior, for the sins of the world, without which they never could have been expiated, and there could have been no redemption from the grave, or the eternal punishment beyond it. As Peter said on Pentecost, "Him being *delivered* by the *determinate counsel* and *foreknowledge* of God; ye have taken with *wicked hands* and *crucified* and *slain*."

We shall here regard the *first*, or "Solomon's Temple," as usually called, as *typical* of the apostolic or first Christian Church; and the *second* Temple as a *type* of the *second*, or present Christian Church—not of the mass of *sectarian* organizations, not claiming to be *the* Church, but *branches* of the true Church and as constituting it in the *mass*—but the *true* CHRISTIAN CHURCH itself, as in the current Reformation, wearing the *name* of Christ to the exclusion of all party, human appellations, and having all the distinctive *marks* that characterized the apostolic church. *Branches* they all are indeed, but branches of the Roman Catholic Church, and having the features and marks of that, and more or less of its corruptions in their organizations, and its exclusive, persecuting spirit.

But to return.

The Temple of Solomon was one of the most splendid and magnificent buildings the world ever saw, in any age or country. All the most costly material, the treasures of art and science, the ingenuity of architecture, and splendor of decoration, were made subservient to its construction. The cedars of Lebanon, the precious and costly wood, of other countries, the gold of Ophir, the silver of the commercial world, and the precious stones of all regions, were all brought under contribution in its erection. The ships of Tarshish and the caravans of the east poured their treasures into the emporium of Israel, to be used in this great building; until the precious metals became as abundant in Jerusalem as the stones in the streets! The wealth of the Indies and of Arabia and Africa, flowed into it in an uninterrupted stream for years. With such means and facilities as were presented by all these, and with the greatest and most ingenious artificers and workmen of the

world, Solomon was prepared to erect an edifice such as the world had never seen, and will perhaps never behold again—a fit dwelling place for Jehovah on earth, and which he condescended to honor with his presence in a peculiar manner! Such an edifice was a fit *type* of the Christian Church, the first, the pure, the *apostolic* Church.

To show that we are authorized to speak of the Temple as a *type* of the Church, we can adduce the language of Paul, to whom we have alluded as speaking, in his epistle to the Hebrews, of the *typical* character of the Tabernacle and its appointments, “which was a *figure* of the time then being.” In his epistle to the Ephesian congregation, he thus speaks of the church: “And [ye] are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the *building* fitly framed together, groweth into an *holy temple* in the Lord.” And “the *stone* that the *builders* refused the *same* became the *head* of the *corner*.” With this example of Paul, who evidently regarded the Jewish Temple as *typical* of the Christian Church, we proceed with our remarks.

Jerusalem was taken by the Babylonians in consequence of the sins of the Jewish nation, the Temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and the holy vessels, those used in the Temple service, carried to Babylon. The Jews also were carried captive to Babylon—into a seventy years captivity. At length this period expired, and the Jews are released from their long captivity, and permitted to return to their native land. And here we have a most remarkable fulfilment of ancient prophecy. It was predicted by Isaiah *one hundred and thirteen years* before the *birth* of Cyrus, that he should restore the Jews to Judea, and have the Temple rebuilt. He was called by *name*, and the prophecy is so remarkable and confirmatory of the *truth* of the Bible—of its *divine authenticity*—that we will quote the whole of it. John says, that “the testimony of Jesus is the *spirit* of *prophecy*,” and there is a most remarkable exemplification of it in this prediction: “Thus saith the Lord—that *confirmeth* the *word* of *his servants*. and *performeth* the *counsel* of *his messengers*; that saith to *Jerusalem*, Thou shalt be INHABITED, and to the cities of Judea, Ye shall be BUILT; and I will raise up the decayed places thereof; that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith to CYRUS, He is *my shepherd*, and shall *perform all my pleasure*: even saying to *Jerusalem*, Thou shalt be BUILT; and to the TEMPLE, Thy *foundations shall be laid*. Thus said the Lord to *his anointed*, to CYRUS, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to



open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut: I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will *break to pieces* the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I the Lord, which *call thee by thy NAME*, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even *called thee by thy NAME*: I have SURNAMED thee, though thou *hast not known me*. I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me: I *girded thee*, though thou *hast not known me*: that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord and there is none else."—Isaiah xlv, 24–28; xlv, 1–6.

We have here, in this remarkable prediction, not only Cyrus foretold *by name* as the restorer of the Jews from their Babylonish captivity, and the rebuilder of the Temple, *one hundred and thirty years before his birth*, according to correct chronology and history, but also the destruction of Babylon, the breaking to pieces of the "gates of brass," the "two-leaved gates," and the cutting in sunder of the "bars of iron" by which they were secured!

Under the reign of Cyrus the Jews, as we have remarked, were restored to Judea, and Jerusalem and the Temple were rebuilt. This brings us to the *second* Temple. Some of the old Jews who had seen the *first* Temple, the one erected by Solomon, were still living, and when they saw the second, such was its *inferiority* to the first that they *wept*! But it was destined to far surpass it in one respect—to have a glory and a privilege which that never possessed, but one unknown to these old Jews—the Lord himself, the long-predicted and long-expected Messiah, the "incarnate Word," was to come to it! It was to have within it His *presence*, and its walls were to echo to the sound of his voice! Had they been aware of this, it would have compensated, in a great degree, for the contrast, and have modified their grief.

It was *predicted* by Malachi, the last of the Jewish prophets, that the Lord should come to the second Temple, preceded by John the baptizer as his forerunner in the following words:

"Behold I will send *my messenger*, and he shall *prepare* the way before me: and the LORD, whom ye seek, *shall suddenly come to his TEMPLE*—even the MESSENGER of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold *he shall come*, saith the Lord of hosts."

Again, in the same prophecy: "Unto you that fear my name shall the SUN of RIGHTEOUSNESS *arise* with *healing* in his wings, and ye

shall grow up as calves of the stall." "Behold I will send you *ELIJAH the prophet* [John the baptizer] before the *coming* of the great and dreadful day of the Lord:" [the destruction of Jerusalem.]

We come now to the *typical* application of the Temples, and circumstances connected with them. We see, in the first Temple, a fitting *type* of the apostolic church. And we see also the *purity* of the gospel, when first promulgated, in the emblem of the "*white horse*," which John saw when the first seal was opened. The Roman apostasy then came on, represented by the "*black horse*," in the third seal. The church then lost her character of purity and marks of genuineness, and was *carried captive* into spiritual Babylon; but it was nearer a *seven hundred years'*, than a *seventy years'* captivity! At length Luther sounded the trumpet of reformation, and the church began to emerge from the long, dark night of Roman apostasy. But no Cyrus had been raised up yet to release her from her long captivity, to bring her back to original ground—that occupied by the apostles—and to build up the "*second Temple*." That was reserved for *another*, and a *later date*. "The days of miracles" had long since passed way—with the apostles when they left the earth—the word had been *confirmed*, the Christian system completed, and *human agency* must now be employed in restoring the church back to her primitive condition.

The first time the "*white horse*" made his appearance, was when the first *seal* was opened, as we have seen. The next time (Rev. xix.) was not on the occasion of the *opening* of a *seal*, but the apostle beholds "*heaven opened*." Now the word "*heaven*," as used in the Apocalypse, frequently means the church, and the emblem denotes that the gospel, *in its purity*, is to go forth the second time from *the Church*. Is not this *now* the case? Has not the pure gospel gone forth, and is it not *now* going forth, from the *Church*? As in the first Temple we have the emblem of the *primitive Church*, so now we have that of the second Temple in the present Christian Church—taking place since the long captivity in spiritual Babylon. The affinity between the *type* and the *anti-type* is too close and striking to be the work of *chance*. And though the present church is probably as far *inferior* to the primitive, as was the *second Temple* to the *first*, and may never equal it, yet it is evidently, according to prophecy, to enjoy a happiness, glory and privilege that the first church was never favored with, and for which the world and church have been in preparation, according to Divine intention, ever since the commencement of the Christian religion. As the Lord Jesus Christ came *personally*, or "*in the flesh*," to the second Temple,

so shall He *come*, when he comes again or the *second time*, but not in the flesh, to the second or present Christian Church. And we can learn from this relation of type and anti-type, what shall be the *nature* and *character* of his *second coming*, about which there has been so much discussion, and such a contrariety of opinion. As his *first coming* was personal or in the flesh, so his *second coming* shall be of a *spiritual* character. It will be according to the order spoken of by Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, 15th chapter: "That was not *first* which is *spiritual*, but that which is *natural*, and *afterward* that which is *spiritual*." Although this is spoken in reference to the *resurrection*, yet the order will hold as to our Savior's comings; *natural* or personal first, *spiritual* afterwards, at his second coming. What is to be the precise manner of that coming—as to his *body* and *appearance*—we cannot tell, nor is it necessary for us to know. It is to be a *spiritual coming* of some kind, and visible, palpable and real. And when He thus comes, there is to be a *union* of Him to the Church, such as has never yet been. This is evident from various places in the New Testament, where He is represented as the Bridegroom, the Church as the Bride, and the union is called, "the marriage supper of the Lamb," or rather the circumstances accompanying it. Paul says, that "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might *sanctify* and *clease it*, with the *bath of water* by the word: that he MIGHT PRESENT IT TO HIMSELF a *glorious church*, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. So ought husbands to love their wives," etc. But we have this *preparation* of the church, his coming, union, etc., presented to us in detail, in the 10th chapter of Revelation, to which every disciple of Christ would do well to give heed; as it behoves the church to be *prepared* for his coming, or she may be taken by surprise, as will be the infidel and sectarian world! In that chapter, after the fall of spiritual Babylon, the vast multitudes of disciples, and the great exultation over her fall, we are told: "Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give honor to him; for the *marriage* of the Lamb *has come*, and his *wife* hath made herself ready." And what is to be this preparation? "And to her was granted that she should be *arrayed in fine linen, clean and white*; for the *fine linen* is the RIGHTEOUSNESS of saints." Then John sees "heaven opened," beholds the "white horse," and the "armies of heaven following," etc. "The *beast*," (the Roman Catholic power,) "the *false prophet*," (the Jesuitical,) and "the *kings of the earth*," (the political powers,) combine to "make war upon" the Lamb and his

army, but are all taken and destroyed, and the last vestige of sin is obliterated from the earth. All this shows that there is to be a *final persecution*, and the church is to pass through this *ordeal*, in order to be prepared, with the *spirit* of the *martyrs* in her, for entering upon the millennium, which is now ushered in, as we see in the next chapter, and where we also see that the reign of Christ on earth, during this period, is to be a *spiritual* one of some kind; but from what precedes, in the 19th chapter, as well as in other places in Revelation, and from what we see in the 20th chapter, it is to be *different* from that *spiritual* influence and reign now exerted in the church and in the conversion of the world.

The MILLENNIUM will be the *consummation* of the Christian system. When our Savior was about to leave the world he promised the HOLY SPIRIT, to take his place on earth, as the *guest* (not "ghost") and *comforter* of the Church; to remain with and in her, "as an *holy temple* in the Lord," "an *habitation* of God *through* the SPIRIT"—until He shall come the second time; and then the Father, Son and Holy Spirit will all be present with and in the church on earth, in a manner, and under manifestations different from any previously existing. Hence the millennium will be the consummation of "*peace on earth, good will towards men, and GLORY to God in the highest heaven.*" And as the reign on earth of the Lord Jesus Christ, during the millennium, is to be of a *spiritual* character, so the *resurrection* to take place when He comes, will be a resurrection or revival of *spirit* and *not* of *body*. As we have observed and shown, the *material* always precedes the *spiritual* or immaterial, or rather the spiritual *succeeds* the material. The Jewish dispensation was of a *material* character, "which stood *only* in *meats and drinks, and divers washings, and CARNAL ORDINANCES*, imposed on them until the *time* of REFORMATION." Then followed the Christian dispensation, a "*ministration of Spirit.*" At the resurrection of Christ there was a *resurrection* of BODY, or a *material resurrection*: "And the *graves were opened*, and many BODIES of the *saints* which *slept arose*, and came out of the graves AFTER HIS *resurrection*, [as He was 'the *first fruits* of them that *slept*,'] and went into the city, and appeared unto many." And at the millennium there will be a *resurrection* of SPIRIT." "And I saw the SOULS of them that were *beheaded* for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and THEY [the *souls*] *lived and reigned* with Christ a *thousand years.*" "This is the *first resurrection.*"

Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be *priests* of God and of Christ, and *shall* REIGN with him a thousand years." As the other—at the resurrection of Christ—was a resurrection of *body*, so this will be a resurrection of *spirit*. The millennial church, as we have shown, after passing through the *ordeal* of persecution, will be filled with the *spirit* of the martyrs, and thus its members, endued with that spirit, are represented as living and reigning with Christ a thousand years, when it is this spirit in them that will live and reign during the successive generations of that period. "But the *rest* of the *dead lived not again* until the thousand years were finished." That is, there shall be no *revival* of the *wicked spirit*, until then, as "when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be *loosed* out of his prison, and shall go out to *deceive* the nations," etc. This sufficiently explains the figurative language used above.

We have shown, we think, with sufficient plainness, that the present church, in this 'current' Reformation, is the *true* apostolic, primitive Christian Church—the one that will have to combat the "powers of darkness," of atheism, infidelity, skepticism, and sectarianism—in short Romanism with its Jesuitism and political alliances—and to pass through the ordeal of their *persecution*, into the millennium. When the fifth seal was opened, representing this period, John beheld under the altar the *souls* of the martyrs, which cried out for vengeance from the Lord, for their blood, upon those on the earth, when they were told to "*rest yet for a little season, until* their fellow-servants and brethren, that *should be killed as they were, should be FULFILLED*." This sufficiently indicates the period of *persecution* alluded to, through which the church will yet have to pass.

The *influences* that are to bring this period about, are also foretold. It was when the *sixth* angel had poured out his vial or censor of wrath that John says: "I saw *three unclean spirits* like *frogs* come out of the *mouth* of the *dragon*, and out of the mouth of the *beast*, and out of the mouth of the *false prophet*. For they are the spirits of *devils*, [demons,] *working miracles*, which go forth unto the *kings* of the earth, and of the *whole world*, to gather them to the *battle* of that great day [period] of God Almighty." As the "dragon" represented the *infidel* power of Rome, the "beast" the *Roman Catholic* power, and the "false prophet" the *Jesuitical* power; these three *typify* the *triple* influence of Infidelity, Romanism and Jesuitism, by which all Europe, and finally the whole world, will become involved in the last "*universal war*,"



Are not these three influences *now* at work? Do we not see them every day in the "signs of the times?" This period will take the world *by surprise*, when they are not expecting it. "Behold, *I come as a thief*. Blessed is he that *watcheth*, and *keepeth his garments*, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." Let the Church take the warning, and watch and be prepared.

IRENEUS.

NOTE.—In carrying out the typical analogy between the Jewish Temple and the Christian Church, we omitted one striking feature, which it will be worth while to notice in a separate note. The materials for the Temple—at least the first Temple, which was a pattern for the second—were all *prepared*, ready for fitting and putting together, when collected for the building, at the spot of its construction. And so perfectly was every piece prepared, that the Temple went up without the sound of a hammer! So the materials for the Christian Church must be all fully prepared, by *faith, repentance, confession and baptism*, before they are builded together as a congregation, for a "habitation of God through the Spirit." But if baptized, or rather *rantized* in infancy, or if received into the church before baptism, they are not prepared, not fit materials. It is like putting up the logs of a building and hewing them down afterwards; or working the logs into the building, (in "infant membership") with all the branches and brush on, and lopping them afterwards? Such buildings may do for *Baptist, Methodist*, etc., buildings, but they are *not* the Temples of the Lord!

I.

## ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF CORRUPTION IN THE CHURCH.

"THE ancient gospel and order of things," was the motto with which we set out in the current Reformation. Primitive Christianity had become almost obliterated and lost to the world; and to re-establish it—to restore the original gospel and the Christian system of church government and worship—was the work we undertook, and in which we have been co-laboring ever since. It was a glorious work, and to plead for it was the noblest work in which the tongues and pens of men have ever been engaged since the labors of the apostles and the first Christian ministers! Every inch of ground was contested by our opponents—every argument sifted and every position closely scrutinized, and our *triumph*, under the circumstances, was decisive proof of the correctness of our principles. But because we have so signally triumphed, and established them so firmly, let us not cease our labors for them or supinely rest in "inglorious ease."

Let us look at the primitive order, as *instituted* by the apostles, and

as left by them to the church for all succeeding ages. On taking a view of it we will see how admirably *adapted* it is to the *wants* of the world and church, and how these wants and that order suit and fit each other.

In the *first* place, the people we call the world have to be *converted* to Christ and brought into his kingdom, and when initiated into it by the ordinance of *baptism*, they must be gathered into communities, called congregations; and these "set in order," or regularly constituted, organized, and furnished with the necessary officers. For this purpose the apostles constituted an order of the Christian ministry, called *evangelists*, whom we find attending to this business. This is the *first order* of the Christian ministry.

In the *second* place, these congregations had their *spiritual matters* to be attended to, as the government of the Church, the overseeing and teaching of the members, administration of the ordinances in it, etc. For this purpose the apostles instituted a *second* order of ministry, called *bishops* or *elders*—the former from their *office* and the latter from their *age*—whose business it was to attend to these matters, and of whom there was a *plurality* in *every* congregation.

And in the *third* place, these congregations had their *temporal matters* to be attended to, as providing the "elements" for the Lord's Supper and handing them around to the members, when it was attended to, acting as the treasurers and almoners of the church, relieving the poor and indigent brethren and sisters, etc. For this purpose the apostles instituted a *third* order of ministry, called *deacons* and *deaconesses*; the latter consisting of *sisters*, whose business consisted in attending to such matters as were appropriate to their sphere, and as from their delicacy or otherwise the deacons could not well attend to. Mosheim speaks of them as follows: "Some, particularly the eastern churches, elected *deaconesses*; and chose for that purpose matrons or widows of eminent sanctity, who also ministered to the necessity of the poor, and performed several other offices, that tended to the maintenance of *order* and *decency* in the church." And we find this class referred to in the case of Phœbe and in 1 Tim. iii, 11, where "wives" should be rendered "deaconesses." The deacons and deaconesses formed the diaconate of the church.

These *three* orders of ministry were all that were required by the *wants* of the world and the church, as regards the profession and practice of the Christian religion—or becoming disciples of Christ and living as such. And we can see how exactly these *wants* and these

three classes of officers correspond, and how they *fit* and are adapted to each other. *Fewer* would not have done; *more* would have been unnecessary; and "God does nothing in vain." The addition of *other* classes afterwards, and the *perversion* of the duties and offices of these, furnish evidence presumptive of the *corruption*. Not only are these three definitely pointed out, but their *qualifications* and *duties* are laid down by the apostles in the clearest manner. When Christianity was established, the Devil at first attempted to destroy it by persecution, but failing in this, he next resorted to *corruption*. We have passed through the ordeal of *persecution*, and *corruption* is now what we have to guard against. Let us profit by the history of the past.

Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, shows how the church became corrupted; how, by degrees and almost imperceptibly, the *primitive church* departed from the apostolic order, to which we have been referring. He first draws the portrait of the church, as we find it in the New Testament, and as it was in the first century:

"In these *early* times, *every* Christian church consisted of the *people*, [members,] their *leaders*, [the elders or bishops,] and the *ministers* or *deacons*; and these, indeed, belong essentially to *every* religious society. The people were, undoubtedly, the *first* in *authority*; for the apostles showed, by their own example, that nothing of moment was to be carried on or determined without the consent of the assembly. It was therefore the assembly of the people, who chose rulers and teachers, or received them by a free and authoritative consent, when recommended by others. The same people ——— excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension that arose in their community; examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with sovereign power."

Here we have the apostolic order; and we see that it was essentially the same as that which we have been describing, and for which we, as a people, have been contending. We have the *two* orders of ministry in the church, elders and deacons, the sovereign power invested in the *members*, and the congregation *independent*.

Again: "The *rulers* of the church were called either *presbyters*, [from the Greek *presbuteros*,] or *bishops*,—titles which, in the New Testament, are undoubtedly applied to the *same order* of men. (Elder denotes age always and never refers to office. T. F.) These were men

of eminent gravity, and such as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity and merit." "Such was the *constitution* of the Christian church in *its infancy*, when its assemblies were neither numerous nor splendid. *Three or four presbyters*, [bishops,] men of remarkable piety and wisdom, *ruled* these small congregations in perfect harmony; nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissensions were known."

Here we have the picture continued; and see from it that *each* congregation had a *plurality* of bishops, who were all *equal* in authority, and had no superior over them. In proof that they had no authority out of their own congregation, or in any other, we add the following:

"A *bishop*, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of [only] *one* Christian assembly."

Let us see now how soon, and how gradually and imperceptibly, the primitive order was *changed*! In this last extract, we have a hint of it, in finding but *one* bishop to a congregation; and in the following, in reference to the second century, we see corruption beginning to be developed:

"*One* inspector, or *bishop*, presided over *each* Christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voices of the whole people."

Here we have the *plurality* of bishops reduced to but *one*, the first step in the corruption and apostasy, that *gradually* crept into the church, eventually changed the whole face of things, and ended in the Roman Catholic apostasy! Where are the *bishops* now, in this second century? Not gone, but reduced to a subordinate position, as the following extract shows:

"To assist him [this "inspector"] in this laborious province, he formed a *council* of *presbyters*, which was not confined to any fixed number; and to each of those he distributed his task, and appointed a station, in which he was to promote the interests of the church. To the bishops and presbyters, [once the *same* class but now *two*!] the ministers or *deacons* were subject; and the latter were divided into a *variety of classes*, as the state of the church required."

Here too the deacons, formerly but *one class* and all equal, are divided into *several*! Such was the progress of error and corruption! And now I would ask, and I do it with all deference to my brethren and with the purest feelings of brotherly love, are not we, as a religious body, (Mind, Brother H., or you will admit we are but another denomination or faction. T. F.) *coming* to this point? Have we not preachers, styled *pastors*, who fill the same office that these "presi-

dents" did?—have the "care of the church," and the real elders or bishops occupying a *subordinate* position under them? Or, if this is not really the case, are not things *tending* towards this? Let us pause, and examine ourselves; and if we are convinced of this, let us apply the remedy at once, and "nip this in the bud," before we get too far to "retrace our steps" and reclaim the church! But this is not all. Are not our evangelists *assuming too much*, in becoming "pastors," or elders, unless they have been *ordained* to that office; and "labor in the word and doctrine" both? I dislike to use the word "pastor," *popular* as it is, because it is used but *once* in the whole New Testament. We have the "ancient order" as well as the "ancient gospel" laid before us, in the New Testament, in terms too plain to be misunderstood; and let us adhere to them. Let us ever keep these before our minds; and let us never make any *compromise* with *error*, or *sacrifice* to custom or expediency a *particle* of divine truth!

"During a great part of this [the second] century," says Mosheim, "the Christian churches were independent with respect to each other; nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bonds than those of charity. Each Christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or at least approved, by the whole society. But, in process of time, *all* the Christian churches of a province were formed into *one large ecclesiastical body*, which, *like confederate States*, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole." After showing that this had its origin among the Greeks, from the *political* meetings of their States, Mosheim proceeds: "To these [church] assemblies, in which the deputies or commissioners of several churches consulted together, the name of *synods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted by these general meetings, were called *canons*, i. e. *rules*." Here we have the origin of "synods" and "councils," these tyrannical bodies and curses to the church!

But to proceed with Mosheim: "These *councils* of which we find not the *smallest trace* before the middle of this century, *changed the whole face of the church*, and gave it a *new form*: for *by them* the *ancient privileges* of the *people* were *considerably* DIMINISHED, and the *power* and *authority* of the BISHOPS *greatly* AUGMENTED. The humility, indeed, and prudence of these pious *prelates*, prevented their ASSUMING *all at once* the *power* with which they were *afterward* invested. At their first appearance in these general councils, they acknowledged that they



were no more than the *delegates* of their respective churches, and that they *acted* in the *name*, and by the *appointment* of the *people*. But they soon *changed* this *humble tone*, IMPERCEPTIBLY *extended* the *limits* of their *authority*, turned their *influence* into DOMINION, and their *councils* into LAWS: and openly asserted, at length, that CHRIST had *empowered* them to *prescribe* to his people AUTHORITATIVE RULES of *faith* and *manners*!

Another *effect* of these *councils* was, the GRADUAL *abolition* of that *perfect EQUALITY* which reigned among *all bishops* in the *primitive times*." "In the mean time the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of *one vast republic*, formed by a combination of a great number of little States. This occasioned the creation of a *new order* of *ecclesiastics*, who were appointed in different parts of the world, as *HEADS* of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such were the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, AMBITION, having reached its *most insolent period*, formed a *new dignity*, *invested* the BISHOP of ROME, and HIS SUCCESSORS, with the *title* and *authority* of PRINCE of the PATRIARCHS."

Here we have the beginning of Romanism; the steps that led gradually to its assumptions; and "by which the BISHOPS of Rome *mounted afterwards* to the SUMMIT of *ecclesiastical power* and DESPOTISM." We have seen how it commenced, and *gradually* continued until it ended in this system of corruption and abominations! With these things before us, let us beware of any *assumptions* of ecclesiastical power *among us*, as not only the whole letter and spirit of that Book by which we profess to be governed, is against it, but it must, sooner or later, end in *spiritual despotism*, that worst of all forms of despotism! When we find any thing wrong, let us apply the corrective at once, and get rid of it. But, above all, let us beware of its *beginning*, and endeavor to *avoid* that, as far as possible. A great danger lies in *becoming like* those around us—in the contagion of sectarian precedent and example—particularly where these *approach* the apostolic precedents and forms, without adopting them. For example, we have "pastors" for our churches, whose power and authority have not the apostolic sanction. "A word to the wise is sufficient."

IRENEUS.

---

REMARKS IN REFERENCE TO BROTHER IRENEUS' ESSAY.

---

MOSHEIM we regard as a fair general historian, but he was not sufficiently intimate with the Scriptures to give a perfectly clear account of the organization of the first churches. Brother I., too, puts in words about bishops and elders which adds not to the perspicuity of the quotations. We are surprised, however, at the amount of correct information in the essay, and must say, that the great difficulty of writers, particularly regarding what is usually termed the organization of the church, arises from the fact that they write at random, having never studied the subject, and frequently, in a short article, they involve themselves in very gross contradictions. We beg our friends to study the Acts of the Apostles before they attempt to instruct others in reference to planting and directing churches. T. F.

---

## PROGRESSIVE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY.

ONE of the distinguishing characteristics of the Christian religion, is its *progressive* character. It is eminently a religion of progress; and this stamps upon it the divinity of its origin, and shows it to be from God. No other religion can claim this character. None of the systems of *men*—of *human* origin and authority—are fitted for man, and so adapted to him as an intellectual, moral and physical being. "The stream cannot rise above the fountain" from which it emanates; and man can no more make a religion to suit himself than he can create a human being! He alone who *made* man understands him, and knows what kind of religion is suitable to him, and adapted to him in every stage of his being, "from the cradle to the grave," under all circumstances, in every latitude, climate and country, suitable to every race of men, and fitted for him in every phase of society and under all the advances of civilization or human progress. Such a system is the Christian religion; and such is no other religion ever introduced into the world.

The religion of Judaism, though of *divine* origin equally with the Christian, was not intended for the whole race nor for every age of the world, as was vainly supposed by the Jewish nation. Here was their capital error; and this was the rock on which they stumbled and fell! Giving a *literal* interpretation to the symbolic language of their prophets, they saw a splendid earthly monarchy through them under the reign of the Messiah, but saw no further. Judaism was a *temporal* religion,

intended for a particular nation only, to preserve the knowledge and worship of God in purity, and to prevent the nation and the world from being absorbed by that *idolatry*, to which mankind were so prone in those early ages of the world. It consisted of a system of "types and shadows," adumbrating the Christian religion, and pointing forward to the promised Messiah, the great "Prophet, Priest and King," who was to appear; and a system of *law* embracing temporal rewards and punishments, and which was to be the Jews' *instructor*, to bring them to Christ." Hence it was not in its nature adapted to be universal, or of perpetual obligation. The world *out-grew* Judaism. It was too restrictive in its character—too local and inexpansive—for that perpetual *progress* in religion for which man was created. And the same objection lies against all *human creeds*, though professing to originate from the Bible and to be based upon that divine volume. Not only are they without its sanction, and opposed to its "letter and spirit," but like the worn-out and discarded system of Judaism, with which they are all more or less tinctured, they bind the human mind with their fetters, and prevent that expansion and progress for which it is constituted—that illimitable growth which Christianity produces and fosters—that "going on to perfection," for which the soul of man is ever yearning and striving! Hence they are not only useless, but schismatical, injurious, and opposed to the best interests of man. "The Bible, and the Bible alone," is the Christian's creed-book; and the one sanctioned by Divine authority.

Christianity is a religion of *principles*, rather than of *forms*; and hence is fitted for that illimitable progress of which we have been speaking. While it contains but few forms or ordinances, initiatory and commemorative in their character, there are a few great, general, all-prevailing and all-pervading principles, under the influence and working of which this progress goes on. These are *faith, hope, love*, etc., and are in the *spiritual* system, what *electricity, heat, light*, etc., are in the natural. As under the influence and operation of these, take place the perpetual and ever-varying phenomena we daily witness in the kingdom of nature, so under the influence of these great *principles* in the kingdom of grace or favor, a never ceasing progress goes on in the human mind; and to which human creeds are opposed. Hence under the influence of faith, love, etc., not only is there a *change* effected in the human mind and heart, and a *new spiritual life* imparted, but man can go on in illimitable progress, as long as he lives. Hence, the

apostolic admonition: "*Grow in favor and knowledge;*" and the never-ceasing progress in the divine life.

J. R. H.

REMARKS.—We object most seriously to Brother Howard's caption, "Progressive Character of Christianity." In the first place, divers denominations employ this style with the idea that Christianity is by no means what it was when first revealed. "Then," say they, "the world was in its infancy, men were ignorant, rude and vulgar, consequently religion was then rude; but it is progressive in its nature, and now it is far superior to what it was in the days of Paul." This is also the correct idea of progressive religion. Secondly, we state that Christianity was as perfect in the days of the apostles as it is at this day, and as pure and ennobling as God would or could have it. Individuals may make progress under the influence of religion, but Christianity is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Again, we object to the style, because it is used by all the religious infidels of the world. Even Protestantism has become drunk with the wine of Babylon under the influence of this pernicious idea. Indeed, both Romanists and Protestants have fancied the right, in the progress of things, to *change* some of the most solemn ordinances of the New Testament. Baptism was thus abrogated for the more "refined ordinance of sprinkling." But we forbear.

T. F.

---

#### DISCIPLES ALMANAC AND STATISTICAL REGISTER.— "REMARKS EDITORIAL."

In the December number of the Gospel Advocate, after giving our prospectus of the above work, you are pleased to indulge in some remarks, in reference to it, which I think are out of place.

You say, that "so far we have most heartily encouraged him" (me) "in his publications, although for some of them we have not seen their *true place in the church.*" What this last sentence, which I have underscored, means, I know not. I have conducted, for nearly six years, the Ladies C. Annual. It never was designed as an organ of "the church," as is the Gospel Advocate, or to set forth the distinguishing tenets as held by "the Disciples." We have now a sufficient number of such periodicals. Its object has been to occupy ground more common and less cultivated among us, and to supply a want which many have seen as well as myself. All of its articles have not been of equal merit, but no religious periodical with its programme has been freer from objections than it. The past will speak for itself.

I published also a volume of original poems a few years since. It was not designed to hold any "place in the church;" such as the New Testament or Hymn Book. It was a contribution to the literature of a Christian public, and has met its award.

I have published "The Gospel and its Elements" and "Christian Evidences." They are well received, have done good, and will do good. Is it for these works, gotten up with much labor and expense, and to aid me in part to make a living, while preaching to those who are not able to support me, that I am to be arraigned by my good brother Fanning? Tell it not in Franklin College lest the children of the aliens rejoice!

But you seem to be particularly grieved at the announcement of a "Denominational Almanac." This is your name, not mine. I call it "Disciples Almanac." With you it "smacks of Rome." And why? Because it proposes to elicit and spread before the people information on the "number and resources of the denomination," "Sunday Schools," "Colleges," "Periodicals," etc. This is to me strange reasoning. Do not our brethren give us reports from year to year, of a limited extent, of their number, elders and evangelists, etc., etc. Have we not Sunday Schools; Colleges, at Bathany, Franklin, Indianapolis, etc., etc.; Periodicals in many of the States? If a register of the statistics of the Disciples "smacks of Rome," then do not the churches of which this is to be a register, the colleges, periodicals, etc., etc., belong to the same category?

But the reason you assign for this Roman tendency is, that you espoused a cause, many years ago, which you never regarded "denominational," or as you add, to give an odious point to your subsequent comment, "sectarian."

What is "denomination" but a name? Have we no name? If I had said simply, that the proposed register was to give the "number and resources of the Disciples," it would have cut off the point of all your objections on this head.

Paul called Christianity a "sect," in contradistinction to Judaism. (Where did Paul call Christianity a sect? T. F.) I call the Disciples, "the denomination" in contradistinction to all that is sectional. Indeed I use the word interchangeably. (For this you have no authority. T. F.)

But you are mortified now to be placed as "a new denomination." I have not so placed you, nor "the Disciples." This is your "denomination" of us, not mine. (You speak of the rise of the denomina-



tion. T. F.) I insist, nevertheless, upon it, that we are both a "new" and an "old" denomination, or name, and I might add people.

"NEW" for the reason, that no other people acknowledging Christianity, either wear the same name, have the same divine creed, receive to discipleship on the same basis, or have the same order and worship. Surely in these times of universal defection, such a people denominated Disciples is "a new thing under the sun"—so "new" that but few know where to place us; so "new" that some of us hardly know where to place ourselves; and, therefore, endeavor to get as far from others, calling themselves Christians, as "from the centre to the utmost pole."

"OLD" for the reason, that "the denomination" called "Disciples" or Christians originated in Jerusalem eighteen hundred years ago; but in the lapse of time was lost and almost buried in ruins, until recently raised to life again. And now with the aid of a little of that spirit of accommodation which "the sects" take with the scriptures, I might say, that "the first has become last, and the last first," or in other words, the new has become old, and the old "new."

So far as the Disciples' Register is concerned, I think that the wind blows from the right direction, and if our brethren think so, they will send us on the statistics required,—which we think they will do. And as Brother Fanning is President of Franklin College—one of the accessories and dependencies of "the denomination"—a patron of Sunday schools, female academies, and editor of a religious periodical, etc., we hope he will send us on all such information in relation to the several interests in which he as a Christian man, and elder in Israel stands connected, so far as "the Disciples" are concerned.

In the one hope,

Philadelphia.

JAMES CHALLEN.

REPLY.—We regret much to see that Brother Challen attempts to defend the exceptions to which we called attention. T. F.

### EVANGELIZING IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

DEAR BRETHREN:—Having received an invitation from the brethren of South Carolina, through brother Havener, to pay them one more visit, and being authorized by the church at Franklin College to comply with their request, I left home, at Lavergne, Friday morning, 14th of November. As I entered the cars I had the pleasure of seeing my faithful fellow laborer in the gospel, brother John Eichbaum. He had been home to sympathize with an afflicted family on account

of the death of a younger brother of much promise, who had but recently completed his collegiate course and entered the kingdom of God's dear Son. But the autumn of death came, and the tender plant was nipped in the bud, but we all fondly hope will bloom in the fruitful fields of immortality. Taking my seat by the side of brother John we conversed seriously of important events, past and present, till we arrived at Decherd, some eighty miles from home, where we exchanged the Christian benediction and gave the parting hand. Soon the iron horse and all his train were buried in the dark tunnel of the Cumberland mountain. But the darkness was left behind and on we rolled across the Tennessee River, through the deep cut of the round mountain, around the overhanging brow of the Lookout mountain and to Chattanooga. After supper, (which was merely the *rough necessities* of life!) we left on the Georgia cars for Atlanta. We were progressing rapidly and speedily till we came near Tunnel Hill, when our Georgia horse suddenly flew the track and let down; fortunately no one was seriously injured, the engineer only had his arm and shoulder bruised a little. But there we were, in the darkness of night, planning, prizing and wondering when we would renew our journey. Having lost some twelve hours in fruitless effort we were at last emancipated by the next passenger train and came on our way rejoicing once more. I beheld with delight, in our rapid flight, the hills and vallies and beautiful creeks and rivers, connected with my missionary labors among the Cherokees from '27 to '37. I also passed in sight of the lonely place where loved ones sleep in the silence of death.

In the evening we arrived safely in the rapidly growing city of Atlanta, in the hope of once more seeing our aged and beloved brother, Dr. Hook, but was informed by brother Shackelford that he had moved some nine miles into the country. He still sustains the honorable relation and performs the important service of State evangelist.

The shrill whistle called us to our seats, and we left for Augusta, where we arrived Saturday night at a late hour and put up at the Augusta House. Having slept a few hours, I rose early on Lord's day morning to look over this lovely city of the South, and to prepare for church. Half after ten I took my seat in the Christian meeting house, unknown and unobserved, and had the pleasure of hearing from brother James Lamar a very sensible discourse on repentance. After the supper brother Campfield gave me an introduction to brother Lamar, and changed my lodgings from the hotel to his truly Christian and hospitable family mansion. At night I preached on "Spiritual blessings

in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" to an attentive audience. Under the labors of brother Lamar some twenty persons have been added to the church at Augusta. The brethren say that "the Christian Union" is accomplishing much good in Georgia, and they have consequently determined to continue it under the endorsement of our well known and very charitable sister Tubman.

I spent several days in Augusta waiting for some means of conveyance, but failing to get passage by steamboat, I secured a birth in a cotton wagon and came on to Old Union. On Lord's day I preached to a small congregation, which has been gradually increasing, and we hope the meeting may result in some good.

Since my arrival here I learned that our well known and highly esteemed Dr. Erwin died on Monday, the 17th of this month. I anticipated many happy hours with him in his pious and interesting family, but I shall see him no more till the resurrection of the just. How uncertain is life! May we ever be ready to die in the faith, hope and love of the gospel!

Your brother in hope of eternal life,

J. J. TROTT.

Old Union, S. C., November 25, 1856.

### EVANGELIZING IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

DEAR BRETHREN:—In my first communication the narrative of my travel and evangelizing tour terminated in the midst of the meeting at Union. That meeting closed on the fifth Lord's day of November. The congregation on the last day of the meeting was considerably larger than it had been on any previous day, and the effort might have resulted in much good if it had been perpetuated in accordance with the apostolic manner. But the brethren have been so moulded in the *monthly Sunday* policy that it is almost impossible to fashion them according to any other pattern. Consequently our labor was in a great measure lost for the want of a patient continuance in well doing.

The church at Union, though one of the oldest in the State, and though composed of many good brothers and sisters, is yet without scriptural *pastors*! True, they have as good a monthly Sunday evangelist pastor as can be found in Tennessee or any other State—brother Havener. But they have no Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday pastors, teaching all the time, publicly and privately, from house to house, and warning every one, night and day, with tears.

Brother Dr. Tompkins performed a good work at Union, and is gratefully remembered by the brethren, and they are anxious for him to return. In the meantime brethren Bush, Williams and Crosland are responsible for the spiritual welfare of the congregation, and should at once prepare themselves to teach and preach in the church and all the families connected with it. (1 Pet. 5 ch.)

From Union I came to Erwinton, where I arrived on Wednesday evening, and, as usual, stopped at the "Preacher's home," Dr. Erwin's. But death had deprived me of the warm-hearted welcome and Christian salutation of former years! The Doctor had recently slept in the Lord in the faith, hope and love of a Christian philosopher. However, while I deeply sighed and wept with those who wept, I still rejoiced in spirit to find myself once more in the midst of a truly Christian family. O what changes a few years can produce in the families of earth! Since 1850 brother Gen. Erwin and a lovely daughter, brother Warren and Dr. Erwin have all gone to the state of the dead. But life is more powerful than death, and hence while death has diminished the Erwin family only three in six years, life has increased it more than twice three. Some six of the children have married and are already rejoicing over several sweet and beautiful little prattlers, while the fond parents seem anxious to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

On Lord's day we assembled at the meeting house, called Antioch, in order to preach and teach and attend to the Christian worship. I delivered a discourse to a mixed and attentive congregation, on the way to eternal life, having first read Rom. 6th ch. Brother Havener presided at the Lord's table, while the disciples remembered Him who loved and gave himself for them. The meeting closed on Monday after a discourse on "Spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

Brother Havener and brother Alfred preach each to the church at Erwinton once a month. Brother Alfred is a young man of considerable promise. He is teaching a small school at Erwinton and expects to complete next session his collegiate course at Bethany. The death of Dr. Erwin will be a great loss to the church and to the cause generally in South Carolina. The brethren of Antioch and Bethel have made arrangements to build a meeting house between them and worship together occasionally. The great want of those churches, as well as most others, is a competent New Testament *presbytery*—pastors to teach, preside well and preach all the time. But the *monthly Sunday* pastorate will ever prevent the more excellent way.

From Erwinton I went next to Liberty, where the annual meeting commenced on Friday before the second Lord's day inst. Here I had the pleasure of meeting and laboring with our venerable and talented brother, Dr. Hook, of Georgia, who had been invited as well as myself to attend the meeting. The Doctor labored faithfully, ably and successfully while he remained, and we regretted that he had to leave on Monday to haste away with railroad speed to attend some meetings in Alabama. The meeting continued until next Lord's day, but under very unfavorable circumstances, as the weather most of the time was damp and cold, and the house being open and without a stove, a misfortune attending many meeting houses in the mild climate of the ever-green South. Brethren Havener and Alfred and messengers from all the churches in Barnwell—five in number—were present. Some of the brethren were anxious to hire me for a stipulated sum to preach monthly at certain points. But I informed them that I had been sent by the church at Franklin College, Tennessee, in compliance with the request of brethren in South Carolina to evangelize according to the scriptures, and all I wanted was for them to say they wished me to labor, and as to the money, that would be left to their own Christian judgment and liberality. All manifested an ardent wish for me to continue, and the Lord willing I expect to devote six months in Barnwell District. Two intelligent young persons made the good confession, and we expect others ere long. The Lord bless our humble efforts! Pray for me. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you!

J. J. TROTT.

Allendale, S. C., Dec. 24, 1856.

---

BRIGHTON, C. W., Jan. 5, 1857.

MY BROTHER:—We have enjoyed a number of refreshing meetings in Canada the past autumn. At four of our meetings, at different points within some four weeks, over one hundred additions were made to the brotherhood. Thirty of these I had the pleasure of immersing. I have immersed some within the past ten days. If all who profess faith were to walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, the world would speedily be leavened with truth.

Yours in holy bonds,

D. OLIPHANT.



# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, APRIL, 1857.

NO. 4.

---

## THE THREE WITNESSES.

“And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit and the water and the blood; and these three agree in one.”—JOHN v, 8.

“We walk by faith and not by sight.” The Christian religion is a matter, not of knowledge positive and absolute, but of *faith*. The church was built upon the proposition enunciated by Peter, when to the Master he said: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;” and the belief of this proposition, therefore, must constitute the basis of all Christian character.

Commensurate with the importance of this proposition is the testimony upon which its truth is based. This testimony is deposed to us by three grand witnesses, the Spirit, the Water and the Blood; all conspiring together to present to the eye of faith the divine character of our Savior, as manifested in his life and his death, his burial and his resurrection, and his ascension to the right hand of the Majesty on high.

It will be the purpose of this essay to present, as clearly and briefly as possible, the testimony of these three witnesses; and this purpose may probably be best subserved by considering them with the order in which they are stated reversed. Let us examine first, then, the testimony of

### THE BLOOD.

The “blood of the new testament” is meant.

To what does the blood of Christ bear witness? To a most important fact in the gospel of our salvation—the death of Christ. If he

had not died—if the new covenant had not been sealed and consecrated by his own blood—the great purpose of his mission to earth must have been unfulfilled. “He is the mediator of the new testament, that, *by means of death*, for the redemption of the transgression under the first testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the *death* of the testator.” Without the shedding of blood, there was no remission under any covenant, and no sacrifice short of that of the Son of God, could take away sins. The sin-offerings under the “first testament” were only shadows pointing to the one great sin-offering, the Lamb of God. Hence the same writer quoted above declares: “But now once in the end of the world hath he (Christ) appeared to take away sins by the sacrifice of himself.” The death of Christ, therefore, is the basis fact of the gospel, without which it were no gospel. How important then is it that this fact should be sustained by testimony the most irrefragable! Such testimony we have, deposed continually throughout Christendom by an ever-living witness—the Blood. It speaks to the world through that commemorative institution of the church, “the Lord’s Supper.” The wine, which Jesus, on the night of his betrayal, consecrated as the emblem of his blood, brings most vividly to view his sufferings and death upon the cross. Hence says the Apostle Paul, “As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” Though eighteen hundred years have passed away, this institution still speaks in the church of God. Whilst men and times and tongues have changed; whilst regal structures, vainly intended to rescue from oblivion the names of earth-born men, have crumbled and gone to dust; this has stood “a monument more durable than brass,” and its inscription still speaks to the world—“Behold the Lamb of God.”

The next witness for examination is

#### THE WATER.

Although the *death* of Christ is a matter of such transcendent importance, yet, if the drama of human redemption had ended here, the world had remained forever unreconciled, unsaved. Upon what could we found a hope of life, if our Deliverer had remained in bondage to the dominion of death? If Christ be not risen our faith is vain and we are yet in our sins. But he arose in triumph over the powers of the grave, and lighted up for us, through the gloomy territory of death, a pathway to immortality. To this important fact, upon which is suspended our hope of eternal life, the water bears unequivocal testimony.

It also speaks in a positive, monumental institution of the church—the “one immersion.” That Christian baptism, in its action, was intended to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, there can be no reasonable doubt. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, speaks of it in this wise: “Therefore we are *buried* with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the *likeness of his resurrection.*” Again in his epistle to the Colossians (ii, 12,) he uses this language: “*Buried* with him in baptism, wherein also ye are *risen* with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” This monumental feature of the institution constitutes, to my mind at least, the most powerful argument in favor of immersion, as the only scriptural baptism. Compared with this, the proofs drawn from the most learned criticisms upon the words *bapto*, *baptizo* and their cognates, however satisfactory in themselves, dwindle into insignificance. When I behold the submission of a creature to the authority of heaven in this most solemn and impressive institution, I am reminded of the burial and triumphant resurrection of my Savior, and reassured that, although I am destined to go down to death, yet I shall rise again to new and immortal life.

Those, therefore, who advocate *sprinkling* or *pouring* as the proper action of baptism, destroy its sublime significance, and, by rendering it a meaningless and purposeless ceremony, silence one of the essential witnesses to the facts of the gospel.

But the testimony should be incomplete without the depositions of the third witness—

#### THE SPIRIT.

The testimony of the Blood and the Water might be corrupted (as that of the latter has evidently been) by the traditions and speculations of men. The Spirit therefore corroborates their testimony and sustains their character as witnesses unimpeachable. But it goes further still. Whilst the Blood points to the cross and the Water to the grave, the Spirit testifies to the birth, the life, the miracles, the teaching of Jesus—to his ascension and glorification—to the establishment and perfection of his Church. It comprises within its ample reach the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, of friends and foes, of God, angels, men and devils; forming an array of evidence which the infidelity of eighteen hundred years has assailed in vain.

But how does the Spirit depose to us its testimony? Is it by imme-

diating inspiration—by the communication of mysterious impulses to the soul, thereby endowing it with a conscious perception and assurance of the truths of religion? This is a question of much moment, for such mystical notions are very generally prevalent. To the commonly received opinions with regard to the witness of the Spirit we beg leave to present two principal objections.

1. Such abstract spiritual influence is not embodied in ideas addressed to the understanding.

The object of testimony is the production of faith. The testimony of the Spirit, therefore, must be addressed to the understanding, which alone, in the constitution of humanity, is empowered to receive, weigh and decide upon the sufficiency or insufficiency of evidence. That man is something more than mere intellect, and that faith has to do with something more than the understanding, is admitted. Faith, the reliance of the soul on Christ as its only hope of salvation, must reach the heart—the seat of the affections and residence of all motive power. But God, in his wisdom, has constituted the understanding as the avenue to the heart, and, in conformity to his own wise arrangement, he has never asked a creature to *believe*, except upon such testimony as comes within the purview of his thinking, rational nature. Hence the great Apostle Paul has said, “faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God.” We have no instance on record of direct and extraordinary influence of the Spirit upon the soul in order to the production of faith, and no promise of such miraculous gift, even in the days of miracles, to an unbeliever.

2. This mystical view of the witness of the Spirit is contrary to the analogy established by the other witnesses with which it stands connected.

The blood of Christ, abstractly considered, bears no testimony to his death. There are no stains of the blood he shed to be found in the soil of Mount Calvary, to testify to the tragical scene enacted there. There are no blood-stained relics of the cross, hoarded up by Popes, or Priests, or cloistered Munks, to tell of the “Lamb for sinners slain.” Nor is it by any mystical application of the blood of Christ to the soul that it bears testimony to this prime fact of the gospel. It speaks alone through a *positive institution of the Church*.

There is no testimony to the truth of the gospel borne by abstract water, either in a drop or an ocean. The pure fountains that gush up from beneath our hills, and the fertilizing showers that fall from heaven, give evidence of the goodness of God in providence, but they tell

---

no story of a buried and risen Savior. The water speaks alone in baptism, *a positive institution of the church.*

In like manner the Spirit speaks, not in vague and mystical communications addressed to the ear of the inner consciousness, but in *a positive institution of the church.* That institution is the Word; for the Scriptures, given by inspiration of the Spirit for our instruction and guidance, constitute a positive institution, just as much as either baptism or the Lord's supper. In the beginning, ere yet the testimony of the written word was complete, the Spirit was present with the Church in all its wonder-working power. But when the days of its progressive development were accomplished, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased; and we now contemplate the sublime spectacle of the Church perfect and fully equipped, in its positive institutions, to carry on the great work of reconciling an alien world to God.

F. M. C.

---

#### BIBLE REVISION.

THE Revision movement is certainly one of the most important enterprises of the nineteenth century. The learning and talent it has enlisted in its service must command the respect, if not the approbation, of all. Whether the revision of the Scriptures, as at present undertaken, will be productive of much good—whether it will exert any influence in harmonizing the conflicting views of distracted Christendom—remains for future developments to decide. In the main the new version, so far, is doubtless a faithful rendering of the Originals; and the zeal and labors of the revisers, in the effort to give to the world the pure Word of God, is certainly commendable. But, with all due respect for superior wisdom and learning, we desire to present what seems to us an objection to all the specimens of revision we have yet seen.

In general the revisers seem to adhere too tenaciously to the old forms of words, as we find them in the version of King James. For example, such expressions as “*unto* the church,” “*grace unto* you,” “*hath* been sounded forth,” “*ye* know,” “*who delivereth*,” etc., have been retained. These are objectionable, because they indicate an unreasonable attachment to antiquated forms of speech. Why have a Bible couched in quaint old Saxon, so different from our common language? To this it may be replied that the Bible is a *sacred book*, and should therefore be written in *sacred style*, not in the vulgar vernacular



of human literature. How came this Quaker style to be regarded as sacred? Simply from the fact that it has been retained in that book, whilst our language has been changing and improving. The argument, therefore, in favor of this style of language is, at best, but a mere "reasoning in a circle." It is the style of the Bible because it is sacred, and it is sacred because it is the style of the Bible!

There is a popular prejudice against any change in the phraseology of our present version of the Scriptures, to which the Bible Union in its instructions, general and special, to the revisers, seems to have paid too much regard. One great objection to the revision movement, in the minds of the people, arises from the fear that it will materially alter the familiar forms of expression in the Scriptures, which have been endeared to them by so many hallowed associations; which have been fixed in the memories of thousands, thus keeping the lessons of inspiration ever before the mind. Let us examine this objection to change of style.

1. This sacred regard for the phraseology of the old version arises from a superstitious reverence for things that are old; and hence it is too often the case, I fear, that the professed friend of the Volume of Truth looks upon it as a relic of antiquity, like some quaint old Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman ballad, than as the living word of God, adapted to the moral and spiritual wants of the present age. The memory of "the old-fashioned Bible that lay on the stand," whose leaves were turned, in days of yore, by hands long since cold in death, is cherished with fondest affection, amid a host of the most hallowed recollections of earlier years. We love—naturally enough to be sure—to repeat from memory and to read the "Lord's prayer," and other select passages, in the very language that fell upon our ears in childhood from the lips of an affectionate mother; and we are prone to regard any changes in the phraseology, just as we are wont to regard the changes which a new occupant may have made in the constitution and surroundings of the old family homestead, as an outrageous mutilation, whether these changes are for the better or for the worse. It is possible for this aversion to change to stand in the way of truth. We may come to love the Bible—many no doubt have done so—not for the treasures of truth and heavenly wisdom which it offers us, but as a sacred keep-sake, and relic of the past; we may love the shadow while we forget the substance; we may regard most sacredly the words, while we lose sight of the ideas.

2. The fact that the language of the old version is already familiar to

the minds of the people, and that its very forms of expression are indelibly fixed in the memories of so many, seems, at first view, to constitute a more valid objection to change; but it should be borne in mind that it is not necessary to forget the language of the Old, in order to learn that of the New. In all cases where the meaning of the original has been faithfully rendered in the common version, it will be an easy matter to change the phraseology into our common tongue and wherever the original has not been correctly translated in King James' Bible, the love of truth would constrain us to receive the corrected version. I doubt, however, whether it is any advantage to one, after all, to have committed to memory so many "texts" of Scripture—so many phrases and mere forms of expression. Those who can quote most Scripture are not universally, or even generally, the most thoroughly imbued with the sublime beauties and spiritual ideas of the Holy Oracles; just as in the study of science, the student, who commits most accurately to memory the language of his text book, in general learns the least about it. Moreover, memory of forms and expressions affords great facilities for a sort of textuary application of Scriptures, enabling one to seize, here and there, upon such texts as may *seem* to be applicable to the subject in hand, without any reference to their connections, and, too frequently, without a correct understanding of the literal import of the words employed. Thus, in the use and application of remembered scriptures, the Bible has been made a mere book of proverbs, from which useful maxims and instructive sayings are to be culled, here and there, *ad libitum*.

3. The style of the common version, I apprehend, operates materially against the understanding of the scriptures by the people. Words are the signs of ideas; and whether we speak or write, or read or think, the ideas we express to others, which others express to us, and which suggest themselves to us in reflection and silent meditation, are inseparably connected with language. Now our common vernacular is so intimately connected with our practical, every-day life that it may be regarded as almost a necessary element of our very existence—the medium of the interchange of thought and feeling. As a necessary consequence, ideas make a stronger and more lasting impression upon the mind when presented to it in words familiar to the eye and ear. A writer, even in our modern English, is more readily understood by the objects of his address when they are familiar with the peculiarities of his style. If then, the peculiarities of a modern author's style present difficulties to be overcome, in order that we may

thoroughly understand and appreciate what he says; how much more so, when, upon opening the Volume of Truth, we are forced to forget, for the time being, the familiar and impressive style of our common tongue, and bid our thoughts flow in the channels of King James' English? How sudden the transition from 1857 to 1611, where the spiritual teaching, which is just as applicable to the present age as to those which are past, is dressed in the fashions of defunct generations! Instead of our own proper language, living, fresh and vigorous, we meet the ghost of a departed dialect,

"Arisen out of hoary centuries."

Why is there so little interest manifested by the young in reading the Bible? Is it not attributable, in part at least, to its style? Its *haths* and its *doths*, its *ye's* and its *eths*, give it a heavy, lifeless style, and cause an aversion to the reading of this best of books. Many, even of the more religiously inclined, while they read with interest the driest of works in History and Philosophy, peruse their Bibles (some of them with commendable perseverance it must be allowed,) as a mere *task*, or religious *duty*.

He must be very sanguine, who expects for the revised version a favorable reception by the great majority of the people. However faithfully and correctly it may be rendered, it will have hosts of enemies. The great battle, which shall decide the fate of the new version, remains to be fought after the work of revision shall have been completed. Would it not be better then, to render it into good English, and let it stand or fall upon its merits alone?

F. M. C.

---

### FASHIONABLE WORSHIP.

WE apprehend a prevailing evil, aggressive in its tendency, and ominous of desolation to the Christian cause. It is that unwarrantable levity and carelessness of members in regard to the exercises of the Lord's house which characterises many of our monthly and semi-monthly meetings. We earnestly solicit the attention of the brethren to this: "For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." (Rom. iv, 11.) Yet we see some who profess to be His servants, either for want of courage or want of reverence, fail to bow even in His sanctuary. It may be, some, especially among the ladies, cannot afford to soil their finery with the dust of the floor.

We confess our ignorance of the true cause; but cannot evade the chilling, impious glare of its effects. I know not the feelings of our preaching brethren, when they attempt leading in worship and find themselves poorly assisted in singing, almost alone in prayer, and entirely so in preaching; but *I* think *I* should conclude there was something wrong, and try to "teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly." I would tell them of the humility of our Savior—how he humbled himself and fell upon His face and prayed;—and of the devotion of Paul—how he bowed the knee; and of all the devout worshippers of God who call upon His name from a sincere and reverential heart. I should be disposed to persuade them to imitate these as worthy examples, and to pray often, or at least, when they come together professedly to worship, not to sit up in insolent defiance of all reverence for God and respect for His people and His house. And would it not be well to tell them that we are commanded to make prayers, supplications, and intercessions, and to pray evermore, and to let the word of Christ dwell in us richly, in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord; and to exhort them to the individual study of the Word of life, which will make us wise unto salvation and eternal life?

A reform in this respect would greatly enhance our progress. The world, instead of contemning our ardor and devotion, as formerly they did our seemingly empty pretensions and profane indolence, would respect our worship, and attend our meetings with that reverence due the solemn convocations of the Lord's people.

As it is, we do not show that reverence ourselves, and therefore cannot expect it from others. As long as the children of the kingdom sit irreverently during the time of singing and prayer, and walk unscrupulously in the follies and fashions of life, the world cannot be expected to submit to the solemn ordinances of God's house. But if we come together in the name and the fear of the Lord, and attend to the worship with the spirit and with the understanding, those that observe will not fail to be impressed with the solemnity of the scene. When the people of the Lord shall study His will and serve Him from the knowledge of His law, then shall His house become a house of consolation and joy, and the people of the Lord a triumphant and glorious people. Let us come together on the first day in the week, carrying about us the sword of the spirit, enter into His house with gratitude, and with praises on our tongues, praise Him standing on our feet and adore Him on our knees; and teach and admonish each other in His fear.

We would suggest the practical adoption of the most approved method of worship, and which we believe has scriptural sanction; introducing the services by standing up and singing praises, then kneeling in prayer; and after this reading and instruction from the Holy Scriptures. And let not the singing be interrupted by reading nor talking; nor prayers be confusedly uttered by different individuals; but "let everything be done decently and in order." Let the rising be at the commencement of singing, unhesitating and simultaneous; and the kneeling when the signal is given, without precipitation, reluctance, or glancing to see who is beholding such submission.

We only insist upon the practice of what has long been approved and partially acted upon. It seems to me probable that there might be much good done by the brethren meeting on the first day of the week and reading a few chapters of Sacred Truth, and mutually conversing on the topics treated on; and afterwards attend to other duties and privileges. This I think would do well where there is no "Pastor;" and even where a congregation is thus favored, reading and conversation might be equally as edifying as sermonizing on "Doctrinal subjects."

We make these suggestions for the benefit of the brethren; and to call attention to the fearful encroachments of fashion upon the lives of Christians, and thereby to avert the calamity resulting from such evils, is their highest aim. If any one see any impropriety in such and shew unto us a more excellent way, we will be grateful for the favor. Bro. Fanning, will you or Lipscomb, or some other brother, stir the brethren, and sisters too, up to their duty in the Lord's house?

Yours in the Lord,

J. R. WILMETH.

Unfortunately, the evils complained of by brother Wilmeth are but too often to be witnessed among those who profess to be Christians. Unless the worship in the congregation is conducted upon proper principles, and with proper views of the legitimate objects of worship, it must inevitably degenerate into mere form and spiritless ceremony. It is frequently urged as an objection to us, by our opposers, that we have the form, without the spirit and life of godliness; and whilst most of those who raise this objection would do well to remember that "they who live in glass houses should not throw stones," it must be confessed that it is too often true.

In this fashion-loving, fashion-following age, we are prone to be



unduly influenced by prevailing customs; and professing Christians are ever in danger of becoming worshippers, not of the God who built the heavens, but of that earth-born idol, so often found enthroned in gorgeous city temples—*Respectability*. Apostate Rome first departed from the simplicity of the ancient worship, by the introduction of pompous rites and imposing ceremonies; from which her daughters, with all their *protestations*, have not yet entirely divested themselves. How oft is it the case, even among the *orthodox*, that “the members” are mere spectators at the house of worship, merely attending upon the ministrations of some man, who is “called and qualified” to deliver elegant discourses to please their fancies, or to administer somnolent disquisitions, to lull them into sweet forgetfulness of the cares of the world! Thus they spend the Lord’s Day with *decency* and *respectability*! It is to be feared that we, too, are much influenced by these fashions of the age. With many congregations a meeting, professedly for worship, would be a failure—a disappointment—without some priest, great or small, called a preacher, to “minister in the sanctuary.” We sometimes speak of the “Clergy” and the “Laity,” using the language of modern Babel. Take heed, brethren, lest you pay too much deference to this same potent Deity, *Respectability*.

True worship, and such as is acceptable in the sight of God, consists not in going through a dull, uninteresting routine of forms as a mere matter of duty. It claims a higher, nobler end—to build up the church and train its members for immortality. This is not to be accomplished by preaching. Whilst the teaching of competent bishops constitutes an important part of the service of the Lord’s house, yet it is by no means the whole; and the preaching of the gospel to the world forms not part of religious worship. Every member of the congregation should be interested in the worship; and in order to be interested he must feel that he has something to do. Let the young brother and sister be taught that the Lord has work for them to do—that they are not mere drones in the hive, but that it is possible for them to be useful in the cause, and they will not fail to be interested.

But the prime cause of coldness, of soul-freezing formality in religious worship lies deeper yet. It arises from a want of genuine, every-day piety. The Christian religion is not a mere Sunday garment, to be doffed on Monday morning and stowed away for the week. If we would cultivate daily the Christian virtues—if we would purify our hearts continually by imbuing them with the enlightening, life-giving truth of heaven—it would be a pleasure to us to

go up to the house of worship; and there would be no need of *mesmerism*, nor any other modern appliances, to make us feel interested in the service of the Lord we love.

F. M. C.

### THE BIBLE OUR CREED.

THE New Testament, which is the new covenant of God with man, forms the only true standard by which the actions of the Christian man are to be regulated. 'Tis the only true standard, in other words, of right. This being universally admitted as a fact beyond all question, the fair and legitimate conclusion is, that all systems of religion, founded upon human creeds and human devices, cannot be infallible guides to the traveller from earth to heaven.

In as much as the *will* of God is revealed to mortals in the Bible, men evidently, when resorting to other inventions devised by human ingenuity, discard God's word as inadequate for purposes for which it was designed. Thus they manifestly declare by their actions, that they do not repose confidence in God's revealed plan. Thus do they treat it with gross contempt and put *themselves* forward as possessing greater wisdom and ingenuity, sufficient to accomplish what God could not accomplish. (?) Poor, feeble worms of the dust, thus to arrogate to themselves so much authority !!

And it is this very thing that has created so much division, so much strife, and so much unchristian-like demeanor on the part of those professing to be members of Christ's body. It reminds one of those, in olden times, who endeavored to build the tower of Babel by which they might effect an ascension into the presence of God himself. Yet the anger of the Omnipotent Father was incensed against them in their folly, and by his supreme will their language was confused, and thereby their impious schemes thwarted.

So in the present case, men striving to ascend to Heaven by their own foolish contrivances, have been visited by the same bitter reproof—by a similar curse. Though it is not the confusion of tongues, yet it is far worse: *it is the confusion of mind*. What is the cause of this confusion? Instead of receiving *the Bible* as the only revealed will of God to mortals, men have sought new revelations. Different methods have been adopted by men of different opinions. Some pretend to hold communion with departed spirits, and through such media feign to receive communications from the Most High God. Some again

are guided by their internal feelings, their conscience being regarded as the *Divinity* within, which teaches them the ways of God to man. Whilst others again rely upon external objects and thereby attempt to prove the goodness and existence of God. They are those who "look up through nature's works to nature's God!" Such views are most infidel in their tendency and degrading in the sight of God. Those embracing such views evidently treat the Inspired volume of God with the greatest disrespect, rejecting its sacred admonitions, and "going in search of strange Gods."

If man cannot repose implicit confidence in God's holy word as revealed alone in his own sacred volume, then he is not his friend, nor is it possible for him to meet with a happy reception into his glorious kingdom, rendered eternal in the heavens. For the Bible is the only infallible guide to the immediate presence of God.

Consequently its rejection proves the eternal ruin of man; whilst its reception tends to the elevation of mortals to a world of future bliss.

Then why will not men receive the word of their God into honest and understanding hearts? Why will they not yield in submission to the authority of Jesus Christ, reposing firm reliance in his revealed will? Will mortals be so blind to their own interest, to their own eternal salvation, as to regard with total indifference the requisitions of the great God of the universe? Will they treat with contempt the word of God, and expect in the meanwhile to escape with impunity?

There awaits a just retribution for the deeds of all men. None can escape. In that day, when all shall be summoned by the authority of the Living God to appear before his awful tribunal, where himself the arbiter supreme shall judge both the just and the unjust; who can describe the feelings of the transgressor of his Father's law? And yet how much more intense must be the anguish of his soul, when he hears his God pronounce the awful doom: "*Depart from me you accursed into everlasting punishment, prepared the Devil and his angels!*" Heaven grant that mortals may be made to feel the importance of leading honest and upright lives. And may we remember, to live as worthy followers of Christ we must live in conformity to the law of his kingdom. We must receive the Bible as our only true and infallible guide to that world of glory, where God has promised to receive those who live in the faithful discharge of their duties to Him and to their fellow mortals.

By assuming this Inspired Book of God as our *only* creed, we stand united upon a firm basis. We reject all *human devices*, and consequently the conflicting opinions and speculations of the world. We are thus

bound by the strongest ties of love to God and to our fellow men. For the spirit of love, truth, and justice pervades the entire will of Jehovah as revealed in his sacred volume.

"Blest be the tie that binds  
Our hearts in Christian love,  
The fellowship of kindred minds  
Is like to that above."

Franklin College, March, 1857.

W. F. F.

### CONSOLIDATION.

BROTHER FANNING:—The people of the present generation are said to be an investigating people. In things pertaining to this life I admit it, but in things pertaining to spiritual matters I am slow to confess it. If people do investigate, why are they so slow in learning the difference between a false and a true standard, between *public* opinion and the Bible? Why is it that christianity can only be seen in the light of an *establishment*? I greatly fear me that the whole tendency of the *Pulpit* and the *Press*, with a few honorable exceptions, is to consolidation, to *establishment*, to clerical authority, and such like blighting powers on the morals and purity of the church.

It is now full fifteen years since we met in the City of Nashville and discussed for a week the great principles of "church order," and church "*organization*," and strange to say, these subjects are now mooted in our oldest and best disciplined churches. Have our brethren attended to the report of that meeting as they should? Would not a new edition of that report, gratuitously distributed among the churches, East, West, North and South, be worthy of the effort?

I must confess that I was very much surprised to see in the December number of the Gospel Advocate, from the pen of one of our veteran editors, a proposition to divide the United States into ecclesiastical districts, and have meetings appointed at intervals, in proportion to the magnitude of the districts. This, I think, cannot be done without creating several new officers, and offices in the church, unknown to the Bible and the primitive congregations in Jerusalem, Samaria, or in any part of the Roman Empire. There is no good to be attained by such an organization that I can see; but evils boundless in number and magnitude. This extended organization in other churches has led to the perversion of all scriptural offices; it has converted the Bishop's sphere of action, which in the beginning was limited to a single con-

gregation, into a *Diocesan Bishopric*, and many of the Bishops are now arched over with political as well as ecclesiastical authority, and made overseers of congregations and people they never saw. The deacons also have been separated from their congregations, to whom their services are due, and made to do the work of an evangelist. Hence the necessity of class-leaders, stewards, &c.

But we might, perhaps, bear this increase of officers, this increase of meetings and consequent expense, were it not for the more fearful evils growing out of the mammoth establishment. When we shall have finished this ecclesiastical monster, furnished rules for its government, and put all its very wonderful machinery into successful operation, meted out the butts and bounds of all the grades and orders of society, then must there be a complete separation of the clergy from the laity,—the greatest sin ever committed against the church of Jesus Christ, either ancient or modern.

I wonder if the writer of the article under consideration has ever seriously pondered on the effects of what he recommends, and endeavored to see the end from the beginning? Has he read the able and consistent view taken of this very matter by *Guizot*, in his history of civilization in Europe? If not, I would most respectfully submit the following extract to his consideration, and pray him to weigh well its every syllable before he urges these first steps of consolidation. Let him see what such steps have effected in other countries, and say whether he is willing to endorse them in this.

*Guizot*, having spoken of the elements of civil society left among the people at the fall of the Roman Empire, says:

“Meanwhile, within the very heart of Roman society, there had grown up another society of a very different nature, founded on different principles, and animated by different sentiments, and which has brought into European civilization elements of a widely different character. I speak of the *Christian Church*. I say the *Christian church*, and not *christianity*, between which a broad distinction is to be made. At the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, christianity was no longer a simple *belief*; it was an *institution*,—it had formed itself into a corporate body. It had its *government*, a *body of priests*; a settled ecclesiastic *polity* for the regulation of their different functions, revenues, and independent means of influence. It had the rallying points suitable to a great society in its *provincial*, *national* and *general councils*, in which were wont to be debated in common the affairs of society. In a word, the christian religion at this epoch was no longer merely a *religion*, it was a *church*.”



My object in introducing this long extract is, that the present school of writers may note the difference between christianity and what is generally called the *church*. Christianity relies on the simple word of truth, and the God of truth, for all that it was, is, or can hope to be. The church looks to human philosophy at least for what it shall hereafter be. This may appear as very unkind and harsh in judgment; but if it is not just, then I am greatly deceived.

Again, if you deny my conclusions, I ask you if the church is not to be made more efficient by the addition of this new and philosophic organization? If not, why add it? If so, then your philosophy is capable of adding strength to the plans of heaven, and you will save a part of the human family by your philosophy, which the Bible could not save without it. But if you say you only want to carry out the intention of the Bible by simple co-operation, then I want you to give me chapter and verse for dividing the world into ecclesiastical districts, and in so doing you will very much oblige me, as well as all the bishops and archbishops of England and America. They have all sought such proof, but have not found it.

I will now only add that (from my knowledge of Bro. H.,) when he re-surveys the whole of the premises, I think he will go as far as any one to stop the growing influence of "organized co-operations." I have long since been satisfied that the whole plan on foot was of the wisdom of men, and consequently foolishness with God, and would per force of its own gravity fall to the ground. Moreover, I do believe it has been the greatest evil our infant congregations have had to contend with, and has done more to retard our progress than all other causes combined. I may some day give my reasons for this article of my faith, but for the present I forbear.

W. H. H.

---

#### EVANGELIZING IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

DEAR BRETHREN:—Since my last I have preached at Cross Roads, Savannah, Ga., and Three Mile.

On the fourth Lord's day in December I preached in the Methodist meeting house, at Cross Roads, to a large congregation, composed of several denominations and the world, on the unity of the church. The people listened very attentively and I think a good impression was made. Here the brethren of two churches have commenced a new meeting house to be called Bethel. May it be in truth the house of God!

## THE CHURCH AT SAVANNAH.

Wednesday morning, 31st December, on board the "Swan," Bro. Havener and myself left for Savannah. The Savannah River, like most rivers, is very crooked. A variety of evergreens, covered with long moss, was the most interesting scenery we beheld, till we reached the large rice plantations, extending several miles above the city and beautifully dotted with negro quarters, painted white and resembling country villages. But the dark curtains of night were let down and concealed the extensive and fertile fields, in which the children of Ham produce one of the richest luxuries of life, from our delighted vision. Soon, however, another more interesting scene was revealed. The moon shone dimly through the passing clouds, the fires of the wharf and gas lights of the city shone brightly in the distance, and, for the first time, I found myself surrounded with a host of ships piercing the heavens with their tall masts.

About eight o'clock, P. M., we landed and proceeded in haste to the hospitable mansion of the first and oldest disciple of the South, as I suppose. Brother Dunning and his intelligent and pious wife received and entertained us in true Christian style. How instructive and refreshing is the society of aged pilgrims! We conversed of many things, old and new, offered our evening sacrifices on the family altar and retired to enjoy the sweet and refreshing rest of sleep.

The first morn of a new year dawned and I found myself surrounded with lovely scenery entirely new to me. The city of Savannah is situated on a sandy bluff of the river, about fifteen miles from the Atlantic. The tide water flows up the river twenty-five miles above the city, and by means of ditches is made to overflow the rice fields as oft as the planters wish it. The streets of the city run parallel with and at right angles to the river. Many of them are broad and beautifully shaded, and ornamented with evergreens. Where many of the streets cross there are large vacant squares, ornamented with evergreens, furnished with public wells and protected with circular railing. These are the healthy breathing lungs of the city and beautiful play grounds for the children. The city extends about two miles up and down and about one mile out from the river, embracing a beautiful Park of several acres, overgrown with the tall long leaf pine. There are many fine dwelling houses, public buildings, and churches. Savannah is now the terminus of three railroads and improving rapidly. It is the city of Oglethorp, the place where Mr. Wesley preached to the

Creek Indians over one hundred years ago, and refused to sprinkle the infant of Mrs. Parker because it was not sick. The eloquent Whitfield preached here also, and still has a literary monument in the midst of the city, a large school building erected by the charity of Lady Huntingdon. Here, too, Mr. Campbell, the brilliant comet of this age, preached the doctrine of reformation. And here last of all the great Southern Commercial Convention recently met.

Friday morning brother Havener left for home. I accompanied him to the boat, and, in a few minutes "all aboard" was proclaimed and the Swan was off for Augusta. I continued my explorations through the day, and at night, by special invitation, attended a *Christian* wedding at brother Galoway's. Saturday night I preached to a few of the disciples, at brother Dunning's, on the importance of Christian charity. On the Lord's day we had meeting three times in the Fireman's Hall, where "the disciples meet on the first day of the week to break bread," and lectured on spiritual blessings, the consolations of the gospel and historic Christianity. We continued our discourses of evenings till Thursday night.

The disciples are not so numerous at Savannah now as in former years, owing perhaps to the fact that some of the good brethren have been too zealous for the *letter*. But such brethren are so pious that we should forgive their zeal, and continue to "forbear one another in love." The intelligence and piety of brothers Dunning and Williams, sanctified by the Christian conversation of their very amiable wives, will, we humbly trust and pray, enable them, with others, to feed and oversee the little flock at Savannah, so as to "preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace."

Having spent one of the most pleasant weeks of my evangelizing life with the good brethren of Savannah, and received many pressing solicitations to visit them again, and a liberal contribution to help me on my way, I left on Friday morning for South Carolina.

On the second Lord's day of January, 1857, I commenced a protracted meeting at Three Mile, and continued till Thursday. Four interesting young ladies, and one intelligent daughter of Ham, confessed that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. After baptizing them on Thursday I left to fill other appointments for preaching.

Yours in the Lord,

J. J. TROTT.

Beaufort District, S. C., Jan. 17, 1857.

## TRACTS FOR THE YOUNG.—NO. 1.

## WHAT SHALL I DO?

THE objects of human pursuit are numberless, and various are the means employed for their attainment. It is on this account that the young mind is so often perplexed with the question, What shall I do? The thousand callings of men are before him, presenting their inducements and their discouragements, their hopes and their fears, appealing to every passion of his nature; and he is often sorely perplexed to decide which of the multitudes of ways and by-ways to take. It is indeed an important decision—one upon which depends his success or failure in life, and should therefore be the result of much anxious thought and calm deliberation. All time cannot atone for an error in the premises; for a failure to accomplish the object upon which the soul has bent its energies, too often quenches the ardor of its zeal, and causes it to turn away from all the laudable pursuits of life, desponding and disgusted.

Whence arise such failures? Come they of chance—of fate—of circumstances over which we can exercise no control? Nay; say rather they are the result of errors—criminal, egregious errors—which every one, by a little thought and patient investigation, may avoid. To the young and ardent mind, buoyant with life and hope, the future is wont to appear in colors attractive, but alas! too often, false. Imagination presents it as a glowing picture—a panoramic view of all that is beautiful, all that is lovely, all that can render happy; but as time, in its onward flight, brings each scene near, reality disrobes it of all its borrowed attractions, and disappointment, often utter despair, is the consequence. We are prone to look upon future life as a day of sunshine and joy, forgetting that, even in the past of our own brief existence, we have been made to taste of sorrow and affliction. We disregard the experiences and warning counsels of those, who have drunk deeply of the cup of life, vainly and unreasonably expecting, that *our* destiny will form a notable exception to what the past world has realized. Such is a false view, which, although it may cause us to revel for a season in the midst of poetic joys—the pleasures of hope and of imagination—cannot but be productive of bad results. We may not expect the sunlight of joy to beam continually upon our pathway. Dark and portentous clouds will sometimes overcast our skies, and chilling, adverse winds will oft assail us. In our short sighted wisdom we fain would have it otherwise; but our Father has ordered

it so, and He does all things well. We should submit, without a murmur, to the dispensations of his providence, and prepare ourselves, by a careful study of life in all its phases, to meet with manly courage whatever difficulties it may present.

In shaping his course in life, the young man, especially if he is a Christian, should be influenced by other considerations, besides the mere means of securing success in worldly schemes. He should take a higher view of life; should remember that he has *duties*, as well as *privileges*. The prime elements of permanent success, in any department of life, is an unwavering love of truth. The first question of the *true* man, in contemplating any action is, *is it right*. The conviction of right imparts an earnestness and a power to the soul, which enables it to override mountains of difficulties.

The late lamented John T. Johnson was a noble example of a man who could sacrifice everything to his convictions of right. Though an ornament to the legal profession, honored by his countrymen with a seat in the councils of the nation, with brilliant prospects of rising fame before him, he relinquished all for the sake of doing his duty. Go thou, brother, and do likewise. F. M. C.

---

### OUR SAVIOR.

THE study of the New Testament cannot fail to have a good influence on the young. The object of this book is to give a history of Christ, and to instruct his followers. It teaches persons how to become Christians, and how to live as such. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John relate one story. They present the same great model for the imitation of the world. They all tell that the Savior came to earth, and devoted years to the relief of sinful and suffering man. They speak of him as going about doing good, bearing insult and contempt, but never returing wrong for wrong. This holy being sympathised with the afflicted and distressed. The most degraded were treated by him with respect and tenderness, and they never asked for his mercy in vain. The leper was made whole of his disease. He spoke to the lame man, and he leaped as the hart, and blessed the God who looked in pity on him. He touched the sightless eyes, and light, glorious and beautiful, burst upon them. To the child of the widow, lying cold and still in his youthful beauty, He imparts life, and gives him back to her who mourned him, as only mothers mourn. The young daughter of the haughty ruler gives up her joyous being, and is borne tenderly to



the couch of death. Flowers are strown over her. Sweet perfumes are breathing round, but she heeds them not. The eye has forgotten its brightness, the voice has lost its music. There are hearts bursting with anguish, but she weeps not. The Savior enters the chamber of mourning. He stands in silent majesty, and with the compassion of a God He says, "Maiden arise." At His bidding she rouses from the slumber that had bound her. Can we not imagine that scene, and be thankful for the love that was touched by the sorrow of the broken-hearted? The sole object of God upon earth, was the good of man. His own comfort, He considered not, but thought only of blessing the needy sons and daughters of earth. He spent nights in prayer to His Father, and, is not prayer hallowed, and rendered a more sacred duty to us, by His feeling so often the need of it? Can youth read a history so noble, so disinterested, without being elevated and improved—without receiving impressions that will tend to the formation of noble character? The heart must be hard that is not touched by love like His, and that bows not down in obedience to His commands. We have mentioned only a few instances of His benevolence. John says, "that if all were written he supposes that the world would not contain the books."

When young persons acquire an earnest love for reading the Scriptures, they become wiser, and better. In them they find the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins, and can attain to a blissful immortality by conforming their lives to the precepts of the Savior. That they may drink of the waters of life and live forever is the prayer of

A SISTER.

---

#### MEETING AT McMINNVILLE.

It will be remembered by the brethren of the Mountain District, that they appointed a meeting to be held at McMinnville, commencing Thursday night before the second Lord's day in May, 1857. This meeting is designed to afford the brethren of different congregations an opportunity to meet, rejoice and worship God together—to exhort one another to unremitting ardor and assiduity in the performance of their Christian duties, and to inspire each other with greater zeal in extending the cause of our common Lord. The meeting is open to all who may have a desire to be present. It is hoped the meeting will be well attended.

A. P. SEITZ.

### APPELLATIONS OF GOD AND OF CHRIST.

Most of the terms used in the Bible, in reference to God and Christ, are of a *relative* character, a circumstance of importance, and that should be ever kept before the mind, both in reading and in writing. The different appellations used by the inspired writers, imply *relations*, and are used as such; and not to vary the expression, as may be supposed by some. There is but one class of terms that are not relative; and they are those which imply the *self-existence* of God, as the term "Jehovah" for instance.

"God" means *good*, as opposed to evil and the Devil. "Lord" means *ruler*, and "Almighty" denotes its own signification. Hence in speaking of the power and *dominion* of God, we should use the last; and in speaking of his *government*, particularly, we should use the term "Lord." Sometimes all three are used together, as the "Lord God Almighty," implying all three relations, or to render the expression more forcible.

So too as to the Son of God. "Jesus" means "Savior," which term is used itself frequently. "Messiah" means *anointed*, "the title given by way of eminence to our Savior," says Buck; "meaning the same in Hebrew as *Christ* in Greek, and alludes to the authority he had to assume the characters of prophet, priest and king, and that of the Savior of the world." The appellation, "Jesus Christ," means the *anointed Savior*. That of the "Lord Jesus Christ," is used as implying also his character as *ruler*; and to give greater force to the expression.

Not only in reading, but in writing, preaching and conversation, regard should always be had to the terms used. The expressions, "*eternal* Father" and "*eternal* Son," are improper, absurd, and never used in the Bible, (and should never be used by men,) as the terms "Father" and "Son" imply *relations* that *began in time*, and therefore cannot be *eternal*. It is true that God is *eternal*, as to his existence, being "without beginning of days and ending of years;" and Christ as the "Logos" is equally as eternal; but he never became the *Son* of God until begotten by the Holy Ghost and born into the world, when the "Word became incarnate;" and God never became his *Father* until he was begotten of him, and became the only begotten Son of God." But I may be met here and told that Christ is called, in Isaiah, "the *everlasting* Father, in reference to his character as "God manifest in the flesh." True, according to the rendering of the common version; but every good Hebrew scholar or Biblical critic knows that the correct render-

---

ing is, "the Father of the *everlasting* age." The common rendering, at least as used by many, would involve a palpable absurdity, as it would make our Savior both Father and Son!—or the Father of himself!! While we believe as firmly as any in the *divinity* of the Lord Jesus Christ, we object to all unscriptural terminology—to any nomenclature not sanctioned by the Bible, or not used by the sacred writers. As they were guided by the unerring Spirit of inspiration, and expressed "spiritual things in spiritual words," or those selected and suggested by the Holy Spirit, they of course are the best, and preferable to any coined by uninspired man. It has been well remarked, that if the *word* itself is not to be found there, the *thing* for which it stands, or is designed to express, is not. We also object to the use of all new-fangled or unusual terms, and all Greekisms and Latinisms, and all words not in common use or in "plain English." Words that can be understood only by the learned and initiated, and not by the *mass* of readers, who are the ones to be benefitted, should not be used. While we advocate a "pure speech," let us adhere to it, and "call Bible things by Bible names."

J. R. H.

---

#### MORE TO THINK ABOUT.

THE first preachers of the Gospel, by their close adherence to the example of Christ, in humility, devotion, and complete consecration to God, with a total disregard of worldly treasures, honors, and powers gave great evidence of their confidence in the doctrine they preached their Master, and their hope of a resurrection from the dead, and eternal glory in the world to come. They lived and acted under the motto, "We have no continuing city her;" or in different words; "The things that are seen, are temporal, but the things which are not seen, are eternal." They received their great impulse from the eternal, and not from the temporal. But a worldly ministry receive their main impulse from the temporal, and not from the eternal. They are governed continually, by worldly influences, appliances, and policies. They are constantly speaking and meditating upon what the world will say, or think of us, and not how they will please God. We have long discovered that even among good men—the best of men—there is a wonderful proneness to wander from the simplicity of the way of the Lord, to real innovations, endangering the peace, harmony, and union of the

whole family of God on earth. It is a difficult task to induce men to fix their minds upon the wisdom of God, admire it, and show by their practice their full confidence in it. It is true, almost any man will admit the wisdom of God abstractly, extol it, and show how infinitely above all human wisdom it is. But the wisdom of God is so unlike the wisdom of this world, that many of its brightest displays are not noticed by the mere worldly man, whether in the church, or out of it.—*Christian Review*.

### RELIGION IN MODERN TIMES.

MUCH of the religion of modern times, if we mistake not, is very fitly characterized in the following:—

“Whither has religion now fled? Of churches and their establishments we here say nothing; nor of the unhappy domains of unbelief, and how innumerable men, blinded in their minds, must ‘live without God in the world;’ but, taking the fairest side of the matter, we ask, What is the nature of that same Religion, which still lingers in the hearts of the few who are called, and call themselves, specially the Religious? Is it a healthy religion, that shines forth spontaneously in doing of the work, or even in preaching of the Word? Unhappily, no. Instead of heroic, martyr conduct, and inspired and soul-inspiring eloquence, whereby Religion itself were brought home to our living bosoms, to live and reign there, we have ‘Discourses on the Evidences,’ endeavoring, with smallest result, to make it probable that such a thing as Religion exists. The most enthusiastic Evangelicals do not preach a gospel, but keep describing how it should and might be preached; to awaken the sacred fire of Faith is not their endeavor; but, at most, to describe how faith shows and acts, and scientifically distinguish true faith from false. Religion, like all else, is conscious of itself, listens to itself; it becomes less and less creative, vital; more and more mechanical. Considered as a whole, the Christian Religion, of late ages has been continually dissipating itself into Metaphysics, and threatens now to disappear, as some rivers do, in deserts of barren sand.”—*Carlisle*.

THE history of the world tells us, that immoral means will ever intercept good ends.—*Coleridge*.

## LETTER FROM S. H. MILLARD.

BRISTOL, Dec. 26, 1856.

DEAR BRETHREN FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—We have one evangelist in the field this year—brother Isaac Hyder. He had since August, when I last heard from him (a month since) made about thirty additions to the church. We would have had another evangelist in the field, but we could not engage a suitable one. Since the first of October I have had two additions at Little Moccasin, two at Poplar Ridge, and four at Concord. I am not able to say what any other of the preaching brethren of this co-operation district have done.

As stated before, we now have at this place a very good house to preach in; the town is thriving fast, and bids fair in a few years to be a place of some note. We are few in number, whilst our opposers are many. If our brethren who are able to defend the truth, would give us a visit, we should be very glad. If either of you could come, I doubt not you might make many subscribers to the Gospel Advocate. You could come by Railroad to Russellville in Green County, thence by stage to Greenville, etc. If you will come, let me hear from you, and I will give you a list of the churches and public brethren convenient to the road. Please call the attention of our preaching brethren to this point, some of the Tennessee, Kentucky or other preachers may favor us with a visit.

I will try and write again soon.

Your Brother,  
SAML. H. MILLARD.

## LETTER FROM BROTHER ROBERTSON,

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., Dec. 16, 1856.

DEAR BROTHERS FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—The Gospel Advocate still comes, and is always a welcome visitor, and will be, so long as it manifests so much of the spirit of kindness, even toward those that may differ with you. It will take time and much labor to get the brotherhood to understand your general plan for evangelizing. Men are slow to learn some things, and equally so to act them out when they are learned. But that you have suggested the gospel plan for the action of the church, in the great work of converting the world, I have no doubt. We, as lovers of the *truth*, cannot hope for success without an effort on the part of its friends. Come then, dear breth-



ren, let us lay aside our vain disputations and work for God and his *cause* while we have the opportunity of doing so, lest the night of death comes when we cannot work. The world is to be converted to God, and the *Truth* must do it. Let each one then that would wish to be reconed as a friend of Jesus, clothe him or herself with his Spirit, for without this Paul says, "we are none of his." Jesus says, "If ye love me keep my commandments." Again, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." Brethren, according to this rule how many of us are the sincere friends of Jesus? Who will answer this question?

J. S. ROBERTSON.

---

#### SOUTH ALABAMA CO-OPERATION,

BRETHREN FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—By request of the Secretary, I give below in brief the proceedings of our late Co-operation for South Alabama, held with the Church of Disciples in the City of Selma.

SELMA, January 10, 1857.

The general meeting for consultation and co-operation of Christian churches in South Alabama, was organized by the election of Brother J. S. Lamar, of Augusta, Geo., as President, and Alfred Berry, of Selma, as Secretary.

It was resolved, on motion of Brother Jno. N. Walthall, that a committee of three be appointed by the chair to raise a sum sufficient for the support of an Evangelist to labor within the co-operation,—to employ said evangelist and put him into his field of labor. Brethren David Hamilton, Selma, W. A. Corbin, Marion, and Jabez Curry, Oak Grove, were appointed said committee, and on motion P. B. Lawson was added.

On motion of Brother Robert F. Goree, it was also resolved that the committee be instructed to use their best efforts to employ a first-rate evangelist, and all the brethren then present were requested to aid the committee in raising the funds necessary to employ such an evangelist.

Further resolved on motion of Brother Goree, that the limits of this co-operation be restricted so as to include only the following counties: Green, Perry, Marengo, Dallas and Lowndes.

On motion of P. B. Lawson, that this co-operation for the future be styled the Middle District Co-operation of South Alabama.

That the next meeting of this co-operation be held with the church of disciples at Marion, Perry County, commencing Friday before first Lord's day in October next.

On motion of Brother Goree, that the proceedings of this meeting be forwarded for publication to the editors of the Millennial Harbinger, Gospel Advocate and Christian Union.

Owing to the inclemency of the weather, bad roads, and a former disappointment in reference to the time of holding the meeting, only two counties, Dallas and Perry, were represented; but the brethren of South-east Alabama having previously held their district meeting, I presume that their want of representation in this will work no material injury to them. I hope that by this fall the Western part of this State will get up a district meeting.

Our meeting in this new and thriving little city was a very harmonious and pleasant one. We have a few warm hearted brethren and sisters there who meet regularly every Lord's day to worship God as practiced in the early and pure days of christianity. They have a very handsome little chapel, erected almost entirely at the expense of one of their number, Brother David Hamilton, who is a liberal and devoted man. It will be a pleasure for you to know that his wife, who I believe was once a pupil of yours, united with the brethren there in November last when Brother Hooker labored for them. We had three accessions at our late meeting, Brother Berry's wife and daughter, and sister Launder's daughter. It was a source of regret that you could not be with us, but we had the labors of Brother Lamar, of Augusta, a very clear headed and pure hearted man as I verily believe, and one destined to do great good in the Master's cause. I trust you will meet us in Marion first Lord's day in October.

Affectionately,

P. B. LAWSON.

---

#### CO-OPERATION IN TEXAS.

SHELBYVILLE, SHELBY CO., TEXAS, Nov. 1, 1856.

DEAR BROTHERS FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—The managers of the Shelby, San Augustine, and Nacogdoches Co-operation "called" our

beloved brother P. F. Southern to the field evangelical, "to go out" and labor in word and doctrine, for the current year, 1857, and that he render account to the managers of Co-operation the number of miles traveled, the number of sermons preached, the number of additions, and how many pray in their families. And we commend the circulation and reading of the "Gospel Advocate."

Your brethren in Christ,

JAMES STRODE,

JOHN GIBBS,

J. M. HOOPER,

JAMES NOEL,

*Managers.*

A. OLIVER, *Corresponding Secretary.*

---

### CHURCH NEWS.

BELLEVILLE, TEXAS.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I am now on my last tour for the present year. My feeble efforts in co-operation with other brethren have resulted in seventy-five additions in the last nine months. At a meeting of brethren and representatives of the churches of the first district of West Texas, held at Post Oak, Washington County, we had 7 additions, 6 by confession and baptism and one reclaimed. At this meeting the brethren again called upon me to serve them as their evangelist for nine months in the ensuing year. The brethren are generally adopting the weekly collection in support of all her demands, and have dropped the hireling system. But I close by invoking the blessing of God upon you and all who love and serve God. And may you be blessed in your work of faith and labor of love, is the sincere prayer of your humble servant and co-laborer in the one hope.

A. NEWMAN.

---

BRENHAM, WASHINGTON COUNTY, TEXAS, NOV. 7, 1856.

DEAR BROTHER FANNING:—It is with sincere pleasure that I have the privilege of dropping you a few lines. I have been preaching for the brethren in the first co-operative district of W. Texas. I have

traveled upwards of twelve hundred miles ; have had the co-operation of brother Stephen Strickland (our general evangelist) in five protracted meetings, at which we had twenty-six additions. I have attended two co-operation meetings—the one in our district, and the other the general meeting. The report of which you will receive. I have labored 160 days ; preached 130 discourses, and received 68 additions. I have received two new subscribers to your most excellent paper—the Advocate—and am sorry I have done no more for so good a preacher. It is the best in the land. Go on brothers F. & L. God bless you in your work of faith and labor of love. We are all pleased with your views on Church Organization. I will do all I can to aid you.

AARON NEWMAN.

---

MISS EMMA RAMSEY, WHO DIED SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1866.

In sweetness she came like a flower of May,  
 Like a bloom of the Spring she passed lovely away ;  
 And the rose-tint of life from her cheeks disappears  
 Ere the troubles of time had bedewed them with tears,  
 And death, they say, could that smile steal away  
 Which lingered like life on that beautiful clay,  
 As if pointing our minds to Heaven where had gone  
 The soul of the sleeper so calm from her flown.

Yes, the spirit hath flown to the home of the blest,  
 Glad angels have borne her to Jesus' breast ;  
 For while upon earth did he not disclose,  
 That such should the kingdom of Heaven compose ;  
 Let us therefore lament not for one loved so well,  
 Let us aim with that loved one in Heaven to dwell,  
 And yet, oh, what heart could deny those a tear  
 Who walk to the tomb with an object so dear.

Bright angels their watch round the clay-house shall keep,  
 Where the body of Emma so sweetly doth sleep,  
 And when the last sound of the trumpet is given,  
 That body shall join with its spirit in Heaven ;  
 And when the last sound of the trumpet we hear,  
 O may we be ready to meet with her there,  
 Where Death never more our union shall sever,  
 Where we'll dwell with the loved one and Jesus forever.

WM. M. F.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

Brother W. A. V. Henderson, of Clarksville, Texas, says, January 5, 1857: "The good cause is progressing slowly, but I trust surely in our region of country."

Brother P. F. Southern, Shelbyville, Texas, date——says: "Mammon, covetousness, avarice, envy, and some drunkenness have got into the church, and it is hard to contend with them." This reminds us of finding once in Ky., two still-houses, with their regular fixtures for operations, belonging to the church; and when we tried to exorcise them, it was found that they had many friends—should we say *brethren*? Truly all are not Israel that are of Israel.

Brother J. M. Hooper writes from Shelby county, Texas, January 11, 1857, "The cause of Christ is advancing here."

Bro. S. O. Richardson, Hunt Co., Texas, Jan. 11, 1857, says: "We are getting along very well here in our little congregation. We are weak, but we meet every Lord's day and endeavor to worship as the disciples did anciently."

Brother W. W. Baird, Lamar Co., Texas, January 18, 1857, says: "The cause you plead is gaining ground here slowly. I have witnessed several signal victories of the truth over sectionalism, and would the brethren and sisters live up to their privileges and duty, truth would soon cover this far west, as the waters the mighty deep, Go on Brother K., &c." C. K.

---

**THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN NASHVILLE BURNED.**

At about 6 o'clock this morning, April 8th, 1857, the Christian Church was discovered to be on fire, and in a few moments the whole building was wrapped in flame. When first discovered the fire was issuing from the Cupola, and as we write the building is a mass of ruins. Fortunately no other house was destroyed.

\*\*\*



---

 TRIBUTE OF RESPECT.

At a call meeting of the students of Franklin College, February 25, 1857, the following preamble and resolutions were reported and unanimously adopted:

*Preamble.*—Since God in his infinite wisdom saw fit, on the 24th inst., at to remove from our midst our much esteemed friend and fellow student, Stanmore H. Smith, of Mt. Hebron, Alabama, after a short though patiently endured illness; Therefore

*Resolved,* That in the death of our friend and associate this Institution has been deprived of a promising young man and a devoted student.

*Resolved,* That we sincerely regret the loss we sustain in his untimely death, and that we do most deeply sympathize with his relatives, particularly his widowed mother, in their bereavement.

*Resolved,* That as a testimony of our regret and sympathy, we wear the usual badge of mourning for the space of thirty days.

*Resolved,* That we highly appreciate the brotherly attention and Christian kindness manifested by his devoted friend and room-mate, William M. Hoover, during his entire illness.

*Resolved,* That a copy of this, our Tribute of Respect, be forwarded to his mother, also to the Gospel Advocate and the Green County papers for publication.

J. O. BLAIN, Ch'm. Com.

W. F. FULGHAM,

T. R. BRADY,

H. R. MOORE.

Thus has faded a tender flower, nipt by death's untimely frosts.  
How uncertain is the life of man.

"He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down. He fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not."  
F. M. C.

---

 OBITUARIES.

DEAR BRETHREN:—It becomes my duty to announce, through the Advocate, the death of our much beloved brother, Wm. H. Brandon. He was the son of brother and sister John and Abigail Brandon, who reside near Roane's Creek Camp-ground, Carroll county, Tenn.

The subject of this notice embraced Christianity early in life, at the

age of 15 years, and continued a faithful and worthy member of the church of Christ at Roane's Creek to the hour of his death. He was confined to a bed of affliction for the space of thirteen days, during which time he manifested the faith and patience of a true believer in Christ. He was a young man in the prime of life, with fair prospects of usefulness opening up before him. He died on the 13th of January last, triumphing in the faith of the gospel. He has left an affectionate father and mother, brothers and sisters to mourn his loss, but they "sorrow not as those who have no hope." They confidently look forward to that glorious day when the dead in Christ shall rise to enjoy everlasting life. May much comfort be administered to the bereaved ones, through the consoling promises of the gospel, and may we all so live that we shall have no cause to fear death, is the sincere prayer of your brother in the hope of the gospel.

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Charlotte, Tenn., March 24, 1857.

---

CORINTH, Miss., March 8, 1857.

BRO. FANNING;—With much sorrow of heart I write this notice of the death of my second son, James Alexander Campbell, who died at 4 o'clock last night. I awoke about 11 o'clock and found him struggling in death's cold arms. He spoke no more after I reached his bedside. He was seventeen years old the 19th day of last month. He is no more on earth; but sleeps in the arms of the blest Savior, and we hope to meet him in heaven, to part no more.

JOSEPH GREER.

ALEXANDRIA, Tenn., March, 1857.

It becomes my unpleasant duty to chronicle the death of sister Mary Frail, consort of brother Edward N. Frail, which occurred at the residence of her father, brother James Barry, on the morning of the 15th inst., in her 23rd year. The deceased at a very early age embraced Christianity, and was a member, together with a large circle of relatives, of the Christian Church, at this place.

Sister Frail had a good native intellect, was amiable in disposition, possessed unassuming manners, and was generally exemplary in the various Christian and domestic relations. She has been taken from the scenes of earth to join the hosts above, leaving three children, one of whom is an infant.

O. D. W.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, MAY, 1857.

NO. 5.

---

## MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES.

WE think it due to ourselves, to the cause we plead, and to the brethren especially who seem to differ widely from us, to state our teaching in reference to co-operative labor—embracing missions and missionaries—in very plain terms. It was with much hesitation we brought ourselves to the conclusion, in 1855, to commence the publication of the Gospel Advocate. As expressed to our intimate friends, we were satisfied that we would be forced to attack existing institutions among the brethren, and we felt unwilling to have their opposition. But we have freely spoken, and now all we ask of our beloved brethren is a fair discussion. We will publish any thing that may be written, indicating the proper temper of mind, but we have in our possession communications, and have seen in some of the papers things which, if we were to notice at all, we would be compelled to treat in a manner by no means pleasant to us.

In the present number we think it not unbecoming to define as clearly as possible our position, that our brethren may make no mistakes in opposing us.

1. We are candid in the belief, that the Bible, fairly translated, offers to the world the whole mind of God to a lost race; that it is indeed a

book of spiritual explanations or interpretations, and, therefore, it is the province of no one to offer expositions of the mind of the Deity to the world. Furthermore, we doubt not that the Bible offers to the world, in form and detail, and better expressed than can be expressed by mortals, the only true and infallible religious creed. We are also satisfied that all pretended imitations of the Scriptures, professedly taken from the Bible and like it, are sheer fabrications of men, untrue in themselves, and are highly pernicious in all their effects. They are to be classed with religious speculations, all of which are without any proper foundation, and are most detrimental to religion. Consequently we believe and teach that man by nature and education is unable to originate moral truth, or even speculate or philosophise correctly; that he is not competent of directing his steps spiritually, and finally, that his only safety is in "*walking by faith*" in what the Scriptures say.

2. We believe and teach, that the Church of Christ is fully competent to most profitably employ all of our powers, physical, intellectual, and spiritual; that she is the only divinely authorized Missionary, Bible, Sunday School, Temperance and Co-operation Society on earth. It is, has been, and we suppose always will be our honest conviction, that the true and genuine service of God can be properly performed only in and through the church. Hence we have questioned the propriety of the brethren's efforts to work most successfully by means of State, district and county organizations, "Missionary," "Publication" and "Bible Societies" or "Bible Unions," "Temperance Societies, Free-Mason and Odd-Fellowship Societies" to "visit" the fatherless and widows in their affliction, or any other human organization for accomplishing the legitimate labor of the church.

We wish to offend none of these associations. All may be *qualifiedly* good, and no doubt men through them have done good service, and may still do more. But the question with us is, to ascertain if Christians, particularly, can not work more successfully in any and every department of benevolent exertion by means of the church alone.

We very respectfully suggest that, in our judgment, the motives which operate on us in these inferior institutions, detract much from the value of our service. We think, indeed, that living soberly, righteously and godly, from the influences of the Bible, is quite a different matter from attempting the same from the authority of human institutions. A single example may illustrate our meaning. Baptism by the authority of Jesus Christ, for the purpose of entering into the

kingdom of God, is a most valuable performance; whilst baptism, though it may be dipping a dozen times, merely to join a sect, is not only a burden, but a mockery of obedience to the Lord.

Regarding missions and missionary societies we must, on many accounts, be specific. The church, as we have often said, is Heaven's missionary society to a suffering world, and the ministers commissioned, sent out and supported by the church, are God's missionaries to call sinners to life. We have not been able to see the necessity of a missionary society beyond the church. We ask the brethren, in all kindness, if it would not be better even to send our beloved Brother, Dr. Barclay and his most amiable, intelligent and really accomplished family, to Jerusalem, by the agreement and co-operation of the churches than by another and strange body? Suppose brother Barclay were commissioned, "RECOMMENDED," by the congregation of which he is a member, as were Paul and Barnabas, at Antioch, and his church were to ask the co-operation of any number of sister churches in this special labor, would not the work be practical? Would not the brethren undertaking the labor have the authority of Scriptural examples in their favor? We venture there is not a church in America, England, or even in Australia, which would not rejoice to co-operate in such a soul-cheering service. If the churches could feel it was *their* work—which they might all do if approached as the *churches* of Christ—they would regard it as a very high privilege to join with their brethren in so noble an enterprise. But the modern *electioneering* system of approaching individuals for money, without regard to the high and most Christian obligations resting upon the churches, is well calculated to *starve* our missionaries and render the church of God entirely useless. We feel not inclined, however, at present to debate the question, our object is to present the teaching which we regard as correct, and we ask the brethren to consider it well before they reject it. Bro. Milligin regards the bodies we are opposing as "*Institutions of necessity*," through which we are to perform the Lord's service. Brother Pendleton has most respectfully requested us to suspend our judgment, and even Brother B. Franklin, we are informed, has written in opposition to the churches employing all of our means to do good, but we say to these good brethren, and all others concerned, that we made up our mind long ago, and unless better reasons are shown, we shall consider all religious expedients unnecessary, and in opposition to the reign of Christ.

T. F.



## SECRET OF RELIGIOUS SUCCESS.

No one, we presume, has questioned the truth of Solomon's declaration, "*There is a time for every thing;*" and we suppose there is quite as little reason for doubting the truth of the assertion, *there is an important secret in success*, whether in worldly business or spiritual concerns.

In a calculation, made a few years since, it was shown that ninety-five out of a hundred merchants in New York city had failed in the past twenty-five years. Why are we surprised at such results, when all seem to run well, all labor diligently, and, so far as a casual observer can tell to the contrary, they all bid equally fair to succeed? But equal difficulties attend the various pursuits of life. What is the cause of failures? We answer, *Incompetency in agents*. No other answer can be given. Men fail in farming, because they possess not the requisite knowledge or energy to execute the work. In mechanical trades, and even in the more "popular professions" the same remark holds good. It will be noted, that in all callings some succeed to perfection. They are able.

We may be told, that men who are competent for business often fail through "bad luck," misfortunes, etc. We reply, that bad luck, misfortunes and accidents are frequently the result of incompetency in the sufferer. Persons, for instance, attempt labor for which they possess not the requisite qualifications, and success, in such instances, should scarcely be anticipated.

Possibly nine-tenths of the lawyers, doctors and preachers of the country evince, practically, such destitution of qualification, that they not only fail, but squander property and sink their character even below its true level. In our *proper sphere* we always act to best advantage. It is said, "*There is no universal genius,*" but we suspect there is no one who could fail of success, possessed of sufficient independence to labor in his true place. It is thought that Satan fell from heaven on account of dissatisfaction with his position, and especially a determination to take the place of the Deity. If it is true that our failures generally arise from our attempts in a wrong direction—in professions for which we are not competent, it is equally true, that all men may be successful by studying carefully their true calling in life. "*All are but parts of one stupendous whole,*" contains a thought better than most poetry; and if in worldly affairs all could learn their true positions, and be induced to occupy them, ours would become a much happier world.

---

But the moral bearing of our suggestions is of vast importance to us. Why is it that there are so many complaints against religionists? Why do we all find so many faults in ourselves, as well as in our brethren? The religious machinery of the world is not in order; the wheels of the great church car move not regularly, and hence the frequent failures of Christians. To point out all the causes of spiritual failure, might be considered an endless labor, but when we reflect in the style of a great tyrant of modern times, that "The mistaken thought of the moment is fatal," we may begin to discover the importance of at least *beginning right* in religion. The fatal error lies in starting wrong. When the whole purpose of religion is absent from the mind, no performance can be beneficial. If, for illustration, the idea of religion is, that it is some terribly gloomy subject, suited only for the sick and dying, and intended merely to enable its advocates to escape hell and gain a sort of mechanical admittance into heaven, all the proper motives for a religious life are concealed. If in our religious performance we act with the view that we are merely discharging *obligations imposed*, our compliance is reluctant and our service is destitute of meaning, burdensome and unprofitable. Such a view of religion not only renders it a burden, but impels persons to labor to rid themselves from its performance. *Mourning* amongst the Greeks, Romans, and even the Jews, was "let" to the lowest bidder; but under the new economy the Savior says, "*Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.*" The grand secret of enjoying comfort in mourning arises from an intelligent performance of the labor. But as certainly as the secret of good physical and mental health consists exclusively in prudence in bodily and intellectual labor, *spiritual vigor arises alone from well directed spiritual labor.*

The grand purpose of Christianity is to give us spiritual employment, to engage our time, talents, energies and our property in the service of God. Hence no people can be religious or spend a religious life without daily exercises of so personal a nature that the heart, mind and body shall have vigorous and healthful labor. This is the key to spiritual existence and the secret of success in overcoming the world.

T. F.

---

DR. W. D. JOURDAN desires his correspondents to address him at Eaton, Buchanan County, Missouri.

## JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ONLY.

BY ELDER R. JONES, OF LEWISBURG, TENNESSEE.

WHEN we are told that men are justified by faith only, we understand that nothing is to be regarded as a cause, agent, or means of justification but faith—solitary faith, faith by itself—Faith separate from, and independent of all other causes, agencies and means. If there be any other cause, agent, or means, then it is not by faith only. And if there is any accompanying cause, anterior, posterior, or collateral, then it is not by faith alone. And to contend for justification by faith alone, is to discard all other causes, agents and means; and is subversive of the truth of the Bible, and of the obedience of faith. For the scriptures teach that men are justified by grace, Rom. iii, 24—By Jesus; Acts xiii, 39—By his blood; Rom. v. 9—By the spirit; 1 Cor. vi, 11—By works, James ii, 24, etc. etc., all of which are made void by the doctrine of justification by faith only; for if it is by faith only, then it is by none of these, though the scriptures so affirm. But the spirit of truth seems to have anticipated the rise of this error, and by James has forever and indelibly stamped it in both its forms with the seal of condemnation. For if we use the term faith alone, he meets it by saying; “Even so faith if it hath not works is dead, being alone.” (James ii, 17.) And if we say by faith only he meets it with: “Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” This it would seem ought to convince every one who is not under the influence of the spirit of Antichrist, that the doctrine is untrue. But as it lies at the very foundation of the modern revival system we will examine it a little closer.

If sinners are justified by faith alone—justified or pardoned the moment they believe; then it follows that they are unbelievers till the moment of pardon; and consequently, neither their coming to the altar, nor their prayers for pardon are pleasing to God; for “without faith it is impossible to please him.” And worse still, “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” If they are justified or pardoned the moment they believe; then there is no interval for prayer between faith and pardon; and consequently it is impossible for them to pray in faith for pardon. Therefore if they pray for pardon it must be without faith. James says, “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed.

For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord."

If they are justified or pardoned by faith alone, then it is without repentance. And if repentance means reformation, then they are pardoned before they reform. Consequently pardoned while in the practice of sin. Or if repentance means sorrow for sin, then they are pardoned before they are even sorry for their sins; consequently, pardoned while in the love and practice of sin. If it is said they must repent before they believe, then it is not by faith only; both being necessary. And if repentance is before faith, then it is not of faith but in the absence of faith; and consequently is not pleasing to God.

If justification is by faith only, then sorrow, repentance, prayer, confession and baptism are all excluded—all unnecessary, and consequently the whole altar or mourning-bench system is a farce—a perfect mockery of coming to Christ.

But, if the position is taken, that men must be regenerated by the Spirit, to enable them to believe, or to exercise faith by which they are justified or pardoned; then justification is not by faith alone, regeneration being also necessary. Or if it is said that they are justified or pardoned the moment they are regenerated, and that regeneration precedes faith; then faith is no more necessary than repentance, confession, prayer, or even baptism. And their regeneration is no more pleasing to God, being effected without faith, than any thing else would be without it. And as they cannot come to God without faith, consequently they are regenerated and pardoned without coming to Him, and to ask men to come to God, to be regenerated or pardoned, is all a delusion.

If we say men must be regenerated before they can have faith, and that they cannot be regenerated and pardoned without faith; then we make it impossible for any one even to be pardoned, for we make faith and regeneration both precede each other, which is impossible.

If we say men must believe that they are pardoned, before they can be justified; then we make the belief of falsehood necessary; which is too absurd to be believed by any sane mind, though some men's reasoning or rather vagaries, seem to favor the idea.

If we say we are justified by faith only, we exclude the obedience of faith, and contradict God, who has said we are justified by grace, by Jesus, by blood, by works, etc.

If men are justified by faith only, then it is without James' works



(Paul's obedience of faith;) and of course, without keeping any of the commandments of God. A most unlikely way to obtain pardon. For John says: "He that saith I know Him, and keepeth not His commandments is a liar and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii, 4.

But we are told, and that too by one who denies ever believing or teaching justification by faith alone: That *justifying faith, is something above and beyond the belief of any testimony*—that it is confidence or trust; and that the moment any one is in possession of this confidence or faith, he is justified or pardoned—that it is a step beyond the simple belief of testimony—that the step beyond is confidence; not the belief of testimony abstractly—that repentance is in and co-operates with faith—that repentance is that part of faith that purifies the heart—that genuine faith, hatred to sin, hope, and love all come into being simultaneously—that repentance is a necessary part of faith—and that belief is the exercise of faith.

This we believe is a fair though brief synopsis of the leading features of the theory as argued in our presence. Now let us look at it.

If this faith is above and beyond the belief of any testimony; then it excludes the belief of all testimony. It is above and beyond it, and of course does not include it. Then men are justified by a faith that does not include, and consequently excludes the belief of any and all evidence or testimony that God is, or that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, notwithstanding the scriptures affirm that, "He that cometh to God must believe," etc. (Heb. xi, 6.) It is above and beyond the belief of *any* testimony. Belief of testimony enters not into this faith. But it may be urged that the words, "Not the belief of testimony *abstractly*," show, that the belief of testimony is included in this faith or confidence; then the proposition falls, which says confidence is above and beyond belief. But the proposition evidently abstracts, or separates confidence and belief, placing confidence above and beyond, and we have not been able to see that confidence abstractly would be any more efficacious than belief abstractly. And really a confidence abstract, or separate from the belief of testimony appears to us to be very nearly akin to the confidence of the infidel. And to talk about the belief of the testimony in which we have no confidence is truly absurd.

The reader will bear in mind that if confidence includes belief; then the proposition that affirms confidence to be above and beyond belief is untrue. And if it is not included, then men are justified in unbelief,



which is contrary to the Bible. Either horn of the dilemma, will prove fatal to the proposition.

It may be thought that we do violence to the proposition; that the meaning is, we begin with belief and ascend step by step till we arrive at confidence, which is above, and beyond the belief of any testimony, We care not whether one step or ten carries us to that point, when we arrive at it we cease to believe; otherwise we are not above and beyond belief. We think it would be much the safer way, to begin with belief, and advance step by step in belief, and never cease believing. For Jesus says, he that believeth not is condemned already. John iii, 18.

Notwithstanding this faith is above and beyond the belief of any testimony; the proof texts in support of justification by it, are those commonly used in support of the faith alone system. Such as "He that believeth on Him is not condemned—Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," etc., etc. The great object in the whole scheme, seems to be, to prove justification or pardon, prior to, and without baptism. The reflecting mind, however, will perceive that as the gospel never proposes pardon by belief, faith, or confidence, without obedience, such scriptures, instead of proving justification prior to baptism, prove the proposition to be untrue, which affirms justification to be confidence which is above and beyond belief. For to prove justification to be by belief is very far from proving it to be by something above and beyond it. The proof is death to the proposition it is designed to sustain.

That faith means, or implies confidence, we have no doubt; but that confidence, or faith means something above and beyond any testimony, is what we do not believe. For belief implies confidence as much as faith, is used for faith, and can mean nothing less than faith, or confidence; for no man can believe that in which he has no confidence, or have confidence in that which he does not believe.

• But in order to escape the charge of holding to justification by faith only, we are told that repentance is in, and co-operates with faith. That repentance is that part of faith that purifies the heart. Well, if repentance is faith, or a necessary part of faith; then it is no more repentance, otherwise faith is no more faith. And it would be just as logical, and as much to the point, to say men are not justified by faith only, but by faith, and a part of faith; or by two parts of faith; as to say by faith and repentance which is that part of faith that purifies the heart; or, that repentance, which is a necessary part of faith, co-

operates with faith. For if it is not still faith only; it is still only faith. And we think it would puzzle a Jesuit to tell the difference.

But we are told that belief is the exercise of faith. How profound! Had it not been for this bit of information we would have thought that the exercise of faith consisted in some kind of obedience; and that it would be just as sensible to say that faith is the exercise of belief, or that faith is the exercise of faith. But this is an age of new discoveries! In ancient times faith wrought (exercised) with works; not the works of the law, but what Paul calls the obedience of faith. As says James: "Seest thou how faith wrought with His works and by works was faith made perfect." James ii, 22. It appears that faith was then exercised in obedience to the will of God, doing the things which he required. Such as offering sacrifices, walking with God, building the ark, going out at God's command, giving glory to God, offering a son upon an altar, keeping the passover, passing through the Red Sea, subduing kingdoms, working righteousness, etc., etc. But now in the nineteenth century, "BELIEF IS THE EXERCISE OF FAITH." But how faith can exercise belief, or how belief can be the exercise of faith, when faith is above and beyond the belief of any testimony, we leave the reader to judge.

*Remarks.*—But seldom, if ever, have we noticed a more logical and conclusive examination of the negative side of justification. Still we are justified, or approved of God, in believing his truth, while coming to him, and while we walk in the faith the Lord deigns to smile upon us most graciously.

We earnestly commend the Essay of brother Jones, particularly to our friends for whom it is intended. T. F.

---

BALTIMORE, MD., March 9, 1857.

BROTHER FANNING:—The Gospel Advocate for February reached me only two days past, having been remailed at Lexington, Ky. As this will be my abode during the year, you will send your paper to this office hereafter.

Upon the 54th page of the Advocate you say, that I admit that the Kentucky State Meeting is a *human organization*, and add, that "It will be well for the brethren to decide the question as to the utility of such organizations to keep the church alive. Can she perform her mis-

sion upon earth without the aid of human legislation? Can the churches of Christ co-operate as churches without converting them into human establishments? This embraces all the controversies of the age. Settle this point and all sincere religionists will become one."

In response to your inquiries and suggestions I say, that the brethren have very generally agreed that such organizations as the Kentucky State Meeting, for purely evangelical purposes, are compatible with the spirit of the New Testament and wants of the age, and in no way encroaching upon church independence or authority. (All sects declare their creeds "compatible with the spirit of the New Testament." T. F.)

The following States have so decided, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Texas, and, if I do not err, Tennessee, have they not State Meetings, or district co-operations for the spread of the gospel in each? (It is singular to hear a teacher of Christianity refer to State authority to prove that a principle is good. T. F.) I care not whether such co-operations are composed of two or one hundred churches, the principle is the same. Will Brother Fanning undertake to enlighten the brethren upon this subject? If we are wrong, I am sure that you can point out the error, and I shall gladly unite with you in opposing all such efforts. I hope that it will meet your convenience and approval to make the effort, and to answer the following queries.

1. May two or more congregations unite in their means and efforts to send the gospel to a destitute point, State or Nation? (Yes. T. F.) If so, State the authority of the Apostles for such a co-operation, (See 2 Cor. viii. 19. T. F.) and how the funds are with the evangelist to be controlled? (See Phil. iv, 16. T. F.)

2. If there is such permission, then say how all the churches in a county, district or in a State can co-operate in the work without infringing upon the individual congregational rights, and yet avoid what you call a "human organization," or one that is not specially marked out in the Oracles of God?

(Any number of churches may co-operate, *as churches*, in any good work. T. F.)

Shall we send the gospel to Jerusalem, China or India? If so, how can it be done by church co-operation scripturally? (Send the gospel into all the world, and when a church is not able to send her missionary, let her ask the aid of others. T. F.)

As you assume that we are rapidly apostatizing from original teach-

ing, I hope you will give us what proof you have. I desire to give you a fair hearing. I assure you, Brother F., that I have an unshaken confidence in the all sufficiency of the Word of God, yet I do not understand from its teachings that all the efforts of a church, in order to convert the world, are to be confined to a mere ritual. ("*Ritual*" is an unfortunate word. T. F.)

If the object and work of the Kentucky State Meeting are antagonistic to the spirit of our religion I am wholly unable to see it, and this is a common failing with thousands. I know that men are prone to apostasy, and I may have embarked in the spirit without knowing it. I am really jealous of apostolic authority, and I have long thought that the churches have but one common interest in the conversion of the world, and that all the Disciples of a State might unite in sending the gospel to another, and that when they have so agreed, that they might appoint A. B. C. and D. to manage, and properly direct their money and talents for the common interest, and also that that agreement might be written in a book for the better guidance of the whole work; provided, that the individual rights of the congregations were not interfered with in any of their personal or congregational duties. (This is all appropriate work for the churches, but when other *bodies* undertake the labor the churches are left out of the question. T. F.) Am I wrong? If so, will Brother Fanning set me right? You and I can write upon this subject for months in a good spirit. I shall look for your reply.

There are evident and manifest departures from Bible teaching among us upon the subject of Church Organization, and I may have gone astray also. Show it to me if you can.

We have an interesting church here, with a flourishing Sunday School, with two sessions in each Lord's day, and much good has been done. May the Lord guide us into all truth.

Yours truly, G. W. ELLEY.

P. S.—We had two valuable additions to the church last night. Large additions have been made to some of the Baptist Churches here of those who *hope that they have a change of heart.* G. W. E.

#### SUGGESTIONS.

WE are much pleased at the very kind manner in which Brother Elly writes in regard to the subject under examination, and whilst this spirit prevails, we have every reason to hope for the best results. The Bible will settle all of our controversies, if we will but examine it with proper care. We trust that Brother Elly will be abundantly blessed in his new field of labor.

T. F.



---

APPARENT CONTRADICTIONS RECONCILED.

Bro. J. R. Warren, of Kentucky, thinks that we are contradictory in our teaching in concluding the "Overseers are the true and legitimate pastors or shepherds of the various flocks of Christ" and the intimation that "Evangelists should have the general supervision of the churches."

Much of our embarrassment in looking at this subject consists in regarding the different members of the church, and the officers in particular, as independent of each other in their labor. The Evangelists planted the primitive churches, set in order what was wanting, ordained the older men or elders to oversee the respective flocks, and then these Evangelists traveled abroad again to plant and put into active service other churches. Whilst also they were the ministers or apostles of the churches, and were careful to report to the congregations that recommended them for the labor, they always not only felt that it was their duty to see that bishops and members acted well their part, but that it was a part of their labor to see that the churches were kept in order. Hence the Apostle Paul speaks "Of that which cometh upon him daily, the care of all the churches." (2 Cor. xi, 28.) Evangelists should now feel that the care of the churches, to some considerable degree, rests upon them. Their eye should be over shepherds as well as flocks. The true Evangelist is one who has all the members to perform their appropriate labor, but he never thinks of taking the office from any one.

T. F.

---

PERSONAL.

IN our February number we felt it our duty to call attention to the teaching of a Mr. Russel, of Missouri, in terms which we considered severe. We had examined the whole matter, with its consequences, were satisfied Mr. R. could have no respect for the Scriptures, and, therefore, we placed him with such as believe not the truth. The occurrence, however, has fully verified the idea that no one can get so far from the Divine oracles that he will not have an abundance of sympathisers. We have received some fault-finding letters on the subject, which, if we were to publish, their writers would have cause to blush for their rashness the balance of their lives.

We know not the young man personally, and entertain no unkindly feelings towards him, but we pledge ourselves to prove all men enter-



taining his speculations enemies to Christ and his religion. That we were not mistaken in this, any more than the Nashville infidelity, may appear from the following facts.

While at Bethany, some weeks ago, we learned that the youth had engaged in "*the mourning bench exercises to convert sinners, and was giving the brethren considerable trouble.*" A letter from one of his fellow graduates says, "*He has apostatised,*" and an esteemed brother of Missouri says, "*He has divided the church.*" So much for the insidious philosophy! It is certain death to all who tolerate it. If the preachers are determined to pronounce such teaching merely scintillations of an exuberant imagination for which the brethren are not *yet* prepared, as some in high places have already done, we may fear the worst.

T. F.

---

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING A HUMAN CREED AMONGST THE DISCIPLES.

BROTHER FANNING:—In your paper for this month, page 50, you introduce into a letter, written by Brother J. M. Warren, the following words: "(A more successful effort has been made at Frankfort. T. F.)" Brother Warren, in that part of his letter, is noting the tendency to creed-making in some localities. Your remark, therefore, charges that an effort in that direction has been made at Frankfort.

I am requested to inquire of you, 1st. What was that effort? and, 2d. When and by what body was it made?

Truly yours,

JAMES S. FALL.

Midway, Ky., Feb. 26, 1857.

---

#### REPLY.

THE manner in which the above enquiries are made, demands a respectful answer at our hands, although we would prefer answering the person or persons who desired the information. We feel bound in all Christian courtesy not only to give a "reason for our hope," but also to endeavor to give full satisfaction to any who may feel aggrieved on account of our teaching.

It is well known by our readers, that we have objected to some of the human organizations amongst the brethren, and to no one have we seen stronger reasons to object than to one which *seems* to exist at Frankfort, Kentucky. We have very honestly believed that the church is the only scriptural school in which to train men for the min-

istry of the word; and so we have taught; still we know that we are liable to err; and if in this instance we are mistaken, we would rejoice to be corrected.

We never saw any necessity for human creeds, and for many years we have considered all State or county ecclesiastical organizations, attempting to perform the labor of the church, as unnecessary. There is a society reported as existing at Frankfort, Ky., styled "*The Kentucky Christian Education Society*." In the act of incorporation we think the directors are called "*The Trustees of the Kentucky Christian Society*."

We notice in the charter "That the exclusive object of this society shall be, to educate pious young men who have been immersed into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, upon a confession of their faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God, who are willing to devote their lives to the proclamation of the gospel, as taught by the Messiah and his apostles, and who, as disciples of Christ, prefer to be denominated Christians."

Provision is also made that no person shall be appointed "Trustee who has not been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, upon a confession of his faith, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, who as a disciple prefers the name Christian, and is a member in good standing of the church of God, that views and holds the Bible as the only and infallible rule of faith and practice, and teaches that faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, repentance for past sins, confession of said faith, immersion for the remission of sins, and a life spent in adding to this faith courage, etc., is essential to the attainment of glory, honor and immortality."

Our first objection is to such institutions, composed as this purports to be, first of the preachers, *ex-officio*; and, secondly, of others upon the payment of certain sums of money. We object in the second place, in consequence of a clear and unmistakable effort to bind upon the necks of the brethren a human creed, with as separate and distinct articles as are found in a Romish or any Protestant creed. We may be told, that "the articles set forth are scriptural;" but so argue the advocates of all the creeds. Although many of the words employed are scriptural, they are not in scriptural connection. Nothing like some of the articles can be found in the Scriptures. For instance, there is no intimation in the Bible that any one should "*prefer the name Christian*," or that to belong to such an Educational institution, "*He shall be a member in good standing of a church of God, that receives and holds the Bi-*

ble," etc. Upon the same authority that these articles—made it is said by less than twenty persons—imposed upon the innocent disciples, ten thousand more may be written and incorporated into school charters as in this instance, and set forth in plain and unblushing creeds.

We feel no disposition to enter further into the merits of the question, but we sincerely believe there is as much authority for any creed of the age as the one published in the charter of the Kentucky Society.

Hence our correspondent has our candid reason for our reference.

T. F.

---

### "BIRTH OF THE SPIRIT."

SOME brother, who has seen proper to conceal his name, has sent us an essay on the birth of the Spirit, but without the writer's proper name we are not willing to publish any thing. His position is, that there is a birth of water in baptism, and that there will be a birth of the Spirit in the resurrection. We reply, in much kindness, that the Savior was not speaking of *two* births, one of water and another of Spirit, but a single translation from death to life, which is effected in a birth by water and Spirit. This idea of two births has through Romanists and Protestants exerted a terrible influence on the world. Men had just as well talk of an independent birth of the father, and another equally independent birth, at a distant period, of the mother. The word birth is equivalent to saved, and the Apostle says, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration (or the new institution) and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. The whole process can be told in few words. The Spirit of God quickens the heart by the truth—good seed sown into an honest and understanding heart—the believer, from this sacred influence, is led to repent, and acknowledge the authority of the Lord in baptism, and is thus born of water and Spirit, or passes from death to life.

These imaginary births, without Father or Mother, or even institutions, have done much to obscure the subject of becoming Christians; but we are persuaded that the people in many sections are disposed to take a more scriptural view.

T. F.

---

The communication from Elder E. D. Moore, of Texas, who has past his three-score years and ten, and who has been some fifty years or more a faithful minister of the Word, offers the senior editor great consolation and encouragement.

T. F.

## REMISSION OF SINS

BROTHER FANNING :—Dear Sir,—We believe that baptism is for the remission of sins, and that this is a fundamental principle of the Christian Church. On this subject some teachers need the way “expounded unto them more perfectly.” This is assuming a great deal, but you (vol. 3,) say, “Every one knows something which will profit others,” and this is my apology for giving my thoughts on this subject.

Some teachers make baptism almost every thing. They say that the sinner remains dead to God, that he has no hope, nor rejoicing until after baptism. This we deem erroneous and we think has greatly retarded the progress of truth.

Our present purpose is, to show what we understand to be the Lord's plan to save sinners. And for the purpose of being better understood, we will arrange the subject under three heads; to-wit:

1. *The preparation of the heart of a sinner before baptism.*
2. *That the Lord has ordained baptism for remission of sins.*
3. *That when Christ was on the earth, that no sinner ever prayed to him for the forgiveness of his sins, and that he forgave no person the sins of the soul.*

And now I pray you be not startled at these bold assertions, but hear me patiently through, and then “search the Scriptures to see if these things are so.”

1st. Unless the heart of the sinner be first prepared, baptism can do no good. The sinner must be made alive to God, he must have hope and rejoicing. He is not baptized to give him these, but that he may have them more abundantly. Baptism is to change his state; to remit the name sinner, and take on him the name Christian, and to make him an heir and a joint heir with Christ in heaven, and as a token that from henceforth he will walk in newness of life. Baptism is to the sinner like marriage to a young woman. She does not marry the man of her choice to make her love him, but that she may love him more abundantly. To change from single to married state. To remit her father's name and take upon her the name of her husband, and to make her an heir with him in his property, character, etc.

John the Baptist required a preparation of heart before baptism. He said, “Bring forth fruits meet for repentance.” (Matt. iii, 8.) Some persons believe that conversion and the forgiveness of sins are the same thing. But we believe that they are two separate things, and that conversion should come first, like the fruits of repentance.

(Mark iv, 12.) Faith, we understand, brings conversion, and baptism brings remission of sins.

Paul said that "the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. viii, 7.) The law of God requires the sinner to confess the Son of God and be baptized. (Acts viii, 37.) This he therefore cannot do until his heart is made alive to God.

At the day of Pentecost those sinners who believed the preaching of Peter must have been made alive to God; they must have possessed hope and rejoicing before they were baptized. At first they were much alarmed and cried out, "Men and brethren what shall we do." And when Peter told them what to do, Luke said, they "gladly received his words," and his words were the means of making them alive to God. This gave them hope, and these sinners must have rejoiced when Peter showed them the way of salvation. After this they were baptized. (Acts ii, 37-40.)

The hearts of those sinners who heard Peter preach at the house of Cornelius, were thereby made alive to God, he gave them hope, and they rejoiced in it before they were baptized for the remission of sins. Baptism changed their state from sinner to disciple or Christian, and it gave them an inheritance in heaven. (Acts x.)

The Holy Ghost came upon the Apostles at Pentecost to convince the Jews that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that they had greatly sinned by putting him to death. And the Lord sent it on all the Gentile sinners who heard Peter preach at the house of Cornelius, to convince the Jews that God was willing to save the Gentiles.

The Savior was now gone and had not revealed this to the Gentiles. The Holy Ghost was not sent to forgive sins but to reprove or convince. Baptism had been ordained for the remission of sins.

Faith in this same Jesus whom Peter preached at Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, is the moving cause of the whole work of the sinner to obtain salvation. Our Lord said to Nicodemus, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." (John iii, 14.)

Faith planted in the heart of a sinner is like a grain of corn planted in the earth, it forces up the blade, then the stalk, and then the ear. Again, it is like fire put into wood, it forces out light and heat. The mighty works which Christ did while on earth were mainly to convince the people that he was the Christ, the Son of God. No person be



lieves without testimony. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (Rom. x, 17.)

Our Savior knew that when faith was once planted in the heart of the sinner, that it would enforce the performance of all the balance, and therefore he said less about repentance, confession and baptism. When a sinner, by the force of the testimony contained in the scriptures, can believe with all his heart, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that he died for his sins, and that he arose for his justification; this thought fills his heart with love to the Savior; he is now born of the Spirit. The Spirit of the Lord bears witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. (Rom. vii, 16.) This is that Charity described by Paul in the 13th ch. of 1st Cor. It is in short, love to God and man. This faith and love produce repentance, and he is possessed of faith, is converted and has repented. These three are inseparable. He that can obtain good strong faith has also the other two. This is manifested in the history of the young man who was born blind and Christ opened his eyes. The performance of this miracle gave the man faith, he then became a disciple of the Lord Jesus, he loved him, he turned away from the principles and practice of the Pharisees, he confessed the Lord Jesus, and he worshiped him. (John 9th chapter.) This young man, we believe, was now prepared for baptism for remission of sins.

Our Savior required confession of both faith and love. (John xi, 26, 27; xxi, 15.)

JAMES YOUNG.

Bagdad, Smith Co., Tenn., Feb. 12, 1857.

### RESPECTFUL SUGGESTIONS.

WE would be gratified for Brother Kendrick or others to state their objections to our teaching plainly and unreservedly. We know we need help from the brethren, and we would be happy to receive light from any source.

The whole pith and marrow of Brother K.'s essay may be presented in few words. "*Preachers should be hired upon a stipulated salary before they begin their year's work.*" The reasons given by Bro. K. may be stated numerically.

1. "*When any thing is required to be done, and the manner of doing it is not given, we are at liberty to adopt such a course as seems to us best.*"

In reply, we intimate that we recollect no requirement of this kind. The *manner* of doing the Lord's service is the chief part of the command. We are left to infer nothing when Jehovah speaks, and when he speaks not let men be silent. Bro. K.'s example we think not applicable. The *manner* of raising funds and amount are prescribed.

2. Evangelists may be influenced not to visit the best places for doing good in consequence of having "*no definite assurance of a support.*"

If a bargain, stipulation, bond or note well endorsed be the indispensable condition of a young man's devoting his life to the Gospel, no other will ever enter the field. Moreover, if the *religious* obligation resting upon Christians will not influence them to support their Evangelists, we cannot see how a written pledge can do it. Our judgment is, that most bargains and written pledges, to avoid evils, become sober, live as honest men, or perform any of our high religious obligations, is well calculated to degrade the motives of the Bible, and give all the honor of right doing to the inventions of men. When we supply the wants of Evangelists, from a sense of the solemn obligation imposed by our Father alone, we glorify God; but when we pay our *subscriptions* we do so to get our names off the paper. On one plan men serve the Almighty, whilst upon the other the honor is always given to some human device to get money. Hence the crafty schemes adopted to raise funds, are well calculated to destroy the whole religious influence of sacrificing to Heaven without letting the left hand know what the right does. The *manner* of doing the work constitutes the service of the Lord. "Do this *discerning* the Lord's body" is the New Testament style. The proper view and motive give value to our sacrifices, and no performance without them is acceptable to Jehovah.

3. Brother K. intimates, that previously settled salaries will enable evangelists "to declare the whole truth," prevent them from "flattering the pride and vanity" to get money or "*raise the breeze*" in his style.

Observation has fully satisfied us that large salaries are generally, if not universally, raised by flattery, and especially by failures in preachers to point out the sins of the subscribers.

4. "Leaving" evangelists "to the uncertainty they must suffer without specific bargains, endangers their support and exposes them to many temptations," says Brother K. We cannot see that an evangelist, acting on the confidence that his brethren will supply his wants will "*send once and again to his necessities,*" "endangers his support;" but be this as it may, no preacher in the Apostolic day acted on a dif-

ferent rule. Regarding the "temptation" to raise money in connection with preaching, we believe the *salary* system offers more temptations to do wrong than any profession regarded honorable on earth. Without lengthy details, we state that it is a system producing envy amongst preachers, personal disparagement of each other; it influences them to flatter the most vicious passions, and yet secures not an independent support. Every plan save God's is immoral. The church is the only body authorized to raise up, set apart and send forth evangelists. Moreover, the church is pledged to God, to the world, and to her servants, to supply their wants, but this she cannot do till they occur. This *exacting* system before the labor is performed, with the endless complaining about money, and the starvation of the preachers, has tended to dry up the whole fountain of Christian benevolence and duty in the hearts of the brethren, and has driven the best men of the land from the field of labor. Men who are not willing to "walk by faith" in their preaching, ought to change their calling. Confidence in brethren is much more reliable than the best endorsed note. We wish the time may come when even men of the world shall abandon all note giving, and salary stipulations for labor, and when all shall be paid as "*their work shall be.*" Such is the Lord's stipulation, and such should be his people's.

T. F.

---

MISSION TO ENGLAND.

LOUISVILLE, KY., Feb. 16, 1857.

DEAR BROTHER FANNING:—You have noticed, I presume, that as Evangelist from the church in Louisville, I have been visiting the congregations, to endeavor to interest them in behalf of a Mission to England, Scotland and Ireland. My labors have been principally in Illinois and Missouri; but the time did not suffice to make any thing like a tour through the whole of these States. My success in raising funds has been only partial. Many difficulties were in my way which do not usually attend such efforts. Some, supposing that ignorant heathens are the alone objects of foreign missions, conclude that an enlightened nation, such as England, have no need of instruction from this country, and that indeed it would be presumption to offer it. Others consider that as the various missionary operations of the different denominations around are carried out through Missionary Societies, and a Missionary Society has been instituted among ourselves, they regard the operation of any single congregation or the co-operation of differ-

ent congregations with distrust, as something new and dangerous. Though the Missionary Society is doing nothing calculated to satisfy the mind of an earnest Christian, they think that all the benevolence of the churches is to be cramped up and made to flow only through the channels opened up by the board in Cincinnati, and that any congregation presuming to use that liberty which is in Christ Jesus, and become a centre from which the gospel is to sound forth, without the control and supervision of the Missionary Society and its Secretary, is entitled to receive more than one rebuke through the press.

I see from your writings that you regard the Church of Christ the proper medium of all evangelical operations—that there is no need for any human institution to accomplish that which the church is every way qualified for, can do more effectually than any other organization, and having been appointed to the work by the authority of Heaven, cannot evade its proper duty and turn it over to other hands without incurring condemnation for unfaithfulness. I therefore ask your co-operation, that by the efficient carrying out of this mission it may be practically that the church of Christ can send the gospel to the world without the intervention of any human devised scheme of operation.

How would it suit for some church in Tennessee to take hold of this mission to England in a similar manner to which the church here has done, and for the time being to make that a centre of co-operation of the churches in the State? I wish you would consider the subject and let me hear from you.

Your fellow servant in the kingdom,

WILLIAM THOMSON.

RESPONSE.—The brethren in Louisville will have the hearty co-operation of many of the saints in the South-West. T. F.

---

### BROTHER CAMPBELL'S TOUR SOUTH.

It is perhaps well known that Brother Campbell has been some two months South, preaching and procuring funds for Bethany College; but we are sorry to learn that he cannot visit Tennessee, as he gave us reason to hope when we saw him at Bethany.

---

BROTHERS Shannon and Henderson have spent several months in the Southern States, preaching and collecting funds for the college under the direction of the brethren in Missouri.

---

SPIRITUALISM AND INFIDELITY AT THE NORTH.

No one, we presume, who has not traveled unknown and unsuspected, can have the slightest conception of the amount of opposition to the christian religion in most, if not all the Northern States. We do not affirm that the intimation is not equally applicable in the South, but we have not had the same means of feeling the religious pulse South that we have North. In every stage coach, railroad car, steamboat and hotel, ten scoffers at religion will be found where one sincere friend can be discovered. A worse feature is exhibited in most of the popular lectures. Higher law authority, political editors, and "progressive preachers," are despisers of Christ and his ways. But enough for the present.

---

## DANCING.

OUR Brother Dr. Hernden of Missouri, and several others, have forwarded us some quite carefully written thoughts on dancing, but really we do not regard the subject of sufficient importance to encourage protracted discussions in regard to it. All Christians must admit that any exercise which, by its associations or otherwise, encourages volatility or fleshly habits should be advocated only when freed from every corrupting influence. As dancing is conducted we have witnessed nothing good springing from it; and with its usual concomitants we cannot well see how Christians can favor it. Reorganize society, and possibly it might be introduced with new associations to advantage, but as this is impracticable, we hope the brethren will direct their thoughts to subjects which may be discussed with more satisfaction.

T. F.

---

EXTREMES MEET.

WE heard the following conversation a few weeks since, between Mr. Spiritualist and Mr. Calvinist:

*Spiritualist.*—Are you aware, Mr. Presbyterian, that the discoveries of these latter day developments have torn down much of the superstition of the times, and corrected many of the very gross errors in the Bible?

*Calvinist.*—No, sir. I am not aware that the Bible is a false book. Will you tell me wherein it is untrue?

*Spiritualist.*—I do not care to argue the question of the superstitions of the Scriptures, but one thing I will say, "Whatever is, is right." This vast universe has progressed for millions of years in per-



fect harmony, and nature's laws are ever true. Every thing we witness is but a result of her laws, and nothing we can do can change our destiny. Does not your creed, Mr. Calvinist, teach you that "*your God ordains whatever comes to pass?*" If this is true, every thing is eternally fixed, and results can not be controlled by the efforts of men.

*Calvinist.*—I now understand you. Every thing is eternally decreed. You may call this the operation of nature's laws, or what you please. Our conclusions are the same on this great subject; but still I believe the Bible.

REMARK.—No comment is necessary.

T. F.

### SELECTIONS OF SCRIPTURE FOR CHRISTIANS.

*For such instructions and admonitions we thank God.*—T. F.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The light of the body is the eye. If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness! No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. YE CANNOT serve God and Mammon."

"Be not deceived: God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

"May God give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that you may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

"Every man that striveth for the mastery, is temperate in all things."

“He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations.”

“We have not an high priest that cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities.”

“Suffer this word of exhortation.”

---

### PASSING THOUGHTS.

A TRUE religious faith is at once the easiest and most difficult achievement. Easy, when we exercise it as a gift of God; difficult, when we attempt it in our own strength.

We are apt to assign a high place in heaven to the eloquent preacher who has faithfully declared the counsel of God, the learned author who has ably advocated the Christianity of the Bible, and the rich philanthropist who has spent his money in doing good; and yet, peradventure, that obscure woman who was cheerful in her poverty; who loved the sound of the Savior's name; who felt her heart always overflowing with love to God and man, and yet lived and died unnoticed and unknown, may occupy a higher place than either.

The means of grace are invaluable when they are used as means to an end. When they are gone through as a mere routine and in a perfunctory manner, they do but little good.

Controversy is inevitable so long as men will assail the truth, and render it necessary that it should be defended. Little, however, it is to be apprehended, do those who give occasion for controversy consider the heavy responsibility they thereby incur. They divert hundreds from their appropriate work in building up Christ's kingdom to defend the outworks, and are thus accountable for all this loss of labor, and all the sad consequences which may follow.

The unconverted who are happy in their ignorance, are really ignorant of happiness.

We have never known any who mingled in fashionable society under the pretext of exerting a Christian influence upon it, who did not sooner or later suffer in their Christian reputation. It is folly to go into the fire for the purpose of extinguishing it.

When the Christian masters his besetting sins he finds his other sins of easy conquest; but not till then.

While there is a possibility that we may fall short of the kingdom of heaven, there should be no relaxation of effort to make the matter certain. There should be no *peradventure* where all that is dear to us is involved.—*Presbyterian*.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

WE have some devoted spirits, lovely and resolute, in this bewitching land. A young brother says, in a recent letter: "I am the only one of our profession in the vicinity of this place, and many are the inducements to lead me from the path of duty: but I am persuaded that things present or things to come will not be able to separate me from the love of God. Fight the glorious battles of the Lord, and a crown of glory awaits you."

Still there is danger. This resolute soul may possibly be overcome; and especially as the congregation in which he holds membership "is in a deplorable condition—every thing in confusion," it having "managed so as to close an ear to their preaching altogether. Very seldom an outsider ventures within the enclosures of the church." No one can know to what congregation reference is made—I do not—may the description be fitted by but one! We give the good. Let it not be said we withhold the evil. The apostles did not. Good may result from "great plainness of speech" just now. I would not risk my Christian character, nor my soul in such a church, nor in the isolated condition of this young brother for all worlds. May the Lord help us to be wise!

---

## SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS.—No. 1.

WHAT little I know of heavenly things I learned, from the first, with few exceptions, directly from the Bible. Still on a few points I have found it necessary to change my views, and have discovered, I think, that my mistakes resulted from deciding upon too slight examinations. From this I have tried to profit. I have annually, or oftener, for several years, re-examined the evidences of Christianity, and the duties it enforces. Some of these, in fact, I try to keep constantly in view. The Christian Baptist made a deep impression on my mind adverse to the hireling system; but it did not change me in what I still think are scriptural views of supporting evangelists. Since the commencement of the Gospel Advocate, and the expression of Brother Fanning's views on the subject, I have been, as far as possible, and without any unfavorable prejudices known to me, examining the subject anew.

Presumption, self-conceit, or a wicked heart may cause one to differ readily from great and good men; but piety, never. If to "*hasten slowly*" was a good maxim amongst the Romans, would it not be good with us to "*differ slowly*?" There are few men with whom I would be slower to differ than with T. Fanning; still—to his praise I say it—there are none with whom I would sooner *express* a difference. Thank God! I hope the time is past, with some pens, when frowns, or smiles, or witticisms, or sarcasms, or even illustrations are to be taken for arguments. With such the search for truth is a reality, its possession, the true riches.

Some things are many times proved, and some are made doubly plain. It is plain enough that evangelists should be sustained, from the very nature of their work. The Disciples should not wait for any special arrangement, or binding contract, stipulating how much is to be received, and how much and when each is to pay. And when the spirit of Christianity prevails amongst its professed friends as in ancient times, these things *will* not be necessary. But the revealing spirit contemplated the world as it was and as it would be, as clearly as what it *should* be. Hence, we have *many* provisions and laws that would not be necessary if all were fully in the Christian service.

Again: Many times an end is commanded, and the means are left for us to determine—the outlines to be filled up by us. And, with all our imperfections, we can go from one post to another, if we have firm ground, and no unreasonable obstruction. Indeed, it may be, I suppose, laid down as a safe rule, that when an end is appointed, as the greater includes the less, so the means necessary to the end are included. Hence, none of us hesitates as to authority for erecting houses to worship in. We reason thus: We are commanded not to "forsake the assembling of" ourselves together, and we must have a place to meet. We are commanded to "do all things decently and in order," and hence we must have a specified hour, and certain other particular regulations.

What would be thought of one who would say it is not necessary to appoint a particular hour or place for meeting—that it is the duty of Christians to meet on Lord's day, and that is enough? How would we like to say, no particular time is necessary for family prayer; no particular duty should be pointed out by the head of the family, for each one of its members, because it is the duty of all to join in it, and they should not wait for any thing? Ah! human nature, as it is, is "sterner stuff"—brittle, hard, unruly. Jonah did not wish to go to Ninevah,

nor Moses to Egypt, and it is not quite certain that Paul very readily took on him all the responsibilities of his Apostleship. We need all the help we can get, and shall be quite deficient enough after all. On this ground human institutions are contended for, and the argument would be good, if they were really *helps*—if *more* could not be done, and *better* done, on the Lord's plan.

It may also be laid down as a safe rule, that every thing not incompatible with the spirit or letter of Christianity, may, and should, be brought to bear, in order to secure obedience to its precepts, and the salvation of souls. A specific bargain, or binding volunteer agreement between an evangelist and those who sustain him, has a tendency to secure his support. Therefore, such stipulations and agreements are right and necessary. However this postulate may strike some minds, I have tried its *practical workings*, and many others have tried it. Does not the united and unvarying result establish the point before us?

Christians are under solemn obligations to support evangelists, whether they admit and do it or not. So aliens are under solemn obligations to obey the gospel, whether they do it or not. Their submission is simply an acknowledgment of the previously existing obligations—not an increase of it, save as they receive more blessings. Now who does not know, that the very fact that they have engaged to do Christian service has a great tendency to cause them to do it? Doubtless many would not join the church again, just now, if they were not of it, but as they are in it, they will try to be faithful. Many, perhaps, would not marry, but as they are married, they will endeavor to be true and faithful to their vows. Such is the tendency of specific, positive engagements or bargains—*subscriptions*, if you please, for these are bargains. In fact, Paul argues from the engagement to the duty: "If, then, you have been raised up with Christ, seek those things which are above." (Col. iii, 1.) So Rom. 6th, and elsewhere. The Corinthians had *promised* something for the poor saints in Judea, and Paul argued from the promise to the doing of it. Still the obligation existed before the promise, and would have existed forever without it. So the obligation to support evangelists exists, and the promise is only an admission of it. Then the questions arise, are such promises contrary to the gospel, and do they have a direct and powerful tendency towards inducing faithfulness? Will we not answer unanimously?

If this be called a philosophical rather than a scriptural argument, I answer, Christianity is the perfection of true philosophy. Certain-



ly there is nothing in it contrary to the most rigid philosophical and logical principles and arguments. I have, for my next, a few great if not large ideas. May all be deeply impressed on the reader's mind.

C. K.

#### SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS.—NO. 2.

It may not be amiss to refer distinctly to the fact, that when any thing is required to be done, and the manner of doing it is not given, we are at full liberty to adopt what seems to us the best manner, regarding always the general principles and spirit of the gospel, and the views and feelings of our brethren. Thus, "go, preach the gospel." But as to how we shall go, whether on foot, on horse, by railroad, or otherwise, we are not told. So, we are not directed what people should be visited first, or when the work should be commenced—though this last may be easily understood to be as soon as possible. And so, we should conclude that the most reasonable, cheap, efficient and effectual means and manner to be indicated; but that *we* are to determine these without direct instruction, is the question.

We are taught that it is the duty of the church to support the poor, and that collections were made in various regions of country, for the poor saints in Judea, on the first day of the week, "as God had prospered each one." And we may safely conclude that this mode of doing this thing is right and proper; though I do not know that this example binds us always, and under all circumstances, to this manner of making collections for the poor. And if we should allow that it does, it would not still follow that we must collect money for supporting Evangelists, erecting houses of worship, etc., in the same way. It would, however, be fair to admit, that the same mode of raising funds might not be adopted in all cases, except as circumstances may rule.

I mean, however, by these suggestions, to bring forward the idea, that we are not definitely taught how to raise funds for evangelizing purposes, how much they shall receive—(that is, how many dollars and cents,—they are to be fully supported;) or whether we shall make a specific bargain with them or not; and that, therefore, we have a right to our own opinions on these subjects, and should not complain of each other for them. Not so, generally, with respect to the *duties* of Evangelists. They are more clearly laid down. We could scarcely be excusable if we should confound the duties of Evangelists and Bishops, or if we should make Evangelists "*Pastors*," each of an individual church, or of several churches, in the present very popular sense of

this term. The *duties* of Evangelists may have special attention in the future. Certainly they are of the utmost importance. But their *support* is a theme quite sufficient for several articles. Indeed, in view of the importance of their support, and of their labors—and the first of these may be estimated by the last—we should not pause to contend at length as to the manner, or any other *human* course of manner or action, so far as *we* are to decide.

I have suggested that the importance of supporting Evangelists is to be determined by the importance of their labors. To this there may be some exceptions, since some will labor much, and many, some, without any support from the church. These are exceptions, however. The rule is, that Evangelists shall preach as the church enables them—as they are sustained. And yet, the exceptions have almost become rule! What Evangelist is now sustained by the church? I do not know him. I know many who receive *something*, however. And, since some are better managers—financiers—than others; spend less and are more dexterous in little trades, (and some of them in large ones!) they keep up; others go down, quit the field, and sometimes do even worse. Some, again, are tempted to act the popular revivalist, and thus, by dint of effort, raise the breeze that will bring their support. Some, indeed, may shun to declare the whole truth, flatter pride and vanity, instead of rebuking them, lest their support fail.

And are not even the best managers of temporal things liable to be tempted under the most favorable circumstances, to visit certain places because the pay may be greater, and to neglect others notwithstanding more good might be done? Tempted, I say, or at least made to feel, somewhat the evil influence, though they may not yield to it. And this evil influence, I think, must be far greater when the Evangelist has no definite assurance of support. He goes from place to place and finds, beyond dispute, the promise or prospect of good greater at one place, and of support at another. Shall he, then, be controlled by the prospect of doing good, or by that of being supported? This is, with him, a solemn question, say of it what we will. It is his *duty* to support his family and himself—it *must* be done. If he goes to the place promising the greatest show of support, he will be relieved more and do *more* good. By going elsewhere he sees he could do more good, but his support would be cut off, and he might soon have to quit the field. Well, perhaps, he says, 'tis better to do some good than none, and I will go where they pay better. And still he almost feels that he is a base hireling, laboring for the loaves and fishes—almost feels *mean*! His

high station is humbled, his godly aspirations brought down, and he is no more what he would have been. He remembers that pay-promising field will not yield well if he rebukes pride and vanity, and particularises and rebukes sins as he really believes would be right. Here, then, he makes another compromise—and is in a direct line of preparation for still further compromises.

Now, is it not the duty of the churches, as far as reasonably practicable, to save their evangelists from these tempting, debasing, corrupting influences? And if the exact amount necessary to their support was secured, and they plainly assured of it, would they not, to a large extent, be delivered from it? Then, if they went here or there, their support would not be materially, if at all, affected; and they would have less temptation to keep back something that ought to be told, less inducement to flatter the proud and sick, or to tolerate the wrong.

But it may be said that they would be equally tempted to be idle, worldly or selfish, since their year's support was determined and depended not upon their continual devotion to the cause as evangelists. Not so. It is always understood, if not expressed, that they are to receive so much if they continue faithful, and that their support will fail as certainly as their devotions to the service.

But they may be sick, their families may be sick, or they may by other controlling circumstances be hindered from doing the work of evangelists as contemplated. So they may. Still the stipulation and bargain cannot, I think, be at all objected to on this account. The high sense of justice, ever ruling in the minds and hearts of Christians, should determine what is right in such cases as they present themselves. The bargain cannot be in the way, nor can it bind them to pay for labor not rendered; though it may serve to direct their attention to the necessities of the evangelists, to their dependence on them, and may, perhaps, aid in causing them to do their duty in sympathising with their afflictions.

#### RECAPITULATION.

Our attention has been directed definitely to,

1. The necessity of candid, close, thorough and *repeated* examinations of important subjects, with an absolute readiness, as far as this is possible to see and correct the errors of former examinations.
2. The command to accomplish an end, includes all the means necessary thereto.
3. That every influence not inconsistent with truth should be brought into requisition.

4. That the manner of raising funds to support evangelists, engaging them, exactly the amount they shall receive, etc., are matters to be decided by the church.

5. That the influence of specific bargains with evangelists is good, and should not be lost sight of.

6. That leaving them to the uncertainty they must suffer without specific bargains, endangers their support, and exposes them to many temptations, from which the church should save them.

Other points have been touched, which, with these will be illustrated by my *experience* in No. 3. Meantime, let me intreat the reader not to allow the exceeding plainness of speech indulged in, nor the commonness of the theme itself, to cause him to turn away from the profound and prayerful consideration of it.

C. KENDRICK.

---

#### DOMESTIC PIETY.

IF there be a curse more bitter than any other to man, it is to be the offspring of an irregular home; of a home where the voice of praise and prayer ascends not to God, and where the ties of affection are not purified and elevated by the refined influence of religious feeling; of a home to which, if the cares or sorrows of life shall bring religion to the heart in after days, that heart cannot turn without bitterness of feeling, without anguish and vexation of spirit. If there be a curse to any country where the truths of religion are known—the deepest and bitterest curse which can be inflicted upon it, is a multitude of homes like the one which I have supposed. Such homes send forth sons unchecked in evil thoughts, unhallowed in their habits, and untaught in the love of God; the name of Jesus Christ stamped on their forehead, but not written in their hearts, and they send them forth to prey upon the land, and to become its curse and destruction. But on the other hand, there is a blessing to the religious home, which no tongue can describe. The home where, in early years, the heart is trained to a love of God, and to take pleasure in His worship and services, interwoven with the existence of many holy affections that die not with the circumstances that gave them birth—which last long, though they may for a season be neglected or forgotten, and which shall exercise at least some check upon the evil of the human heart, and often, nay, commonly, recall it to hear again the word of God, and turn to the paths of holiness and peace. How great and unspeakable is the happiness of a land where homes like these are common.—*Rev. J. H. Rose.*



# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, JUNE, 1857.

NO. 6.

---

## RELIGIOUS EXPEDIENTS.

OUR teaching has been from the commencement of the Gospel Advocate, that Christianity is a subject of authoritative revelation; and admits of no compromises, substitutes or expedients. We are to believe what is written, as it is written, or lay no claims to a belief in the religion of Christ. We have also maintained with our humble ability, that Christianity as revealed in the New Testament, is sufficient for all of our moral and spiritual wants. We have regretted to differ with any, and we are really pained to know that men professing to be governed by the Bible alone, contend for modern expedients as necessary in our present circumstances. But we are happy beyond expression to know that some of our strongest brethren are taking the proper view. We are pleased to make the following extracts from the "British Millennial Harbinger," for May, 1857, published by Bro. J. Wallis, Nottingham, England:

"Will-worship and presumptuous meddling with divine things now pass current under the cover of expediency. With us it is always expedient to keep close to the Christian system as given by the Apostles. When it is ascertained that that divine system supplies to us, on any given point, a clear precept or a plain example, what right can we have to deviate therefrom, and still call the system we support Christian? It has been well said—

"If thought expedient then by the inspired apostles, why is it not equally expedient now? What right have men in this or any other



age to set up their ideas of expediency in opposition to those of the divinely appointed founders of the church? We admit that the principles of church government laid down in the New Testament cannot work well in practice unless they be expedient; but the Divine will has determined what is expedient, and in recording the fact has not accompanied it with the slightest intimation that the plan promulgated was expedient for one country or for one age only. For example, the *peculiar fitness* of a plurality of teachers, to edify the church is to be inferred from the fact, that such a plurality was everywhere established by those who knew best what would operate successfully; if one man *exclusively* devoted to the duty of teaching would have succeeded better in disseminating the truth than the combined and co-operative efforts of many in each church, it is very strange that this 'expedient' method was not suggested by the apostles, or alluded to as a possible improvement which future ages might substitute for the apostolical scheme. We hold, then, that the system of a plurality of teachers in each church having been adopted by the apostles, and without reference to any limit either as to time or place, it is obligatory upon us for the double reason that it was expressly sanctioned by Divine authority, and has been determined by an *unerring* judgment to be *expedient* for the church in all ages."

"Again, it must not be overlooked that in these days we have no infallible means of determining what is expedient. We entreat those who may hold the views on which we are now animadverting to ponder this remark. If we take upon ourselves to depart from principles laid down in the New Testament, who is to decide what is and what is not expedient? or whether the change will or will not be for the better? If we leave the vantage ground of Scripture, and trust ourselves to the wisdom and expediency of post-apostolic churches, where are we, and where shall we be? Popery sets up human wisdom against the sole authority of Scripture, otherwise the bishop of Rome would be without even the pretence of a warrant for his usurpation; his warrant is the wisdom of the fathers, and expediency would be appealed to on behalf of the boldest usurpations of the Papacy. Diocesan bishops are also aware of the weakness of the scripture evidence in support of their pretensions, and would gladly accept the reference to expediency. Therefore, we ask, can we stand our ground in the conflict with the existing forms of ecclesiastical error, if we once admit that it is allowable to depart from a clearly stated Scripture usage on an important point affecting the constitution and government of the church?

If expediency be permitted to disturb the recorded practice of the primitive church, it is not difficult to foresee that doctrines—even essential doctrines—might be subjected by those who exalt human reason, to modifications and improvements to meet the circumstances of our time.

“It appears to us that the grand preservative against error, whether in matters of doctrine or church government, is the recognition of the sole and infallible authority of the Divine will, in all points where that will is distinctly recorded in Scripture, without any express qualification or limitation exonerating us from rendering obedience to it in this age.

“Another thought will not perhaps be out of place here. If the New Testament church be accepted by Christians as a model for imitation in all its distinct features, we can understand that the churches will be gradually brought nearer to one another by the very effort to imitate that model.”

“It is then expedient to take Christianity as God gave it. Most inexpedient have been all the attempted emendations. In eighteen hundred years not one good thing has been added to it, and not one tittle of it departed from without loss. If we have not yet had experience enough to teach us that we cannot mend God’s ways, it is to be feared that we are past help, and that others less marred must be called to teach the true expediency.”

---

### SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

WE read an essay a short time since, if we mistake not, on “*Faith and Philosophy*,” and for our life we could see but little of faith in it, and as to philosophy, there was not even an attempt to say any thing, and we would not be surprised if in the present remarks we do not reach our caption. The fact is, in enabling others to learn, more depends upon unteaching them, and disembarassing their minds, than in imparting information. Speakers and writers very often employ words as blinds; merely to deceive the simple—words which neither they nor their hearers understand. For illustration, some two months since we were attending a meeting of modern spiritualists in Portland, Me., and the chief speaker—quite a slippant and conceited declaimer—took great pains to say to his admiring auditors, that “Philosophy and Spiritualism, most perfectly harmonized, explained, proved and forever confirmed each

other." Almost unconsciously we rose and begged permission to propound a question. "We will answer," said the speaker, "with much pleasure." "You tell us," said we, "that philosophy and spiritualism explain and prove each other; pray tell us what you mean by a philosophy that explains spiritualism?" We state it as a fact, that the speaker could not tell even what he *thought* was the meaning of philosophy; and we were more than satisfied that he had never thought on the subject, and that the word was a perfect blank both to him and his brethren.

With this suggestion we hope that we are somewhat better prepared to approach our subject.

We know not a word used even with the learned, so destitute of meaning, as the term *science*. The opposers of religion are most free to seize upon the word, and attach to it some wild notions, to enable them to talk against God and his authority; and religionists, very often fear and imagine there is something so deep, mysteriously profound and terrible in science, that they dread its influence upon religion. No marvel then, that men professing science but who understand not the Bible, are disposed to apologize for the word of God. Agassiz and several writers we have recently noticed, are most particular to speak of God, and revelation in connections that give full evidence that they believe not in any extraordinary revelation, or in the God of the Bible.

But we wish to say, that Christians have nothing to fear from truth, scientific or practical, let it come in what shape, or from what quarter it may. It is the bounden duty of the teachers of religion to know all science and philosophy; and above all, to be able to expose the tricks and impious assumptions of men professing science—falsely so called. One of the greatest mistakes of the age on this subject, consists in making the Bible teach what it really does not say. In having it for instance to assert that there was no world, age, or anything, before the period of man, which began some 5861 years ago. Moses said not a word on that point. His purpose was to declare authoritatively in opposition to speculatists—men of science,—who maintained that the world was self-originated—that is, come into existence by the self-agglomeration of self-created materials, that "God made the heavens and the earth." As much as if he asserted, they did not make themselves,—God is their author.

Again, geologists and others professing science, and wishing to be nominal church members, find it very difficult to reconcile the Bible and what they call facts with the work of the six days of creation.

Hence most apologists for the Bible make the six days, six indefinitely long periods in which the world, like some huge beast, was growing into size and proportions. No necessity for such speculations. Moses tells the literal truth, and to believe his words, when correctly translated, there need be no difficulty. He has the earth originated and completed before the six days began. His statement is, "In the beginning," or in the first place, "God made (originated) the heavens and the earth." The earth was then finished and the first day had not dawned. He says of the condition of the earth before the first day, "It was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. The work of the first day was dividing the light from the darkness, and no doubt when Moses speaks in Exodus of the heavens and the earth being *made* in six days, he employs the word *made* in the sense of *arranged* or fitted up. This is still our use of the word. We make clothes, houses, and every thing, but we originate nothing.

These thoughts we have thrown together merely to prepare the way for making a statement or two, that should be well considered, particularly by timid Christians.

Nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths of persons, who are wont to array science against the Bible, have not studied the meaning of the word science; and have made themselves acquainted with no branch of learning.

It is our conviction, that there is much less real science developed even in this exceedingly progressive age, than we are willing to admit. We are more than satisfied that science never taught, or developed a single syllable regarding morality, piety or the origin of the world; and but for the incidental declarations of the Bible, such as "By faith, we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God," the profoundest philosopher of earth could not give a single sensible conjecture regarding the creation of the world or man.

We have all to gain in the highest scientific investigations, and should not the scriptures bear the test upon critical examination, the sooner they are cast overboard the better.

Finally, we declare it as our last and most certain conclusion that all the boasted light of science and philosophy of the nineteenth century, in reference to God, heaven, our origin, and destiny, consists in a few straggling rays of light stolen from the heavenly oracles. Without the words and ideas of the Bible, men could neither think or talk on spiritual subjects. The Apostle asks, "What hast thou, that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?"

T. F.



## SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND SUNDAY SCHOOL BOOKS.

It is written, "Man was not made for the Sabbath but the Sabbath for man," and we were not made for the Lord's day, but the Lord's day was made for us and our children. If therefore, there is a paramount obligation resting upon the disciples of Christ, it consists in our duty to God, to ourselves and our dependents, in improving the first day of the week. It is not merely a day of rest,—a day to visit friends, prepare business for the week, go journeys or give to declamation, political, or religious—but it is pre-eminently, the day for labor in the Lord's vineyard. For many months we have earnestly labored with our feeble ability to convince the brethren, that there is religious work for us to perform in order to acquire religious health and exert any beneficial influence upon our fellow creatures. In the present suggestions we desire to present not only the obligations resting upon us in regard to our duties to children and servants, but to endeavor to set forth the proper manner of performing our duties.

In the first place, we regard it the bounden duty of Christians "To bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," (Eph. vi. 4,) and it has long occurred to us as most unnatural, unreasonable and incongruous for parents to commit the instruction of their tender offspring to strangers. Mothers are the appropriate teachers of infants and juveniles; fathers should give lessons in riper years, and if practical to send to higher schools, let no pupil be dismissed from parents before the age of ten to fifteen years.

Not only is it the duty of parents to give the first lessons to their children, particularly in what are regarded the primary branches of a common school education; but they are also the natural, legal, and consecrated teachers of their children in *morals* and *religion*. If in the family circle, there is no pious breath for youths to inhale, difficult will be the task to bring them under proper influences in after life. Solomon said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," and we may safely add, if the training is wanting in childhood—if parental influence is vicious, there is but slight hope of future amendment. The sudden, remarkable and almost miraculous conversions of our times, in the first place give evidence of an utter destitution of training in youth, and secondly, the converts are generally so totally devoid of preparation for religious life, that their profession answers no good end. The good seed must be sown upon prepared soil, to bring forth fruit, thirty, sixty and an hundred fold



The honest and understanding heart, or as translated in another place, "the good heart," which is the properly educated heart, affords the only foundation for Christian practice. The hundreds and thousands of persons who join the church without preparation, offer a terrible lesson upon the negligence of the moral training of youth. We are disposed to attach a high importance to parental responsibility, because we believe it necessary to stir up the pure minds of the brethren to a sense of their duty. It is generally of little use to attempt to instruct youths in morals, manners or even decency, when parental instruction has been wanting, or of a vicious character.

Most good men have good fathers; and we can call to mind but few, even passable men, whose *mothers* were not noble women.

It becomes us, however, if we respect our caption, to call attention to the manner in which parents should direct their influence to the moral improvement of *their* children, and indeed all children over whom they can exercise influence, and particularly to Sunday schools.

That the churches of Christ are the only authorized Sunday schools of the New Testament we entertain not a remaining doubt. Christians are required to meet on the Lord's day, and they are expected and enjoined to teach, exhort and correct each other with the view of the highest improvement. That it is their privilege and duty also to teach the children of the congregation on Lord's day, we are as well satisfied as it is their duty to furnish their households bread. That it is however, necessary, prudent, wise, advisable, or proper for Christians to form, organize or be in any way connected with a Sunday school different from the church, we are not satisfied. All mixed Sunday schools, guided and taught by saints, sinners and infidels, we regard as unauthorized and useless in Christian communities. It is an acknowledgment, in the first place, that the church is incompetent to disseminate "the true light," but skeptics, and scoffers at God and the word of his grace, are to be invited to teach the children of Christians. These things ought not to be. Such mixed Sunday schools surely can not be a permanent blessing.

Finally, it is in place to enquire as to the best series of Sunday school books. We suggest with great respect, that it has never seemed to us wise to spend the Lord's day in teaching children their alphabet, spelling, reading, writing and ciphering; and the little story books used in Sunday schools, we have always regarded as out of place. We do not say, that human productions may not be profitably employed in Sunday schools; but we are confident we have seen no series of such

works at all safe or useful. As an instance, some months since, while we were preaching in a congregation of disciples, we discovered a singular looking little black book in the pulpit; and we made free to open it, and to our surprise, we found it was a popular Sunday school book, on "*Natural religion*," as infidel a production as we had seen. On the very first page, at a moment's glance, we discovered that the author assumed the dogma that religion is natural—not revealed miraculously from God, but a strict following out the dictates within. None of the question books that we have seen, will bear the test of scriptural comparison.

It is, however, at least respectful to say, that brother James Challen & Son of Philadelphia, have given notice that they will issue a series of Sunday school books adapted to the purposes of Christians. We can not pronounce for or against the works till we see them; but if the brethren will submit them to us, we will deal with them most candidly.

It is our most solemn belief, that the scriptures are better calculated to profit all who are *qualified* to attend Lord's day school, than any other productions; and if we were permitted to recommend a series of books suited for unconverted children, we would have them study Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and the Acts of Apostles; and for converted children, we would recommend above any other series, the one found in the New Testament, beginning with Paul to the Romans and closing with "the Revelation of Jesus Christ" sent to John on the Island of Patmos.

In our hasty remarks, we have merely attempted to notice the chief points; but we submit the whole matter without argument. Our main purpose is to give our readers what we have taught from the beginning; and whilst we feel that we are unquestionably in the right, we trust if our brethren should see that we are in error, they will have the kindness to show the better way. Our candor should, at least, entitle us to respect.

T. F.

#### "CAMPBELLISM DEMOLISHED."

SOME one has sent us from Arkansas, a pamphlet of 40 pages with above caption, but in glancing over its pages, we see nothing requiring an answer, and have finally concluded to offer a friendly suggestion to Mr. Langley, the author, and other writers of his class.

Alexander Campbell and his brethren are not disposed to defend Campbellism real, or imaginary. They contend for the authority of the

scriptures alone, and if in their pleadings for the word of life, they should teach any thing erroneous, no doubt they would receive the proper correction. Alexander Campbell never professed personal infallibility, and he is willing to admit that he has made mistakes, but this concession interferes not with his main position as a religionist. If Mr. Langley or others will presume to doubt the infallibility of our position in supporting the authority of the Bible, and the church of Christ, and not a Campbellitish, Methodist, Baptist or any other sect, it will be demonstrated that the religion advocated by the disciples of Christ, is no modern invention. It is exceeding wickedness, to say the very best of it, to palm upon us what we dislike more than others can. We believe God, and have hope of a resurrection through Christ. We ask no one to believe what is not in the scriptures, and we will recognize no people in the "*narrow path*" who will not in *name* and in *fact*, plead the authority of Jesus Christ alone. T. F.

#### MISREPRESENTATIONS.

It is not necessary to go far to hear *misrepresentations* of our position and sentiments, particularly by our Baptist friends. One has only to hear some of their preachers allude to us in their discourse, or to read Jeter's book, to find them thick enough. My object in this communication is not to examine these as generally heard and met with; but to notice a discourse which the writer lately heard, by a prominent Baptist preacher of this region of country. It was a singular mixture of *misrepresentation* of our sentiments of scriptural *truth*, *inconsistency*, and *misquotation* of scripture.

In speaking of the *operation* of the Spirit, and giving his views upon it, he said that some had "*no Spirit but the word*"—thereby repeating the old stereotype slander, that we make the *word* and *Spirit* of God *identical* or the same—a thing we have never believed or taught; and which originated from our teaching that the Spirit of God operates by or through the word *alone*, and rejecting all direct abstract operation, separate and apart from the word of God. He gave as his view, and that of his church, that the Spirit operates by or through the *gospel*, in contradistinction to the view he imputed to us, which we hold in common with them; and then said, that he dare not *limit* the operation of the Spirit to the word of God, as the instrumentality, as we know not, he continued, but that it operates *outside* of the word, and quoted in proof

Paul to the Romans; "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made"—passages which have no applicability whatever to this outside operation of the Spirit, but to the *knowledge* of God, which the heathen world once had and lost, and of which the works of nature contained a sufficient illustration to have kept them in mind of Him. Here was not only a *misapplication* of scripture, but an *inconsistency*, in asserting that the word of God was the instrument of the Spirit's operation, and then admitting or contending for an operation *outside* of it!

Again, another *inconsistency*; he condemned an *abstract operation* of the Spirit, and denied holding it; and *affirmed* an outside or abstract operation! Such is the character of the preaching by which we are opposed and misrepresented by those claiming to be orthodox, and to be specially called and sent by God!

Another *misrepresentation*: He said that at the beginning of the Christian dispensation the church was not divided into a multitude of sects as now—that there were no Baptists, Methodists, *Campbellites*, etc., thereby making us out a *sect* like the rest, and "Campbellite" as our denominational name; whereas we have always denied the imputation of being a *sect*, and the name "Campbellite" is a *nickname* given us by our opponents, which we have never acknowledged, but always denied. Indeed, we have uniformly rejected all party or sectarian names whatever; and acknowledge none but those permitted in the New Testament, worn by the primitive church and her members, as "Christian," "Disciple of Christ," etc. and "Christian Church," "Church of Christ," etc.

Another, and a most gross *misrepresentation*: He represented us as making *baptism* the *cause* of spiritual life, or the *means* by which it is *obtained*; whereas we teach that it is only the means by which we come into the *enjoyment* of the spiritual life already obtained, and without the previous existence of which baptism is of no avail. When an individual *believes* on the Lord Jesus Christ with all his heart, he is *begotten* again by the gospel or word of God, through the influence of that *faith* upon him, which "comes by the word of God," and by which he *dies* to the love of sin, or it is destroyed, his *heart changed*, and he receives *spiritual life*, by the *operation* of the Holy Spirit upon him through means of the *word*, "the sword of the Spirit," by which the heart is circumcised, its enmity to God slain, and the



person "renewed in the spirit of his mind" and "made alive unto God;" and then, when he is *baptized*, he is "born of water and of the Spirit," and enters upon the *enjoyment* of this spiritual life. This embraces the process of conversion and regeneration—not as taught in the *human* creeds and systems of the day, but as taught in the BIBLE. We would not notice these misrepresentations, but because they are so common, old and stereotyped, and continue to be reiterated, after being refuted again and again—so dull or perverse are those who misrepresent us!

As we have exposed the misrepresentations of our preacher, we will give him credit for the *truths* he advanced, for he said several good things and uttered a good deal of truth. He represented the *baptism* of the Holy Spirit as consisting of the *miraculous* displays or effusion of the Spirit, which took place on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius on the occasion of the visit of Peter; that there had never been a case of this baptism on any other occasion; and that to *pray* for this baptism was wrong, absurd, and without any promise. We give this as the *substance* of his remarks on this subject. He was undoubtedly *right* here; as well as on the *baptism* of *fire*, which he represented as the *destruction* of *Jerusalem*. He also advanced several other important truths, to some of which we have already referred, as the word of God being the only medium of the *operation* of the Spirit and of *faith*. But he was guilty of a good deal of misquotation, or rather partial quotation of scripture—hardly ever quoting the *whole* of a passage, where the sentiment militated against his theory. I noticed that he several times "*dodged*" passages and parts of passages, on the *design* of *baptism*, where remission of sins was involved. Such is the course to which an *unscriptural* system leads a man, and drives him to pursue. What a superior advantage over such a man, has that one who has no sectarian system to sustain, nothing but the *Christian* system itself! untrammelled by the shackles of party, he is not afraid to declare "the *whole* counsel of God;" and boldly marches up to *every* truth of the Bible, as he has *all* in his favor and knows how to put the right construction upon them. How many an able and noble mind is paralyzed by sectarianism, and how much zeal badly expended, and effort thrown away and lost!

A HEARER.

Near Conyersville, Henry Co., Tenn., May, 1857.



PROFESSOR RICHARDSON'S NOTICE OF THE SENIOR  
EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

In the *Millennial Harbinger* for May, 1857, we find the following notice of ourself, from the pen of Professor Robert Richardson; to the *matter, manner and spirit* of which we respectfully invite the very serious attention of our brethren in the Lord.

FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY.—No. 4.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.—Paul to the Colossians.

"We have been endeavoring to show that the introduction of human philosophy into the pleadings of the present Reformation, is not to be disputed, at least on the score of improbability. The lessons of history; the tendencies of the mind itself; the facility with which men slide into speculation; and the insidiousness and latency of philosophical theories, all conspire to prove that there is no intrinsic improbability in such a supposition.

"As an illustration of some of these points, and a confirmation of our main position, we have now before us the case of brother Fanning, to which it seems especially proper for me to pay some attention, as he has been pleased to introduce my humble name into the *Gospel Advocate*, and I have no desire to be ungrateful. He places me with others who, in his opinion, manifest 'a settled policy to introduce *novelties* amongst the brethren.' I would be pleased if it were allowed me to return the compliment *in kind*, for I remember him who said: 'Every scribe who is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, is like a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things *new and old*.' The *oldest* things of Christianity are, indeed, in these days of apostacy, often the greatest '*novelties*.' But I do not blame Bro. Fanning for not discovering any of them, as I do not doubt that if it had pleased God to bestow upon him the gift of discovering new things, he would have employed it. Certainly, I am confident that his failure to present any thing of this nature to the brethren, has not proceeded from the fact, that he has long since *exhausted* the treasury of divine truth, or that there is no longer any thing *new* to be learned from the Holy Scriptures.

"I must, however, acknowledge my obligations to him for bringing of late, the subject of human philosophy so prominently before the brotherhood. And I would furthermore, take this occasion, also, to express my entire concurrence with him as to the unlawfulness of introducing human philosophy, of any kind, into religion. In this, I am happy to say, we are perfectly agreed. We certainly have no business with human philosophy in Christianity. We do not need it at all, and its introduction can only result, as it ever has done, in the perversion of truth and the hindrance of the gospel. Nevertheless, I have to regret that the ardor of Bro. Fanning's zeal against philosophy has hurried him into extremes, and that, probably for want of time to make himself acquainted with the *subject* and with the facts, he has allowed

himself to do great injustice both to philosophy itself and to certain individuals whom he supposes to be infected by it.

"He appears to think that philosophy of every kind has a direct tendency to infidelity, and under this impression, he very consistently wages war against it. He would proscribe totally, it seems, from schools and colleges, all works upon Philosophy 'both mental and moral.' I do not know whether or not he likewise anathematizes physical and chemical philosophy, but, however it may fare with physics, certain it is that he has no toleration for metaphysics of any sort, either in religion or psychology; in church or school; college or university. He says: 'There are striking contradictions in the professions of school directors. For instance, in all the schools amongst the disciples of Christ, the Bible is represented as the only foundation in morals; and still the directors have introduced the various philosophies *mental* and *moral*, of the times.\* The revelations of God and the philosophies of the world agree in no particular. Moreover no one can believe in the truth of miraculous revelation and of any system of professed wisdom originating with men. All metaphysical systems and moral philosophies are not only subversive of the truth of religion, but we declare our solemn conviction that no one who respects the Bible can believe in any system of philosophy in existence. Hence we think the schools generally, are well calculated to make infidels. It is well known that the universities and colleges of Germany, and, indeed, of Europe, have generally renounced the miraculous inspiration of the Bible, through the influence of the various systems of philosophy in use. Furthermore, we are inclined to believe, that the different systems of Natural Theology and moral philosophy are well calculated to overthrow the hope of Christians.' These are sweeping declarations, it must be confessed, which so unceremoniously denounce the best of men as infidels, because they believe that there are true systems of 'professed wisdom originating with men!' I do not think it necessary here to say any thing in confutation of such assertions, but would simply commend them to the attention of educators of youth, especially to the aforesaid 'school directors;' confident that, emanating as they do, from the President of Franklin College, and being as we have every reason to believe, his sincere convictions, they will receive all the consideration to which they are entitled.

"It is, however, entirely pertinent to the subject before us, that we should hear a few sentences from the analysis which President Fanning proposes to give us of the different systems of speculative philosophy which have existed in the world. These, with sufficient correctness, he resolves into two theories, and says: 'We state, with much confidence, that the two theories, viz: Knowledge from the external world, and knowledge from our supposed inward spiritual nature, in our judgment, comprehend all the professed philosophical systems of the world.'" In describing the two systems, he says in relation to the

\*These directors probably supposed, as I have known sensible people to do, that a 'foundation' was not so comfortable or commodious as the house that could be built upon it. It is hardly conceivable how a foundation could, in any case, be made to serve the purpose of a superstructure, or how a 'foundation in *morals*' could be made to answer for both foundation and superstructure in '*mental*' science.—R. R.

former: "Philosophers of almost every grade and religious theorists generally agree in maintaining the doctrine of deriving all knowledge of God and the things divine from the *external world*. This is called the *a posteriori* argument, or the argument from effect to cause, taking for granted that all men, unenlightened as well as the enlightened, would conclude that the world and all its parts are the results and not causes. This is the doctrine in all philosophical books; it is found in every Sunday School under the name of natural religion, and it is preached from Protestant pulpits generally. There are, we believe, a few individuals in the respective denominations who doubt its truth. Without any hesitation, we pronounce the doctrine of Natural Theology, in all its shapes and bearing *false, deceitful* and *subversive* of the Christian religion.'

It will be sufficient to place before the intelligent reader these extraordinary assertions and this *pronunciamento* against Natural Theology. He will be able to draw his own conclusion, and to recognize at once President Fanning's true position. We might, perhaps, merely 'suggest' that Natural Theology does not assert that *all* knowledge of God and things divine is derived from the external world; for this were to deny the truth of revelation and all other sources of knowledge. On the contrary, it admits the superiority of Revelation, 'which,' says one of the ablest writers on the subject, 'converts every inference of reason into certainty, and, above all, communicates the Divine Being's intentions respecting our lot, with a degree of precision which the inferences of Natural Theology very imperfectly possess.\* Natural Theology

\*Lord Brougham's Disc. of Natural Theology, p. 138. The same author, after referring to the arguments of atheists and sceptics against Natural Theology, says: "An objection of a very different nature has sometimes proceeded unexpectedly from—the friends of Revelation, who have been known, without due reflection, to contend that by the light of unassisted reason we can know absolutely nothing of God and a future state. They appear to be alarmed lest the progress of Natural Religion should prove dangerous to the acceptance of Revealed; lest the former should, as it were, be taken as a substitute for the latter. They argue as if the two systems were rivals and whatever credit the one gained was so much lost to the other. They seem to think that if any discovery of a First Cause and another world were made by natural reason, it would no longer be true that "life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel." Although these reasoners are neither the most famous advocates of revelation, nor the most enlightened, we yet do well to show the groundlessness of the alarms which they would create.

In the *first* place, it is worthy of our consideration that the greatest advocates of Natural Theology have always been sincere and even zealous Christians. The names of Ray, Clarke, Derham, Keill, and Paley attest the truth of this assertion. None of these were likely to lend his support to any system, the evidence of which put the outworks of Christianity in jeopardy. Some of them as Clarke and Paley have signalized themselves as strenuous and able defenders of the Truth of Revelation. \* \* \* \* \*

But *secondly*, Natural Theology is most serviceable to the support of Revelation. All the sundest arguments in behalf of the latter pre-suppose the former to be admitted. Witness the profound work of Butler, his "Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion to the order of Nature," the most argumentative and philosophical defence of Christianity ever submitted to the world. \* \* \* \* \*

"Boyle and Newton were as sincerely attached to Christianity as any men in any age, and they are likewise the most zealous advocates of Natural Religion. Lord Bacon regards the evidences of Revelation as founded upon the previous demonstrations of Natural Theology. "The latter," he says, "is the key to the former, and opens our understanding to the genuine spirit of the Scriptures, but also, unlocks our belief so that we may enter upon the serious contemplation of that divine power, the characters of which are so deeply graven in the works of the creation."

I enter, however, upon no defence of Natural Theology here, but merely quote these authorities and remark, that notwithstanding the concurrence of the master-minds of the world as to its value, and notwithstanding the fact that Brother Campbell himself is a teacher of Natural Theology in Bethany College, President Fanning has ventured "without any hesitation" to "pronounce the doctrine of Natural Theology in all its shapes and bearings, *false, deceitful* and *subversive* of the Christian religion!" Moreover, "the schools generally" are, in his opinion, well calculated to make infidels," "because they use such books as Upham's Mental Philosophy, Wayland's Moral Science, Paley's Natural Theology and Butler's Analogy!"

proposes to prove the being and attributes of God from the works of nature, in harmony with Paul's declaration, Rom. i: 19-20, 'That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.' But President Fanning boldly asserts that Natural Theology '*in all its aspects and bearings*' is 'false.' Now as Natural Theology teaches that man can learn the being and attributes of God from the works of nature, and President Fanning pronounces this 'false,' he, of course, according to the established principles of logic, maintains the contradictory to be true, viz., that *man is incapable of learning the being and attributes of God from the works of nature.* The reader will note this, as we shall have a use to make of it presently.

"We shall now hear him upon his other school of philosophy. 'The doctrine *a priori*, from cause to effect, or which says we possess in our constitution either the elements of all spiritual truth, or the natural power to *originate* knowledge, heavenly and divine, has been maintained in most of the speculative systems, from the Hindoo Vedas to modern spiritualism. \* \* It is somewhat remarkable that this doctrine prevails in all the schools and colleges of the land, or if there are exceptions, (save F. C.) we know not of them.\* They all use the books which advocate the *intuitive divine knowledge of feeling*, which is above the understanding. \* \* \* We regret most sincerely to notice a very strong tendency even amongst the disciples of Christ who profess to take the Bible alone as their standard, to adopt the doctrine of inward spiritual ability to grasp the truth, without help from God or man. We were much surprised in reading the August No. of the Millennial Harbinger, to notice an address by one W. J. Russell, of Mo., who, on graduating, delivered one of the most infidel productions we have seen. We had hoped to see a rebuke from Bro. Campbell, but none has reached us.'† I cannot pause here to notice

\*The intelligent and *well-educated* reader will, perhaps, be inclined to think it still *more* "remarkable" that F. C. should be the solitary exception. I confess I have no terms in which to express my appreciation of the extreme *modesty* manifested in this assertion concerning the tendencies of the colleges established by our brethren and of "the schools generally." If such be their tendency, it is certainly much to be deplored. The world, however, have the consolation of being informed by President F. that, since there is no *general* rule without an exception, so "Franklin College" is, in the present case, the fortunate exception which prevents the rule from being *universal*.—R. R.

†In another part of the same article, President F. again refers to Bro. Russell, as "our infidel young hero, of Missouri." These charges of infidelity, heresy, etc., which he has, of late, so boldly made against our colleges, our schools, and some of our preachers, have already been caught up eagerly by Baptist editors and enemies of our cause, in order that they may turn them to our disadvantage. Under these circumstances, it has seemed to be necessary for *some one* to repel these unjust accusations, and to define the position of the individual who presumes to make them, in order that the authority which attaches to them may be properly estimated.

The address to which Bro. F. refers was one of the usual College exercises of the students, who, being of course, without the advantages of age and experience, may well be expected to be somewhat deficient in their modes of expression and even in the matter of their addresses. It is, hence, usual for persons of education and of refined feelings who have public influence, to regard such efforts with a certain degree of leniency, and rather to encourage those thus entering upon the stage of active life, than to denounce them and their well-meant efforts with rudeness. The discourse in question was delivered before the Faculty of Bethany College and a large concourse, and was regarded as, upon the whole, so meritorious, that Bro. Campbell deemed it worthy of publication and of the following commendatory introduction: "The following address, delivered at our late commencement, on the 4th of July, by W. S. Russell, of Missouri, will be read, we doubt not, with much interest, by all our readers who have a taste for either the



the awkwardness and inaccuracy of this account of the other scheme of philosophy, which, as he elsewhere more correctly states, professes to derive 'knowledge from our inward spiritual nature.' All we wish to say, is this, that as President Fanning denies the truth of the basis on which this philosophy rests, viz: that 'knowledge can be derived from our inward spiritual nature,' he, of course, as in the other case, maintains the contradictory, to-wit, that *man is incapable of deriving knowledge from his inward spiritual nature.*

"And now, we wish to come to a fair understanding upon the whole premises, and to ascertain, in as few words as possible, how the matter really stands. President F. maintains, as we have shown, these propositions:

"1st. That man is incapable of learning the being and attributes of God from the works of nature.

"2nd. That he is incapable of deriving knowledge from his own inward spiritual nature.

"And now, gentle reader, what is all this but President Fanning's *own* philosophy; *his* adopted theory of human nature; *his* approved speculative view of man's powers and capacities? What are these propositions but the basis of a system of philosophy which is as well defined, and as clearly recognized as any of those against which President F. inveighs? According to this philosophy of man, he can receive no impressions except those from material things around him, so far as either his mental or bodily constitution is concerned, and he is consequently by nature a materialist, utterly incapable of deriving either from the external world or from his own soul, any conceptions of spirit or spiritual things. For these he is wholly dependent upon revelation, that is, upon words, divine communications addressed to the bodily senses, which are, in this system, regarded as the only avenues to the soul.

"But we are not left to gather President Fanning's belief in this

---

*real* or the *ideal* in Philosophy.' Notwithstanding all this, President Fanning has "hoped to see a rebuke from Bro. Campbell," and does not hesitate to characterize this address as "one of the most infidel productions" he has seen, and to denounce Bro. Russell, with whom he is entirely unacquainted, as an "infidel young hero." The least that we should expect from one making such a charge would be to show in what the infidelity consisted, and where it was to be found. But it is much easier to assert than to prove, and President F. does not attempt to sustain his allegation; for the few garbled phrases which he quotes, but does not understand, are nothing to the purpose. In fact, so far is there from being any just foundation for the charge, that the whole tenor and purpose of the address is *just the opposite*; it being directed against that infidelity which is the legitimate result of the sensualistic philosophy. It seems, however, never to have occurred to President F. that the phrases to which he objects, admit of a very different meaning from that which he is pleased to attach to them, and that it was entirely possible that the difficulty existed not so much in the address itself, as in want of ability to comprehend it.

So far as regards Bro. Russell himself, he has always been regarded as one of the most promising, pious and devoted young men in our ranks. He is beloved for his Christian deportment; his gentleness; his spiritual mindedness, and highly esteemed for his intelligence and his acquirements. He has been for some time engaged in the field as an evangelist, and is now laboring for a respectable Christian congregation, and yet the editor of the Gospel Advocate, because the style of a certain College address does not suit his fancy, does not hesitate to publish him to the world as an "infidel!" But Bro. R. needs no defence from me. I would only remark, that if President F. thinks himself justified in making such a public charge of infidelity against a highly esteemed Christian preacher, who is in good standing amongst the brethren, then we certainly think that his views of Christian courtesy and church discipline have need to be greatly reformed. Such instances as this, at least, can hardly be adduced to justify what some friends of the Advocate are quoted as saying of it, that it is "gentle and respectful towards those who differ from us," and that "it is an admirable feature in it that it detracts from no man that to which he is justly entitled."—G. A. vol. iii: p. 90.—R. R.



philosophy, merely from his opposition to other systems. It runs through most of his writings, and seems to govern all his religious views. Whether the subject be the 'Church of Christ,' or 'Preaching for a Salary,' or 'Metaphysical discussions,' it is all the same; like a heraldic lion, either *couchant* or rampant, we find this favorite scheme of human inability—this overruling idea ever present in his ecclesiastic *armorial*, tincturing all his views and sharpening his opposition to 'Philosophy,' under which head he embraces all speculations that are contrary to his own. Occasionally, we have such declarations as the following: 'The new-born babe knows just as much of God, heaven and eternity, philosophically, as Locke, Kant or Bacon ever knew from their' natural resources.'—Gos. Ad. v. ii: p. 356.—'Moral philosophy not only assumes the ground of natural ability in man to teach the character of his Author, but also professes to demonstrate the existence of God from external nature. Dr. Paley's stereotyped syllogism is familiar to every school child. It runs thus:

"1. Whatever exhibits marks of design has an intelligent Author,

"2. The world exhibits marks of design.

"3. Therefore, it has an intelligent Author.

"We are not disposed at present to offer an argument for or against this reasoning. We simply state that the fallacy is in the minor premiss, and we believe the conclusion is false."\*—Gos. Ad., vol. i. p. 357.

"At no time have the wisest manifested capability to originate a single moral idea or principle of government.—Id. vol. iii: p. 37. 'The political, philosophical and many religious systems of the world serve to convince the human race of the utter incapacity of man to *originate* any correct system of government or morals or even to imitate the models which God has given.'—Id. vol. ii: p. 354.

"It will be perfectly clear, then, to every reader who understands the *meaning* of the word philosophy, that President Fanning not only believes but advocates a system of philosophy which takes very decided ground as to man's capacities and powers. It is, in plain terms, the system of Locke, which teaches precisely the same things, and of which President F. himself gives the following account, which is sufficiently accurate for our purpose. 'There are,' says he, 'but two ideas in Locke's system of philosophy. He maintained that all of our knowledge comes through sensation and reflection. His notion was that the mind is a blank sheet upon which may be written impressions, according to external influences, and, moreover, that all of our information is from without. Secondly, he believed the mind capable, by

---

\*It is a little remarkable, (to adopt a little of President F's, peculiar style) that he should be so seldom "disposed to offer an argument," and that he should be so often "disposed" to avail himself of the well known trick of the sophist, and to present "bare statements," with a *promise* of "ample reasons" for his conclusions "at another time." The confounding together of Ethics and Natural Theology, and the other remarkable assertions in the above extract will surprise no one conversant with President F's facility in these respects. He believes, it seems, that the conclusion above, viz: "That the world has an intelligent Author" is "*false*." We hope the reader will not, from this, suppose him to be either an "Infidel" or an atheist, as it is to be presumed he means merely that the argument is invalid. We confess, we should have quite a curiosity to see his "argument either for or against this reasoning," though we entertain no doubt that it will, when forthcoming, be found to answer either purpose *equally* well.—R. R.

what he called *reflection*, to manufacture the material thus received through the senses, into correct thought and ideas; that form and consistency are given to whatever comes into the mind through the senses, and that beyond these sources, we can gain no knowledge.' The reader will see, at once, that these views of Locke and those of President Fanning perfectly coincide. Sensation furnishes all our ideas. Reflection merely compares them with each other. As God and spiritual things are not objects of sense, we can obtain no knowledge of them from our perceptions of nature. Neither can we from the workings of our own minds, since reflection is wholly occupied with the ideas furnished by perception, and is incapable of originating any. Man is thus left, in Locke's view, which is precisely that of Bro. Fanning, wholly dependent upon revelation for all his ideas of God and spiritual things.

In corroboration of the fact that Bro. Fanning is really a philosopher of the school of Locke, we may adduce his favorable expressions in regard to both Locke himself and his philosophy. He says: vol. xi: p. 4, 'It is a little singular, that while the most, if not all modern writers oppose Locke, they admit that his modes of thought and investigation are correct.' But the most extraordinary compliment which he pays to Locke, is found on page 3d, where he says: 'John Locke, the real author of the Baconian philosophy, and all correct thinking in England, since his day, was born in 1632.' To attribute the authorship of the Baconian philosophy to Locke would really almost appear like a sort of *posthumous* flattery, especially when it is remembered that the great Bacon died in 1626, some six years before Locke was born.\* But we would particularly advert to the second item of commendation, viz, that 'John Locke is the author of all correct thinking in England since his day.' Now the question arises, Is thinking a different affair in *America*, from what it is in England? Can thinking be carried on correctly in England upon one plan, and correctly in *America* upon a different one? I would not say how it might be among the *Chinese*, who live on the other side of the world, and whose *heads*, (and, of course, their *ideas* too, if these be material images as Locke supposed) are turned in the opposite direction from ours, and with whom it may be, for aught I know, very natural to reverse our order of things, (as they do, for instance, in their custom of putting *tails* to their *heads*; wearing *white* for mourning, and letting off their fire-works in the *day-time*, lest otherwise they should not be seen;) but I think I can answer for the *Americans*, who are of Anglo-Saxon lineage and speak the English language, that their thinking is pretty much the same as that which is performed in England. And now, if

---

\*Possibly President Fanning may have committed a *slight* error here in mistaking Metaphysics for Natural Philosophy, or one person for another. It is not very easy to conceive how Locke could be the master of Lord Bacon, owing to the *slight* difficulty of his not having been born until six years after Bacon's death as above intimated. But perhaps President F. meant *Voltaire*, who was really a pupil of Locke. Cousin, the eloquent and distinguished historian of Modern Philosophy, says of the meetings of Gassendi's pupils: "This was the foundation of that society of free-thinkers of the Temple from which Voltaire drew his first inspirations, before he had found in the conversations of Bolingbroke and in his voyage to England, Epicurean philosophy under a regular and scientific form. Locke was the true master of Voltaire."—Hist. of Modern Philosophy, vol. ii: p. 87.

John Locke is the author of all correct thinking† in England since his day, depend upon it, he is understood by President Fanning to be also the author of all correct thinking in *America* during the same interval. Surely, then, unless President F. thinks *incorrectly* or *not at all*, it must be admitted that John Locke is the author of *his* thinking, and that he is, however *unconscious* of it, a philosopher of the School of Locke, or, what is usually termed A SENSUALISTIC DOGMATIST.

"I have now done with this case, but I have by no means done with my subject, having made use of the case of Bro. Fanning because it afforded so striking a proof of the insidiousness and *latency* of human philosophy, and that it is entirely possible for an individual to be thoroughly imbued with it, without having the slightest suspicion of the influence by which he is directed. This is, with us, at present a very important point and we have selected the case of Bro. F. in illustration of it, not for its own merits, but because, while he has made himself so conspicuous as an opponent of philosophy, we regard him as an excellent representative of a considerable class who habitually inveigh against philosophy, yet are, *themselves*, all the while, in like manner, in a religious point of view, its victims. And this, because they look at revelation and religion through the medium of this philosophy, which thus, as it were, becomes a part of their religion, and exercises a most unhappy influence in regard to matters affecting the best interests of Christianity and the highest enjoyments of the Christian life. It arrests their progress in every thing except in the conceit of superior knowledge. They imagine themselves to have entered the most holy place, when they are, as yet, only in the vestibule of the Divine temple. They fancy themselves to be in possession of Christianity in all its fullness, when they have as yet, but laid hold of the skirt of its mantle, and they assume the position and authority of teachers when, like some in the apostle's days, they have need to be taught even 'the first principles of the oracles of God.' Among these, are not a few who bring a reproach upon the cause of the present Reformation, by their unbecoming love of controversy, and by the crude and erroneous exhibitions which they make of the real purposes of this religious movement, which was never designed to establish a new philosophical system of religion, but to put an end to controversy by a simple acquiescence in the plain teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

---

†President Fanning has here, either by accident or otherwise, fallen upon a very appropriate word to denote philosophy: *Thinking* is undoubtedly philosophy. One of the first thinkers of the age, says: "Philosophy is a necessity. Every man philosophizes as he thinks. The worth of his philosophy depends upon the value of his thinking." "If to philosophize be right," says Aristotle in his Exhortative, "we must philosophize to realize the right; if to philosophize be wrong, we must philosophize to manifest the wrong; on any alternative, therefore, philosophize we must." This being so, and Locke being, in President Fanning's estimation, the author of all correct thinking, it is not very obvious why, upon his own premises, he should exclude his philosophy from the course of instruction in Franklin College. What eminent men like Bacon and Locke (President F. will excuse me for placing Bacon *first*.) have *thought* about matter; about the laws of their own minds or human duties and relations, has been esteemed a very important study in a course of education in a *literary* point of view, however unnecessary it may be thought in a *religious* one. It must be admitted, after all, however, that to spare students, as much as possible, the labor of *thinking* will greatly facilitate their progress in the College curriculum, whatever may be the result as to the *development of the mind*. This labor will, no doubt, be greatly lessened by eschewing *Logic*, Mental and Moral Philosophy and any "books" that treat of either the theory or the practice of *thinking*.

"I have commented freely upon Bro. Fanning's writings and expressed opinions, because these are public property and justly amenable to examination. As he has, himself, been so liberal in charges *without proofs* against myself and others, he surely will have no reason to complain because I have advanced a single proposition in relation to himself, *with the proofs*. For himself, personally, I entertain all due respect and kind wishes, and, I trust, I know how to appreciate his zeal and long continued labors in behalf of the Bible as the only safe guide in religion. Here, I am with him heart and hand, as I am also with him in his avowed opposition to human philosophy in religion.

"I cannot, indeed, go with him so far as to say, as he does, 'that no one who respects the Bible can believe in any system of philosophy in existence.' I believe it to be entirely possible to be at the same time a philosopher, a metaphysician and a Christian. I believe that Locke 'respected the Bible,' and at the same time believed in his own system of philosophy. I think that Bro. Fanning 'respects the Bible,' though he believes that Locke's 'thinking' or philosophy, is the only correct one. Although I regard *human* Philosophy, when *blended with religion*, a hindrance and an incumbrance, I am of the opinion that there are some, even under such circumstances, who may be Christians *in spite of it*. The various religious parties of the day are founded, in a good degree, upon philosophical theories of religion, yet I presume it is universally admitted that God has a 'people' among them.

"It is when a system of philosophy is made the *basis* of religious thought; when the Scriptures must be interpreted so as to agree with it, and when the dogmas thus deduced are imposed upon men as the orthodox Christian faith, that it becomes the ground-work of sectarianism. In regard to this matter, the platform of the present Reformation cannot be improved upon; for it proposes that all shall approach the Scriptures without a preconceived theory, and accept its plainly expressed truths in humble trust; while at the same time, each one is at liberty to entertain what opinions he pleases, (and these include all matters of philosophy and expediency) with this proviso, that he hold them as *private property*, and that he does not attempt to *impose them upon others*. This is the only ground on which a Christian union can ever be effected. It is clearly, then, a departure from the principles of this religious movement for any one to adopt certain philosophical dogmas about human inability to do this or that, and then denounce everybody as an 'infidel' who will not receive them and interpret the Word of God in conformity to them.

"Nevertheless, since the philosophy of any thing is its *reason*, there is a philosophy in religion, else there would be no reason in it. But it is a *divine* and not a *human* philosophy. *It is Christ crucified that is God's philosophy*. It is the *gospel* that is God's *power* and *wisdom*. Hence it would be correct to say that Christianity contains the most glorious and sublime philosophy in the universe, since it is the *divine plan* or *system* of salvation, perfectly *adapted* to man through an *infallible knowledge of his nature, character and condition*. It is because it is thus absolutely perfect in *its own* philosophy, that any addi-



tion of *human* philosophy spoils it. Christ must be our '*wisdom*' as he is 'our righteousness, our sanctification and our redemption.' But his precious teachings—this '*wisdom* which cometh from above,' can hardly touch poor erring humanity without contamination. Thus the pure rain of heaven when it falls plenteously upon the earth, produces *muddy* streams, and becomes unfit to drink. This is when it is received merely upon the *surface*, just as it is the vain and *superficial* who corrupt the gospel. But as the rain received by the '*good soil*' sinks into its depths, and not only renders it fruitful, but re-appears in the bright and sparkling waters of the fountain; so the divine truth received by the '*honest and good heart*,' will become abundantly productive, and flow out again in streams of '*living water*,' to refresh earth's wayworn pilgrims.

"We trust our brethren will carefully examine themselves in relation to this important subject, and, without waiting (as Bro. Fanning proposes to do) to 'hear from Bro. Campbell,' or from any other man, however distinguished, that they will carefully read their Bibles, and give ear to the admonition of the inspired Apostle 'Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ.'"

R. R.

#### REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERT RICHARDSON.

COURTEOUS READER,—In the forty and seven years of our pilgrimage, and particularly, in the twenty-eight we have labored in the Lord's vineyard, our journey has been rather pleasant than otherwise. Thankful to Heaven are we that much of the time we have been able to look on the bright side of human nature, when frequently there was no small amount to discourage us. Not only have we been successful in the cultivation of kindly sentiments towards our fellow beings, but we have even been scrupulous to entertain a fair degree of self-respect, without the least envy towards any living mortal. True, we have not, like Paul, been "in prisons," "received from the Jews five times forty stripes save one;" neither have we been "beaten with rods," "suffered shipwreck," been "a night and a day in the deep," or "fought with wild beasts at Ephesus" or elsewhere, but we have endured what is much worse—we have on several occasions been forced to taste a bitter cup from the hands of those who called us "Brother." In our 19th year we enlisted as a corporal in the cause of One who "has gone to prepare a place" for his friends; so soon as we were able to bear the King's weapons, we threw His banner to the breeze for a life voyage, and we have not yet taken down our sails or put off the armor. We now hope not for peace, or even an armistice. When



we consult the flesh, our Master's enemies oft whisper in honeyed strains, "compromise," "compromise," but our Captain says, "Onward," there is no time for trifling,—“fight the good fight of faith, take the kingdom by violence, and lay hold on eternal life.” In our well-intended struggles for the cause we plead, we have necessarily been forced into severe conflicts with some of our brethren of earth; but while sin abounds, we can hope not for rest. Our *inclinations*, and especially our desire to merit the favorable opinions of men, oft urge us to abandon the field, and sincere friends whisper in our ear, “You will appear to love debates and strifes;” but we endeavor to heed them not, and pray God for strength to more skillfully wield the spiritual weapons furnished us. We hope by the favor of our King still to stand for the defence of the Heavenly Oracles “as they are written.”

In reference to the notice Prof. Richardson has seen proper to take of us personally, and our teaching generally, we at present will utter but a single thought. Such a mode of warfare we were not anticipating, and his essay is certainly not well calculated to promote Christian sympathy.

Should it become necessary to examine into our *imbecility* or *madness*, we would respectfully suggest that there are tribunals of the country for the purpose, but we really cannot account for Prof. Richardson's course.

We beg permission to apply in the present case a noble sentiment, expressed by Brother A. Campbell, when standing at the noon-tide of his greatness in the midst of the scribes and elders of Boston. Said he, with a manliness peculiar to himself, “If I cannot overpower my enemy in all his strength, I will not meet him at all.” Our feelings are those of regret, but we are determined to treat Prof. Richardson with respect, unless we should be satisfied that he has abandoned, in fact, the cause of the Savior. Though, at the outset, we suggest in the kindest terms, that Brother Richardson cannot long occupy his present position. He must retrace his steps, or go overboard with all who have fancied the impulses of humanity to be inspirations of the Almighty. We will endeavor to examine the main points of his notice in their proper order; and if we really differ essentially in our teaching, the fact should be known.

We are unwilling, however, that the discussion should terminate as did the one with Brother Milligan. The issues should be clear and distinct, and we *ought* to be required to sustain our ground or abandon it openly, and admit it indefensible.

It will be remembered that Brother Milligan, no doubt in great sincerity, took the ground, that "*We as a church can do but little for the salvation of the world.*" "*I ask,*" he said, "*no better proof of such an evangelical organization (as a Missionary Society) as that for which we plead, than the creation of so many religious and semi-religious associations, for the accomplishment of certain specific ends. They (human institutions,) are the creatures of necessity, the offspring of pious hearts, whose benevolence must and will flow, and for which the church, as it is now organized, furnishes no corresponding medium.*"

Our reply was to the effect, that the church of Christ is sufficient for all Christian labor, and many of the brethren we are happy to learn, solely on the ground that we had the truth on our side, gave a most hearty approval of our teaching; and in a short time after, Brother Milligan, in an address, without admitting his error, took our side of the question, and failed to publish our last reply. We refer to this in no feeling of triumph. From an interview with Brother Milligan, at Bethany, a short time since, we are pleased to say, that he impressed us with the idea that he is a devoted student and a pious man; but he has not managed the discussion with us in a way to do justice to the cause we both profess to believe.

But to the labor before us.

1st. Brother Richardson attempts in the first place to show, that "It has not pleased God to bestow upon us the gift of discovering new things." There is much expressed in his words, and no doubt much more is meant. The purpose is to satisfy the readers of the Harbinger, that we are not competent to see that "*the oldest things of Christianity are, indeed, in these days of apostacy, often the greatest novelties.*" But fortunately he blames us not for our failure.

We need scarcely say to Brother R. that we never made very high pretensions in any department; and when we lack knowledge we are not ashamed to seek it. Yet we are satisfied to do the best we can with our limited means, and we assure all whom it may concern, that we believe we would sincerely rejoice if we *knew* that all our teachers were more talented and more learned than ourself. We would delight to sit at their feet and take lessons of wisdom from their lips. Even in our weakness we will face men in all their strength, or admit our incapacity to do so.

As much that Brother R. says is of a personal character, it will be somewhat difficult to avoid retaliation, but we will be as respectful as the circumstances will allow.

2d. Prof. Richardson thinks that our "zeal against philosophy has hurried us into extremes, and for want of *time* to make ourself acquainted with the *subject* and the facts, we have allowed ourself to do great injustice to philosophy and individuals."

It is charitable to attribute our profound want of knowledge on the "*subject*" to our *youth*. We would really be gratified to learn the age at which it is possible for one of ordinary ability, to arrive at correct knowledge on the subject of human philosophy?

3d. Prof. Richardson says, we, "It seems, would proscribe totally from schools and colleges all works on philosophy, both mental and moral," and that he does not "know whether or not welikewise anathe-matize physical and chemical philosophy."

We respectfully reply that regarding metaphysical works in schools and colleges, we consider them well calculated to encourage skepticism and make infidels, unless teachers should be careful to show their true place in a course of education. Witness their ruinous effects in the German Universities. With the view of furnishing the students of Franklin College all the aid in *mental discipline* that speculative philosophy can afford, we give the subject in our classes unusual attention.

We have used the history of philosophy by Morell, Cousin, and Tennemann, a history translated from the French by C.S. Henry, and we are now using Schwegeler's History. In regard to speculations, we have used Cousin's psychology, Upham's philosophy, Reid's and the work of Sir William Hamilton. In what is denominated moral science, we have employed the works of Paley, Wayland, Butler, Sydney Smith, Whewell, Alexander, Stewart and others. Our chief purpose in employing such books has been to give our students a knowledge of the speculations of men of renown. This we consider gratuitous, but if Prof. R. or others are honestly mistaken in regard to our course, it will afford us pleasure to give the means of correction.

As to his enquiry, "If we anathe-matize physical and chemical philosophy" in our college, we have only to say, that those who know us best, flatter us that no institution West has done more than Franklin College in Chemistry, Natural science and Natural philosophy. We have seen but one institution with a better cabinet for the purposes, and in our laboratory we have the best means for investigation. True, we *read* no prosy borrowed lectures to our students, but we *work* with them in circumstances favorable for improvement. How Bro. Richardson may regard the morality of such an insinuation we cannot imagine.

4th. In the fourth place, Professor Richardson attempts a criticism upon our words, "In the schools amongst the disciples of Christ, the Bible is represented as the only foundation in morals." He says, "Sensible people suppose that a foundation is not so comfortable as the house," and he thinks it "hardly conceivable how a foundation in morals could be made to answer for both foundation and superstructure in 'mental' science."

We answer Brother Richardson, respectfully, by saying, that our words convey the idea, that the brethren receive the Bible in the sense of a system, which is a foundation or rule of morality; and yet some seem disposed to substitute for the Bible, systems of human wisdom. We think the language is as sound as the declaration of Holy Writ, "Built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

The Apostles were in some sense, at least, a part of both the foundation and the superstructure.

5. It strikes us as very singular that while in one part of his notice Bro. R. seems to agree with us, that "we have no business with human philosophy in Christianity," and yet, in other places he certainly advocates the claims of Natural Theology.

He makes, on this subject, three points, viz: 1st. "Natural Theology does not assert that all knowledge of God and things divine is derived from the external world." 2d. "Natural Theology teaches that men can learn the being and attributes of God from of works of nature;" and, 3d. "NOTWITHSTANDING THAT BRO. CAMPBELL HIMSELF IS A TEACHER OF NATURAL THEOLOGY IN BETHANY COLLEGE, PRES. FANNING HAS VENTURED TO PRONOUNCE IT FALSE."

The first point can be decided alone by history. Bro. R. quotes authority which asserts, in our judgment, the opposite of what he wishes to establish. To prove that Natural Theology does not assert that *all* knowledge of God is derived from nature, he quotes, for instance, the words, "Lord Bacon regards the evidences of revelation as founded upon the previous demonstrations of Natural Theology." We state again, that Natural Theology assumes that every thing divine is revealed in nature, and there is of course nothing for the Bible to reveal. Two or three authorities will answer our purpose. Paley says, "Natural law, or Moral philosophy, is that science which teaches men their duty and the reasons for it." Chalmers says, "*The school of Natural religion is founded on the competency of the human mind to know God by the exercise of its own faculties, to clothe him in the attributes of its own demonstration—to serve*

him by a worship and a law of its own discovery," and emphasises "the audacity of these presumptions." We are, indeed, surprised that Bro. R. seems not to admit the high pretensions of Natural Theology.

But he says, in the second place, that "Natural Theology teaches that man can learn the being and attributes of God from the works of nature." Bro R.'s position is, that we can learn the being and attributes of God from nature, but we cannot thus learn "*all*." Should Brother R. show *any thing divine*, from whatever source, we think we will be able to prove it is precisely what natural religion attempts to teach.

Brother Richardson quotes Rom. i, 19, 20, to prove that nature reveals the being and perfections of God; but while we admit that it is almost certain the King's revisers understood as he does, we declare, after what we consider a sufficient examination, that the Apostle had not the most distant reference to revelations of nature. If nature was *then* revealing things which had been "invisible from the creation," we would be glad to know why she could not have revealed them at the beginning? This was not the point before Paul's mind. He said, "That which may be known of God is manifest in them," (in men,) for God hath showed it unto them—(not nature.) Being understood by the things that are made—(*done or shown by Christ*. Examine the Greek Text.) On the same subject he speaks again, ch. xvi, 25, "Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." This is our exposition.

But we are scarcely prepared for the third point made by Brother R., viz: "*Notwithstanding that Brother Campbell himself is a teacher of Natural Theology in Bethany College, Pres. F. has ventured to pronounce it false.*"

This is, indeed, news to us. We had feared that some of the Professors at Bethany were giving themselves to Natural Theology, but in regard to Brother Campbell, we sincerely hope that Professor Richardson is mistaken. If he is not, Brother Campbell has abandoned his former ground. Think of it, brethren, Brother A. Campbell, who above all men living deserves the gratitude of the Christian world for his defence of "Revealed Religion" in opposition to the Natural Theology, of the prince of atheists, Robert Owen, we are told is



now a teacher of Natural Theology in one of our Colleges. We cannot, and will not believe it. We visited Bethany, in February, mainly to ascertain the standpoint of Brother Campbell on this question, and if he is for the speculative theology, indications of which we have been noticing, we are mistaken.

Furthermore, we give it as our candid judgment, that in the day, yea, the very hour, that Brother Alexander Campbell admits himself a believer in the truth of any system of Natural Theology, his god-like strength will go from him as irrevocably as did Samson's, when shorn of his locks by the insidious Delilah, and he will become a child. God forbid such a calamity. Shall "The Philistines take our greatest and best man? bind him with fetters of brass? put out his eyes, and make him grind in the prison-house of Natural Theology !!! This, too, after accomplishing a greater work than any man alive? It is too bad to think of it. We have but little in the goods of the world, and less of its honors, and we say, in the sincerity of our soul, that we would greatly prefer becoming a beggar in the street, than to be satisfied that Alexander Campbell is teaching Natural Theology.

But be this as it may, Prof. R. asserts it, and says, "President Fanning" has "ventured without any hesitation"—notice reader, the word "*ventured*"—"to pronounce it false." Has it come to this? Ponder this matter, believers in Jesus through the words of the Apostles. This is a mournful picture.

6th. Prof. Richardson fully sustains Mr. Russell, whose teaching we pronounced infidel—speaks of our "*rudeness*"—says we do not "understand" Mr. Russell, etc. We understand Plato, for he meant what he said, and Mr. Russell calls his "Platonic ideas." We also understand the expressions "*universal and necessary truths*," "Inspirations from the infinite mind;" "Spirit, either our own or that of God, acting within us, being the *cause of the effect which we call intelligence*," when employed by Strauss, Theodore Parker, F. W. Newman, Judge Edmonds or Andrew Jackson Davis, and we suspect he uses them in the sense of his masters. Time will tell.

Prof. R. is, to be sure, somewhat inclined to apologize for Mr. Russell's "address" on the ground that it was one of "the usual college exercises, of a student without the advantage of age," and tells us, "*It is usual for persons of education and refined feelings to regard such efforts with leniency.*" We reply by stating, that all men acquainted with colleges *know* that students are not responsible for their graduating speeches. It is understood the world over, that the addresses are put

forth under the supervision and direction of the Faculty, and are supposed to be the result of their teaching. Who doubts that Mr. R.'s speech was the embodiment of his instruction? Brother Campbell understood it to be such, or he would never have commended it. Yet, he says he never saw or heard it. But we promise our Heavenly Father and our brethren, that if we should find ourself mistaken as to Mr. Russell's teaching, to do all in our power to repair the injury.

Bro. R. says some of our "charges have been caught up eagerly by Baptist editors and enemies of our cause;" "under these circumstances" he feels it his duty "to repel these unjust accusations," etc. When Alexander Campbell marked "*Apostate*" upon J. B. Ferguson, many said, This is putting a weapon into the hands of the enemy. We rejoice to know that the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians of Nashville, did most nobly denounce the infidelity of this unfortunate man, without casting the least odium upon the brethren who adhered to the truth. We will trust them still in preference to any speculators living. This is a question of religious *life* and *death*, and we cannot be too prompt in meeting the insidious monster. It was not "*rudeness*" in Christ, or the Apostles, or in any believer since their day, to rebuke the sin of substituting new gospels for the old.

7th. Prof. R. is more than welcome to the amusement he affords himself by placing us in the ridiculous attitude of making John Locke Lord Bacon's teacher, notwithstanding Bacon had been dead six years when Locke first saw the light. All we said we still believe. Prof. R.'s idea was not in our mind when we wrote.

Notwithstanding Lord Bacon was regarded as the author of the Inductive mode of examining truth, owing to his doubtful moral character, at his death his views were little known. Indeed, the world knew but little about them till Locke adopted his principles in his Essay on the Human Understanding. Hence Locke was, in the sense we intended, the author of this system. Alexander Campbell is, to all intents and purposes, the author of a valuable reformation, but B. W. Stone and others advocated the identical principles, and we believed and adopted them before we knew that such a man lived.

8th. Prof. R. has finally, he thinks, ferreted out our whereabouts, and affirms that he has furnished the "proof." He says, "In plain terms," ours "is the system of Locke," and we are "what is usually termed a SENSUALISTIC DOGMATIST." He also quotes from the infidel Cousin to prove that Voltaire was Locke's pupil, and strongly hints, that all men who depend for their faith upon their understanding and

belief of the Bible, must be what? "MATERIALISTS and SENSUALISTIC DOGMATISTS." We wish, however, to intimate to Brother R. that our investigations lead us to call the different theories of men in regard to God, the origin and destiny of all things, as so many systems of philosophy, but John Locke denied all theories and speculations, and therefore was, strictly speaking, no philosopher.

Brother R.'s statement that we are "*by nature a materialist*," we trust we can appreciate.

9th. Finally, Bro. Richardson makes the issue in plain terms, and we have but to repeat it. He says that in our view, 1. "*Man is incapable of learning the being and attributes of God from the works of nature.*"

2d. "*He is incapable of deriving knowledge from his own spiritual nature.*"

This he calls our "*philosophy*." We confess it has always tried us, when we preached, that "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved," to hear seemingly discriminating men say, "Oh, that is just your opinion!" But it is much worse for Professor Richardson to attempt to make it appear that our belief through the word is our system of philosophy. This is not the worst feature in "the case." He attempts to account for all of our church delinquencies from the same cause. He has written four essays under the caption, "*Faith vs. Philosophy*," and we doubt if any man can find a single philosophical system which he opposes. We are fearful that his is a "*studied policy*" perhaps to introduce "*novelties*" and a system of pretended knowledge that makes shipwreck of the word of God and the understanding of man. We may see before we are "*done with the case.*"

To return. He says, "According to this, (our teaching) man is incapable, either from the external world, or from his own soul, to receive any conception of spirit or spiritual things. For these he is wholly dependent upon revelation, that is upon words, divine communications addressed to the bodily senses, which are in this system regarded the only avenues to the soul."

This, gentle reader, "is the head and front of our offending—no more;" and for such a belief we are denominated a "sensualistic dogmatist," and "*by nature a materialist*," by a Professor in Bethany College. We think it in place to make a remark about schools. God knows we speak the sentiment of our heart when we say, that there is no man living whom we so highly regard for his work as Alexander Campbell, and there is not a school in existence possessing so many claims upon

the brethren as Bethany College. We are sorry that Bro. Richardson dragged up the subject of schools. We believe, it is true, that there are other institutions of high merit, but the claims of Bethany are still the highest.

It was our love to the cause, connected with Bethany College, that induced us to "*venture*" to call attention to certain wild sounds which fell upon our ear, whose meaning we happened to know perfectly well. We are not vain! we are not puffed up or mad; but we understand *modern spiritualism*, whether it reach us under a philosophical semblance or through ghost rappings. It is instant death, even to hold a parley with it.

Bro. Richardson admits in fact that our sin consists in maintaining that "*the world by wisdom knew not God,*" and that all of our knowledge of things invisible comes from God in the form of revelations. In other words, that "*Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*" Here then we rest, and God forbid that we should ever swerve from our position or falter in avowing it.

Bro. Richardson takes the opposite, or he has done us great injustice by his vehement attack upon us.

The whole tenor of his notice is in deadly hostility to our teaching, and yet it is a little singular that he seems slow to take his positive ground.

That Brother Richardson opposes this teaching, and the principles upon which we have long stood as a people, will appear upon the slightest examination.

1st. His opposition to us, notwithstanding he seems to be with us, is demonstrable that he looks for spiritual light from other sources than the Bible.

2d. He endeavors to prove, that "the being and attributes of God may be learned from the works of nature." Page 268 of Harbinger.

3d. He fully advocates direct spiritual knowledge without the intervention of such forms as are in the Bible. As proof on this point we quote a few passages from his writings.

He says, there are certain persons who "glory in the letter; they rejoice in its facts; they boast in its evidences, but they regard it as a system terminating in the ordinary understanding; every thing in religion must be brought within the scope of the understanding upon which it is supposed to act by means of the reasonings and motives which it presents. They ignore the spiritual in man." "The understanding," he says, "can never rise to spiritual reality, till

it goes beyond and above the outward forms." "It is the spirit alone that can perceive the truth." "All attempts then to reduce spiritual truths to the forms of the understanding, must be futile and derogatory to the Divine word which addresses itself to our higher spiritual nature—to ourself-consciousness, as the only auditor of its communications." *Millennial Har.* 1856, p. 505. If the understanding can be trusted at all, we can no longer hesitate as to Brother Richardson's true position. We may be told, again, that we cannot comprehend these things. German Neologists a few years ago maintained that English and American intellects were not sufficient for this *transcendentalism*. Now he that runs may read. The country is full of it. It is heard in every steamboat and railroad car throughout the country. A single quotation we beg leave to make from our quondam friend, J. B. Ferguson, written when he and his friends thought the brethren too "sensual" and "materialistic" to understand him. "These"—communications in words—he says, "*are gross conceptions, but they are such as human nature clings to till it can rise above the outward and perishing to the spiritual and eternal.*"

Brother Richardson also says, "The understanding can never rise to spiritual reality, till it goes beyond and above the outward forms."

If we are not mad, these extracts fully set forth the same system. Our purpose at present is not to discuss the merits of the system, but to show what it is. Brother R. and we differ as far as it is possible for men to differ. But we suggest, that inasmuch as one may be in ruinous error without knowing it, we will try and persuade ourself it is possible—though it cannot be probable—that one may go even all the distance we have indicated, and not be fully aware of it. Of one thing we are certain, should not Brother Richardson and those who are with him, speedily retrace their steps, and re-occupy the foundation on which we have battled so long, we cannot anticipate a continuance of Christian harmony.

TOLBERT FANNING.



## FRANKLIN COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT.

THE commencement exercises of Franklin College will take place in the College chapel, on the forenoon of Thursday July 2, 1857, and the public exercises of Mrs. Fanning's school will take place in the afternoon of the same day. The friends of the schools are particularly invited to be present.

W. LIPSCOMB, *Sec'y.*

---

## CHANGES CONTEMPLATED IN FRANKLIN COLLEGE.

THE President of Franklin College, confidently believing that the prosperity of the institution depends very much upon relieving himself from so weighty responsibilities, contemplates very important changes in a reorganization of the Board of Trustees and Faculty, as well as the general management of the school, by the opening of the session in September. There is no situation in the west combining more school advantages, and with prudent management the college will continue to prosper. It has been in existence thirteen years and its number of pupils has ranged from 65 to 140, and this number might be more than doubled by slight exertion. The effort will be made. The friends will not be approached for their money, but to interest them in a noble enterprise. Details may be expected as soon as practicable. From the anxiety also manifested by brethren and friends in different sections of the country, possibly efforts will soon be made to establish a much larger Female School than at present amongst us in the State or South-west.

W. LIPSCOMB, *Sec'y.*

---

THE PERFECT PATTERN.—Once, in all human history, we meet a being who never did an injury, and never resented one done to him, never uttered an untruth, never practiced a deception, and never lost an opportunity of doing good; generous in the midst of the selfish, upright in the midst of the dishonest, pure in the midst of the sensual, and wise far above the wisest of sages and prophets, loving and gentle, yet immovably resolute; his illimitable meekness and patience never once forsook him in a vexatious, ungrateful, and cruel world.—*Christ in History.*

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, JULY, 1857.

NO. 7.

---

## NATURAL THEOLOGY.

OUR readers will please remember that Prof. R. Richardson says, "Notwithstanding that Bro. Campbell is himself a teacher of Natural Theology in Bethany College, President Fanning has ventured to pronounce it false;" and they will also remember that we expressed our doubts as to the authority of the statement, Bro. Campbell has fully vindicated himself in the June No. of the Harbinger. We are much gratified to give this essay in our pages.

T. F.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

## NATURAL RELIGION FALSELY SO CALLED.

'THE religion of the Greeks and Romans, so far as it existed in a definite and consistent form—that is, as it was conceived by enlightened and thinking men among them—was wholly drawn from their philosophical tenets; or more properly speaking, it was identical with those tenets.' So writes the professor of 'Natural Religion' and moral philosophy, and civil polity in Harvard College, Boston, Ed. 1855, Francis Brown, A. M.

It was, therefore, properly defined by Paul—'an empty and a deceitful philosophy.' And was it not *empty*, because void of palpable facts, and documents, of real arguments and motives? And was it not *vain*, because ostentatious, fruitless, and worthless?

And pray what is *Natural Religion*; or what is *Nature* and what is *Religion*? There is an *aim* or *attitude*, not a reality, of antagonism in the association of these words. For what affinity exists between

*Nature* and *Religion*? Is not *Nature* the course of things? And is not religion *supernatural*? Can there be a *natural supernatural*?—What means the first syllable *re*? Does it not usually indicate *again*, as in *return*, *repeat*, *reflect*, *reabsorb*, *reaccess*, etc., etc.? In these and every one of these is found the idea of reiteration, repetition, or of performing the same act a second or a third time. At least a second time.

Religion is, in fact, derived from *religo*, to tie hard, to bind fast, indicative of an antecedent rupture or breach. Now as there has not been breach or disseverance in *Nature* from its creation, there could not in fact, in the primary import of the term, be any such idea or existence as *natural* religion. There is nothing in the course of things, or *nature*, indicative of what is properly called *religion*.

Θρησκεία *Threeskeia* occurs but four times in the Christian Scriptures, and is once translated *worshipping*, and three times *religion*, in the common version. The cases found are Acts xxvi: 5, Col. ii: 18, Jas. i: 26-27. But in not one of these is reference had to what we popularly call the *Christian religion*. We have in the common version, also, the word *Ioudaismos* occurring twice, translated '*Jews religion*,' but properly rendered, it should be translated or transferred, *Judaism*.

We have, then, this now so common word in the New Testament, canonized in sacred desks, schools, and colleges, only four times—once translated *worshipping* and three times religion.

But we should add that we have a more beautiful and a more apposite word than either *Threeskeia* or *Ioudaismos*, which should be more popular than it is, and that is *εὐσεβεία*—*eusebeia*, translated com. ver. fourteen times, *godliness*, and once holiness. Acts iii: 12. Of this same family, in the Christian Scriptures, we have the verb *εὐσεβέω* only twice. It is, in com. ver., represented by *worship* and *to show pity*. We have the adjective four times rendered, thrice *devout*, and once *godly*. Also the adverb *εὐσεβώς* is found twice, rendered *godly*. This is the whole family and currency of these important terms found in the Christian Scriptures.

From Papal Rome we got the word *religion*, as a sort of general representative. Neither Luther nor Calvin ever noticed it, as they did not a few other terms and phrases. They canonized them, or their followers did; and we unscrupulously adhere to them and fight for them.

Pagandom, Papaldom, and Protestantdom have equally canonized them; except that we *swear* a witness, or compel a witness to swear

—whereas the Romans ‘gave him religion’ and he took it—that is, in our style, ‘qualified him,’ or made him swear by God to tell the truth, etc., etc.

In this tortuous course, men invented ‘*Natural Religion*’ after God gave us a ‘*supernatural religion*.’ This is now the popular style. But the grave question is,—Does *Nature*—Dame Nature originate, teach, suggest, or establish any religion? Nature is defined by our wise men—‘*The established course of things*’—the constitution of things. And Alexander Pope taught our fathers

“To look through Nature up to Nature’s God.”

This canonized deism or theism is of the same school with Natural or Physical religion. But it has been consecrated by all the pulpits in the land—as much as has been and yet is, the Pagan ‘*Sunday*.’

The Jews had a ‘*Sabbath*,’ the Pagans and Romanists have long had a *Sunday*; and we have got many of their descendants in Rome, Paris, Dort, Amsterdam, London, Westminster, Edinburgh, Boston, New York, and New Orleans. Even our colleges in America have got *Natural religion* canonized, that is a *natural supernatural religion*!

Be not startled, gentle reader, while we affirm that there is, *in fact*, solid, solemn, substantive fact, no such thing as *Natural Religion*. Yet we teach something so called in Bethany, as in every other college in the civilized world!!! But we teach Paley’s Evidences of Natural and revealed religion, after Butler’s Analogy has been carefully read, and after these are digested, as we teach matters of general literature and science, the *external* and the *internal* evidences of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations of a mediatorial system.

As the Greek and Roman Pantheons are taught in schools and colleges to facilitate the acquisition of Greek and Roman Literature and Science, so teach we Butler’s Analogy and Paley’s Evidences. But as our strong tower, our rock of refuge from these plagiarisms and human traditions, we teach daily in our chair the three Bibles;—the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. These by the old Scribes and Printers, and even by the Bagsters of London, are called *the Bible and Testament*!

There is a Papal spell, or a Grecian Patriarchal spell, incubus like, brooding on the brains of many a Periwig doctor of the style and livery of the Addisonian age. To these we would prescribe a vegetable diet and much open air exercise.

But from this episode to return, we make this bold statement, that there is no *religion*, natural or revealed religion, in either heaven or

Hadees. There is no need of any religion in heaven. There is nothing to pray for, nothing to ask, nothing to reconcile, nothing to sacrifice, nothing within or without its inmates to improve or aggrandize. There is no religion in hell. There is no dispensation remedial or propitiatory in heaven. There is worship, praise, or adoration, there is fulness of joy, and there are everlasting pleasures.

We substitute for what is called natural religion, the harmonies of the universe, the concurrent vouchers of creation, Providence, and moral government, as displayed within the area of human knowledges of every sphere accessible to the eye of reason or to the ear of faith, as in eternal harmony with the Remedial economy called Christianity.

A. C.

## PROFESSOR R. RICHARDSON'S SECOND NOTICE OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

WITH increased anxiety, we invite the attention of the brethren to the *matter, manner and spirit* of Doctor Richardson's remarks in the June number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, under the head of

### FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY.—No. 5.

"BEWARE lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—Paul to the Colossians.

We have just had before us a notable illustration of the latency and insidiousness of the sensualistic philosophy. We have seen how deeply imbued with it an individual may be without being at all conscious of it, and while he is loudly declaiming against all philosophy. And if such may be the case with one who is of some reputation for education and intelligence, how much reason there is to fear that the genius of Locke holds its secret councils in the hearts of multitudes who are still less capable of detecting its presence! In the further prosecution of our subject, and that we may render some aid to such of those referred to, as may be disposed to undertake the important task of candid self-examination, we shall now briefly indicate some of the natural results and tendencies of the philosophy in question.

One of its most striking features is, that it constantly seeks to resolve everything into sensation, or into mere words. It is, hence, naturally and directly antagonistic to everything spiritual in religion, so that one cannot so much as say with an apostle, that 'the things of the spirit are spiritually discerned,' without being at once charged by those of this school with teaching 'strange things.' But I am not at all surprised at this, for it is the nature of this sort of philosophy to indispose and unfit men's minds to receive anything that is not merely outward and formal, and to estrange them from all inquiries and ex-



periences which have regard to the 'hidden man of the heart.' In these respects, its influence is the same in all, and this becomes more and more manifest in proportion as the mind becomes imbued with it. It gradually dries up the fountains of spiritual sympathy, and creates in the heart a species of impiety towards the spiritual and invisible which doubts its presence and denies its power, and thus substitutes, in religion, an interested obedience to things external, for the confiding heart-trust of unselfish love—an experience which is merely sensible and exterior, for the self-consciousness of the soul and the earnest of the Spirit.

These individuals must have taken up strange views of reformation in general, and of the present 'Reformation' in particular, to suppose that one extreme is remedied by another, and that a mere nominalism is to be administered to religious society, in order to cure it of enthusiasm. They have yet to learn that extremes *meet*, like east and west or day and night, and that the metal *cooled* amidst the frost of an Arctic winter will 'burn' as readily as that which is heated in a furnace. They have been mightily annoyed and scandalized at the modern 'Spiritualism' of one Ferguson and his co-adjustors! It is right they should feel thus, for a grosser delusion or a more unhappy apostacy from truth, reason, and scripture, has rarely been witnessed. But let me ask them to define the practical importance of the distinction between disquieting the spirits of the departed, to bring them up, by incantations, 'knocks,' or other modes of suasion, moral or immoral, in order that they may deliver oracles which may serve as *addenda*, *corrigenda*, or substitutes for the Bible, and the delivering oneself up to the sensualistic philosophy in religion—to the guidance of the *spirit* of JOHN LOCKE, evoked, not from the tomb, but from the 'Essay on the Human Understanding.' A substantial printed volume may afford, I fancy, communications quite as influential as any revelations ever whispered in the dark, or spelled out by a spirit in his *psychomantic primer*.

It is most true that it is a cardinal feature of this religious reformation, to direct the attention of men to words, even to the precious words of Holy Scripture. But it was never intended that these should be made a substitute for the *things* which they reveal, or that mere *grammar* and *logic* should replace *spiritual discernment*, and be permitted to establish themselves as a barrier between the soul and spiritual enjoyment. Yet this is precisely what is done under the influence of the sensualistic philosophy, 'which sees nothing but metaphors in spiritual beliefs; which, after the senses, ascribes everything to signs and to language, and whose essential character is the negation of all the great truths which escape the senses.' 'Scholasticism,' says Cousin, whose language we have just employed, 'had converted many collections into substances, many words into entities; by an exaggeration in a contrary sense, Locke converted substance into collection, and made words of things; and this, mark it well, necessarily, and by the force of his system. Admitting only ideas explicable by sensation or reflection, and being able to explain the idea of substance by neither, it was necessary for him to deny it, to reduce it to qualities which are easily

attained by sensation or reflection. Hence the systematic confusion of qualities and substance, of phenomena and being, that is the destruction of being, and consequently of beings. Nothing, therefore, substantially exists, neither God nor the word, neither you nor I; all is resolved into phenomena, into abstractions, into words.'

So completely, indeed, does our sensualistic philosopher satisfy and occupy himself with words, that he can neither understand nor relish 'the things of the Spirit.' To him they are unacceptable 'novelties.' They are denounced as 'metaphysics,' because, being of the sensualistic school, he can have nothing to do with anything that may not be presented to the senses, and he accordingly limits himself to PHYSICS, since everything must be *physical* that is not *metaphysical*. We have but two great departments in this universe of ours, that of mind or spirit, and that of matter.\* Metaphysics treats of the one and physics of the other, and he who inveighs against the former, as does our friend Fanning of the Advocate, gives conclusive evidence, if he understands himself at all, that he is wholly devoted to the latter. Hence the need of eclairsissement, for no individual can be permitted to declaim incontinently against the one half, and that the 'better half' of God's universe, and at the same time attempt to occupy an ambiguous position as if he himself belonged to *neither*, and was *superior to both*. Persons who profess to be educated, are justly expected to use words in their true significations, and must be held strictly to the issues which they themselves are pleased to make. The tendency, however, to scout everything that is spiritual and not physical or material, is characteristic of the sensualistic philosophy. Locke, the master of the school, went so far even, as to intimate that mind or spiritual being might be, after all, a mere modification of matter,—that matter might, by a peculiar modification, produce all the phenomena of thought. He says: 'We have the ideas of matter, and of thinking, but possibly shall never be able to know whether any mere material being thinks or no; it being impossible for us, by the contemplation of our own ideas without relation, to discover, whether omnipotency has not given to some systems of matter, fitly disposed, a power to perceive and think, or else joined and fitted to matter so disposed a thinking material. What certainty of knowledge can any one have that some perceptions, such as pleasure and pain, should not be in some bodies themselves, after a certain manner modified, as well as that they should be in an immaterial substance, upon the motion of the parts of the body?' Book iv. Ch. iii. § 6.

I would remark here, that I do not wish to be understood' as accusing of deliberate materialism, those who have been laboring so diligently to engraft the philosophy of Locke upon the present reforma-

---

\*The natural division of things that exist, is into body and mind, things material and immaterial. The former belong to physics, and the latter to the science of metaphysics."—Webster's Dict. *Metaphysical* science, as contradistinguished from *physical*, embraces *psychology*, which, treats of spiritual being or existence, and *morals* or *ethics*, which treats of rights and duties. In signaling his antipathy to everything that is not physical, the sensualistic philosopher is not always content to denounce *metaphysics*, but often is at the unnecessary pains to include by name in his anathemas, "*moral philosophy*," a department which is as naturally connected with psychology as corollaries are with the propositions from which they flow, and is consequently included in *Metaphysics*.

tion. They seem to believe in spiritual existence, and some of them even go so far as to admit, if not that the Spirit of God is present in the body of Christ, at least that such a doctrine is *somewhere* taught in the Bible. They seem, in relation to spiritual things, to be very much in the position of chemical philosophers, in relation to certain subtle agents, as light and heat, which resist our powers of condensation, and whose true nature is left to be determined in the future progress of science, it being thought entirely possible that they may be ultimately found to be mere qualities of matter. Thus our sensualistic philosophers hesitate to decide in regard to spiritual influences. They seem to 'incline to the opinion,' that they may all be resolved into the mere qualities of facts; that they are a species of *aura* which emanates from words, and surrounds the truth as a sort of atmosphere of spiritual electricity, which the future investigations of some of the Faradays of the sensualistic school will prove to be as material in its nature, as, in the same school, they already reckon words and ideas. I do not then, charge them so much with materialism on this question, as with an absolute *vacuum*. I do not allege that they have a *bad* meaning, but that they have no settled meaning at all. They do not understand themselves, nor the empty philosophy which they have unwittingly embraced under the guise of religion, which insidiously directs their religious thoughts, and like a demon beneath the veil of an angel, mocks at all their endeavors to make spiritual progress.

As a specimen of the method by which philosophers of this school contrive to throw incertitude over the whole subject of spiritual religion, we may take a not unfamiliar comment on Paul's exhortation to the Ephesians, v. 18-19. 'Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.' Should one quote this as showing the need of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the propriety of praying for that Spirit, he will be met by the remark that the Scripture is its own interpreter, and that the epistle to the Colossians being obviously a sort of counterpart of that to the Ephesians, will serve us as a safe and direct means of explanation. All this being admitted as true, as it undoubtedly is, his attention will now be directed to the fact that the corresponding passage in Colossians reads thus: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Now, let me ask, what is the obvious meaning of such a reference as this? What is the design in thus attempting to replace in the mind of an inquirer, the former passage by the latter? Is it not to induce the conclusion that 'the word of Christ' of Colossians is 'the Spirit' of Ephesians; and that, these expressions being interchangeable, we may fairly regard 'the Spirit' as nothing more than the 'word of Christ,' so that when an individual has the word dwelling in him, he has, by necessary implication, the Spirit dwelling in him? Is it not an evident attempt to show that the word and the Spirit are the same? Or rather is it not an effort to resolve the Spirit into mere words, in obedience to the behests of the sensual-

istic philosophy? If it be not this, then we have no hesitation in affirming, that the effect at least, is to throw ambiguity over the whole subject and leave the inquirer in utter darkness and doubt as to the real distinction between the Spirit and the word.

But what trifling this is with the Scriptures! Suppose an idealistic philosopher, denying the value and necessity of the word, and relying upon some imaginary spiritual light within, as sufficient to guide us in religion, should reverse the order and proceed to explain Colossians by Ephesians. The injunction 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly,' will now mean, 'Be filled with the Spirit.' The word is now resolved into Spirit, and as in the former case, the inquirer is relieved from any direct dependence on the Spirit of God, so is he in this case by a rhetorical *leger de main* precisely similar, released from any dependence on the written word! But all such efforts, either to condense spirit into word, or to evaporate word into spirit, are alike adverse to true religion and incompatible with the word of God itself. In the Divine volume, the word is never thus exalted against Spirit nor Spirit against word. The connexion and train' of thought, in every instance, will justify the reference to the one or the other, as the case requires.\* Nor has it ever been the design in this reformation to institute any opposition between the Spirit and the word of God. All that it claims is, that the word and the Spirit shall NOT BE SEPARATED. It belongs not to it to dogmatize upon the manner in which either the spirit or the word acts upon the heart, but to speak on this point reverently, and as the Scriptures speak, if they be found to speak on it at all. It has been called upon, indeed, to protest against certain vain and enthusiastic notions of 'spiritual operations,' which have extensively prevailed, and which have had a direct tendency to render the word of God of none effect, and it seems to be now just as needful that a similar protest should be entered against some who profess to be its advocates, and yet have been so far carried away in the blindness of their zeal for the written word, that they have adopted and inculcated a philosophy which renders the Spirit of God of none effect; which carnalizes everything spiritual about Christianity, and makes the Bible either a rubric which prescribes forms and ordinances, or a species of mere logical machinery, independent and self-moved, to which the eternal destinies of mankind are exclusively committed. In the midst of their tirades against "miraculous agencies, ghosts and sights and dreams," they seem to have lost sight of the real connexion between the word and the Spirit of God, and they do not hesitate to claim for the 'word ALONE,' all power in the work of human salvation.†

\*In the passage quoted from Eph., "being filled with the Spirit" is evidently introduced as an appropriate apposition to being "drunk with wine." In Colossians, where the apostles had already spoken of the graces of the Spirit as exhibited in the "new man," the mention of the Spirit would have been inappropriate, while that of the word of Christ was in harmony with the whole connection.

†I regret that the proofs of this unfortunate error are so abundant. As a specimen, I have only room at present for the following, taken almost at random from the Gospel Advocate:

"God by an effort of his omnipotence in the beginning, caused the light to shine in the midst of darkness; but from the time He looked upon his finished work and pronounced it very good, we have enjoyed this, as all other natural blessings, not by a perpetual miracle, but as the result of established law. So, by an exertion of creative power more grand and glorious if possible, God has given to a benighted world the light of the new creation. He has given a perfect reve-



It argues, indeed, but little real love or reverence for the Bible, when men will thus presume to add to the language of Scripture in order that this may be made to express the doctrine of their favorite philosophy. And it argues but little consistency for men to do this, and at the same time, complain of *others* because they, in accordance with *their* religious philosophy, must needs make Paul say that 'we are justified by faith *alone*.' The Scriptures nowhere affirm any such propositions. They belong to theory and philosophy, and not to religion. They constitute standards, not of faith, but of opinion. They announce a departure from Bible Christianity, for there is no surer evidence that men are dissatisfied with the *things* of the Bible, than when we find them dissatisfied with its *language*.

It is a fact which we regard as highly significant, and as further indicative of a want of true regard for the Scriptures, that those who

lation of his will as the great *Sun* of the moral and spiritual universe; and he that would enjoy light need not expect to find it by groping in darkness and ignorance, praying for influences which God has not promised, but he must come within the sphere where, by God's appointment, it shines. God addresses man *as man*—as a rational creature, capable of understanding his word. His word is the embodiment of great spiritual *ideas*, which passing through the understanding, reach the deepest deep of the human heart." Vol. II. p. 334.

"Our trust and our hope is still in the gospel as the power of God unto salvation. It is the seed of the kingdom of Christ, by which every subject is quickened and made alive in Christ Jesus. It is the great enlightening, instructing, admonishing and purifying agent of the body of our Lord. And finally, by it we shall be enabled to overcome the world and its snares and trials, and at last triumph through faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Our confidence is still in the power of this truth to make all see alike, believe alike, and feel alike. Heaven has left it as the great instrument for building up, uniting and sanctifying the Church of Christ. When the people can be persuaded to give up their senseless and inoperative dogmas of mystic influences, and permit this word of truth to shine with full-orbed, unclouded brightness in their minds and hearts, then may we expect to see them intelligent, upright and "ready at all times to give an answer to every one who asks a reason of their hope, with meekness and fear." For this we must toil and struggle in this Christian warfare, looking neither to the right nor the left, but trusting to the might of the word of God. If there is not power in the word to make all who receive it children of God and heirs of the promise, then we are utterly, hopelessly in the dark, we know no other way. The dreamy shadows of mysticism, and the cold, dead formulas of fatalism, even admitting them to be true, present a most gloomy prospect to him who desires to know of a certainty a way of salvation. To the word of the gospel spoken by Christ himself and by his holy apostles, then, we can only turn for sure, certain, confiding, steadfast hope. To that word which is both "Spirit and Life," that is "quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword," to that word "whose entrance gives light and makes the simple wise; to it we must turn, and to it trust as God's mighty power unto the redemption, enlightenment and glorification of man." Vol. II. pp. 363-4.

The former of these extracts is from an article by F. M. Carmack, a correspondent, the latter by W. Lipscomb, one of the editors of the Gospel Advocate. The reader will notice particularly the assertion of F. M. Carmack, that God "has promised no influence independent of the human understanding and his own word." "His word," he adds, "is the embodiment of great spiritual *ideas*, which passing through the understanding, reach the deepest deep of the human heart." The word is the "embodiment" it seems, and the *ideas* are the soul or spirit, and that is the whole of it, according to friend Carmack's philosophy. The reader will also notice W. Lipscomb's statement: "If there is not power in the word to make all who receive it children of God and the heirs of the promise, then we are utterly, hopelessly in the dark, we know no other way." According to Scripture, it is necessary to have both the word and the Spirit of Christ, for believers are "born of God," and "if any man," says Paul, "have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." But in the above extract no account whatever is made of any agency or power, except that of the word alone. That the word, indeed, is regarded as being itself the Spirit, is evident. "To the word of the gospel," he continues, "spoken by Christ himself and by his holy apostles, then, we can only turn for sure, certain, confiding, steadfast hope. To that word which is both Spirit and Life," etc., Let the reader note the manner in which the saying of Christ, Jno. vi. 63, is quoted and applied. In reference to a *particular discourse*, and in a *special* sense, our Lord said to his disciples, "The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Friend Lipscomb does not hesitate, however, to affirm in an ordinary and general sense of the word of the gospel spoken by Christ and the apostles, that it is "SPIRIT." Thus an extension and application is given to our Lord's saying, wholly unauthorized, and the impression is attempted to be made, that the word—the gospel—the New Testament in short, is in reality, the Holy Spirit, or at least "Spirit" in such a sense as leaves any other Spirit than this "word" altogether unnecessary. The whole object, indeed, in adducing this saying, is evidently to show that the word is the Spirit, and if our friends in Tennessee have really come to this conclusion, and disbelieve in the efficacy of prayer for the conversion of sinners, and the actual indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians, it is certainly proper that we should understand their position *clearly*.



are thus apparently the loudest in praise of them, are precisely those who *quote them the least* in their discourses and essays, who are the least addicted to the *devotional study* of the sacred volume, and who are found the least capable of *developing new truths* from its pages, or detecting the *perversions* and *misinterpretations* to which it has been subjected. Their regard for it, indeed, is quite of a *peculiar* character. It has, they think, conferred upon them *peculiar* advantages. It has relieved them from all care of their own souls; from all concern about their internal spiritual condition; from all fears of visions, ghosts or spirits. They need no longer trouble themselves with earnest efforts to lift themselves to the contemplation of the spiritual and unseen, for they find all this now reduced to visible words and embodied in sensible forms, and the relief they experience is like that of the idolator when he has succeeded in embodying his conception of his divinity, and is enabled to contemplate with facility, in the carved and substantial image, those features and qualities which before, were with difficulty discerned amidst the dim and shadowy visions of the soul.

This extravagant religious nominalism has, on this account, been very appropriately termed *Bibliolatry*. It is an ignorant, pretentious adulation, a blind, unreasoning partiality, which, in reality, degrades the Bible, by placing it in false position, and ascribing to it exclusive power and attributes which it never claims for itself. It is not a just appreciation of the importance of the word of God, nor an intelligent admiration of its perfection, but an overweening exaggeration, a positive misrepresentation, in fact, of the real nature and design of revelation.

It is the glory of the present Reformation, that it has sought to exalt the Bible, and to abase tradition and opinionism. Its plea for the Scriptures as the means through which the Holy Spirit is to enlighten and sanctify men, is not to be improved upon. But it is a matter of serious regret, that it should be *perverted* by any who profess to be its advocates, and that the noble enterprise of recovering the religious community, from speculation and dissension should be converted into a cold and heartless nominalism, prolific of unprofitable controversy, but barren of religious fruits.

R. R.

## SECOND REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERT RICHARDSON.

*Courteous Reader:*—We very much regret the necessity of the controversy with Prof. Richardson. As a writer, Doctor R. has long held a high position before the brethren, and from his connection with Bethany College, what he says is not only entitled to consideration, but must exert considerable influence either for good or for evil. We have, however, feared the present result for years, and to a few of our intimate friends we have, on frequent occasions, communicated our thoughts most freely. Some three years ago we respectfully expressed to Bro. A. Campbell our fears in regard to speculations amongst the brethren,

and earnestly besought him, as an important duty to the world, to examine "Modern Spiritualism," under the imposing title of "Philosophy," with the view of exposing it.

In the present reply it is our purpose to notice, first in order, very briefly, a few of the minor points in the June number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, and then we desire to set forth, in a manner which we think cannot be misunderstood, the system which Prof. Richardson is endeavoring to inculcate amongst the brethren.

1st. The manner in which Doctor Richardson assails the Editors and correspondents of the *Gospel Advocate*, affords unmistakable evidence that he feels we are not pleading for the same religion. Doctor Richardson knows that if his new position is true, our teaching is false and injurious; and we assure our brethren and all whom it may concern, that we are more than satisfied, if we teach the Christian religion, Doctor Richardson does not. As previously intimated, we differ across the whole heavens. When we objected to his teaching, as set forth in an address by Mr. Russell of Missouri, we did so after surveying the whole ground, and weighing all the difficulties that might arise. We consider it but justice to Mr. Russell and Dr. R. to say, that by the term "*infidel*" we simply desire to denote one who does not occupy the true Christian stand-point. In our definition one may be both religious and philosophical, indeed, believe many things about God and his administrations, and yet be an infidel.

We are not pleased to apply the word to any one, and we particularly dislike its use in connection with persons whom we have recognized as members of the body of Christ. But from the various experiments in speculation which we have witnessed, we feel confident that it is certain moral death for men to adopt any ancient or modern human theory of religion.

We wish also to state, that the teaching of Prof. R. is by no means new to us. It was not introduced amongst us in Tennessee by "*one J. B. Ferguson*," as Prof. Richardson may suppose. Thirteen years ago a Professor of the same school of two Professors who "have been instrumental in giving shape and character" at Bethany, put forth Dr. R.'s recent speculations in our College chapel, and it will be remembered by a hundred living witnesses that, without the least hesitation, we at the moment pronounced it infidel and highly pernicious. Some of our readers are aware that a Presbyterian preacher at Gallatin, a few months since, condemned it in the same individual, not only as infidel, but as most immoral in all its tendencies. We have seen no adequate reason for changing our views.

2d. Dr. Richardson, in a very special manner, calls attention to the "*Latency and insidiousness of the sensualistic philosophy*" in us, "*without being at all conscious of it.*" Again, the Doctor employs still severer language in a connection that leaves no room to doubt that he points at the conductors of the Advocate.

He says, "*I do not charge them so much with materialism, as with an absolute vacuum. I do not allege that they have a bad meaning, but they have no settled meaning at all. They do not understand themselves.*"

We give not these statements for the purpose of replying to them, but merely to show Prof. R.'s state of mind. It is singular that while men are dying under the influence of the Professor's system, they make such terrible exertions to drag others down with them. It may become our duty to notice Prof. R. personally before we are done "with the case;" but our purpose, at present, is to give all who may desire it as clear a view of his moral stand-point as possible.

3d. Prof. Richardson quotes several extracts from the Gospel Advocate to prove, as he says, we teach, "*that the word, indeed, is regarded as being itself the Spirit.*" Such a statement from Prof. R. is indeed surprising; but we feel that he is not of us. We have heard such things to be sure from partisans, but such language we do not recollect to have seen from a professed disciple of Jesus Christ. Why does not Prof. R. take Brother Campbell's teaching in hand? His language is stronger even in the June number of the Harbinger than any we recollect in the Advocate.

Is it possible that Prof. R. really thinks that we believe the Holy Spirit and the word of God are identical? Such a thought never entered our heart, and the quotations from Professors Lipscomb and Carmack justify no such a conclusion.

The Holy Spirit we have always taught is the Advocate—is God's agent to call us to our Father; but this it does through the living oracles, the church and influences therewith connected. It is true, we have never been able to find any authority for believing that the Spirit, without words—the means of approaching the soul through the understanding—has convinced any one of sin or converted a rebel to God. The Spirit has visited no heathen nation in his converting power—has turned no one from darkness to light, and has borne witness to no one that he is an heir of God and joint heir with Christ, without the living word. But as to the *manner* of the Spirit's influence through the gospel and means ordained, we have no information further than the statement of Paul, that the Spirit is ministered by "the

hearing of faith," and, therefore, we aspire to no speculations on the subject. As we have always believed and taught, it is the rejoicing of Christians that they have the Spirit of Christ bearing witness to their spirits that they are heirs to an inheritance above. As intimated, Bro. Campbell expresses our views quite plainly. In the June number of the Harbinger, he says, "The Spirit in regeneration never dispenses with the word. He is always working in, through and by the word on the understanding, the conscience, the heart, the affections of men." He adds, "The metaphysicians, the abstract, speculative doctors are of necessity abstractionists. No man can live on Alcohol. Where no word, no vision is, the people perish." But we need no more.

The Doctor says, our "whole object is to show that the word is the Spirit," and asks, "If his friends in Tennessee have really come to this conclusion, and disbelieve in the efficacy of prayer for the conversion of sinners, and the actual indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians?"

To these enquiries we promptly reply.

First. If Prof. Richardson would quote any "random" full page from either of the writers he has seen proper to notice, on the subject of converting power, he could but perceive the charge, that we make the word the Spirit of God, is without the shadow of a foundation. We repeat, that this effort astonishes us. Regarding the indwelling of the Spirit we state, that we are as well satisfied that the Spirit of God dwells, really and truly, in the body of Christ, and in every branch of the heavenly family, as we are that there is a spirit in the body of man, or that sap is the life in the vine. In reference to the intimation regarding "*the efficacy of prayer for the conversion of sinners*," which the Professor supposes we deny, we can but express still greater surprise. As intimated in a previous number, while at Bethany, in February, the chief sister of the place informed us that she had learned by letters from Missouri that Mr. Russell was engaged with the denominations in praying at the mourner's bench for God to forgive aliens, but, really, we were not expecting the advocacy of the practice by Prof. R. But we have it before us. We scarcely know whether to make a reply.

A suggestion or two must suffice. While prayer is the constant exercise of the Christian heart, it is possible to pray, as the Apostle says, "*amiss*." We are authorized as Christians to pray for each other, and Paul writes, "I exhort therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers,

intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings and for all that are in authority;" not that God would convert them, but that the saints might, "lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." Christ said, "I pray not for the world, but for them who shall believe on me through their word." God has done so much for the world in the gift of his Son, in the rich provisions of the Gospel, in the exceedingly great and precious promises regarding the future; and, moreover, has sent out so many zealous messengers to pray the world to be reconciled to him through his son, that really we would be at a loss to know what more to ask the Lord to do for the conversion of sinners. We are aware that the system is developing itself in the two Professors with whom we have had to do, that the gospel means of salvation are quite inadequate, and we are to expect much greater developments. Hence even Prof. Milligan says, "*Let us not cherish the delusion, that this great moral revolution will be effected by the word of the Lord alone. The world will never be regenerated by such cold and lifeless speculations.*"

When men give up the Holy Oracles as "cold and lifeless speculations," not adequate for the conversion of the nations, it is not to be wondered at, that they invoke other powers for help. Whilst, however, we hold the Gospel is God's power to the salvation of all who believe it, our labor should be to preach it zealously, and pray our fellow mortals to be reconciled to God. Our Father in heaven is ready, willing and waiting to be gracious to the last, and the Savior says; "Come unto me all you that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and you shall find rest to your souls."

Our want of space, however, forbids us noticing all that Prof. Richardson, has said in his fifth essay, and, therefore, we will employ the balance of our space in presenting a fuller statement of the Doctor's theory. Without the least inclination to boast, we respectfully suggest, that for many years we have been necessarily compelled to examine the pretended philosophy of the age, and we rejoice to be assured that we not only know what it is, but we believe we can make so plain a statement of it, that all who desire may see it.

In the first place, however, it becomes our duty to give a brief notice of the effort of Prof. R. to make us a disciple of John Locke, and to convert our belief in Jesus, through the words of the apostles, into a system of sensualistic materialism. It is proper to say that the Professor is sufficiently compassionate as "not to charge us so much with



materialism as with an absolute *vacuum*." We beg permission to say to Prof. R. that we are scarcely willing to claim any commiseration on the ground of our ignorance. We profess not to know mysteries, but we think it in our power to give his religious stand-point.

We feel no disposition to defend men, and therefore we care not to become the apologist for Mr. Locke's philosophy. Prof. R., though, does great injustice to Mr. Locke. He quotes a passage to prove that Mr. Locke taught, "that mind or spiritual being might be, after all, a mere modification of matter, that might produce all the phenomena of thought." The reader will be surprised to hear Mr. Locke answer for himself. He was speaking of the power of thinking and said, "*The soul is agreed, on all hands, to be that in us which thinks,*" and adds, "*that God can, if he pleases, superadd to matter a faculty of thinking.*" His statement is, that mind alone thinks, but it is in God's power to organize matter to think. Prof. R. may regard our teaching as he says, "Antagonistic to every thing spiritual in religion." "It is mere nominalism," he says. "The tendency is to scout every thing spiritual and not material." "It carnalizes every thing spiritual," etc., etc.

The reader may justly ask, what is the meaning of these sweeping and unqualified charges against the Editors of the Gospel Advocate? Prof. R. answered this question in the May number of the Harbinger. He says, President Fanning maintains the proposition,

1st. "That man is incapable of learning the being and attributes of God from the works of nature." This is our first sin.

2d. "That he is incapable of deriving knowledge from his own inward spiritual nature." Our second sin of ignorance.

3d. "For his conception of spiritual things, he is wholly dependent upon revelation; that is, upon words, divine communications, addressed to the bodily senses." That we teach men to trust in God through the truth, is our third and greatest sin.

This is Prof. R.'s exposition of our supposed dangerous sensualism and materialism. Without attempting to answer these grave charges, we ask the brethren if these are not the things President Campbell has taught for the past quarter of a century? The brethren have all taught, that we are not to look to external nature, or to the self-consciousness for spiritual light, but to the revelations of God in the blessed Bible alone. On this broad foundation we still stand, though we will hear all that may be said in opposition to it. But on this point Prof. R. has betrayed himself. He has shown who his real teachers are. He quotes *Victor Cousin*, the scoffing idealist as conclusive authority

against Locke. We are glad to reach the point from which we can examine Prof. R.'s system in a manner that will admit of no disputation. He must permit Cousin's translator to explain the criminal empiricism of Locke. He says, "As a philosophical term it is used in no invidious sense, but rather to designate a system which makes experience the exclusive source of knowledge." This is the Baconian system of investigating truth? Again, "Sensualism, in philosophical language, is taken in no bad sense." "Some French philosophers rejected reflection as a source of knowledge, and analyzed all human ideas into *sensation* as their sole principle. Hence the term *sensualism*, to distinguish it from the empiricism of Locke." Thus Prof. R. will please observe in his use of empiricism and sensualism, that the former is applied to Locke's teaching, because he maintained that knowledge is from sensation and reflection; and the latter to some of the French speculatists, in consequence of deriving knowledge, as they supposed, from sensation alone.

Cousin's most merciless charge upon Locke is, "That he firmly believed in revelation and Christianity." Again he says, "If the immortality of the soul is solely grounded upon the promise of God, who is to be believed upon his word, that is, the Christian revelation, it condemns the human race to materialism pervious to Christianity."

So then the crime of Locke consists in believing in God and immortality through the revelations in the Bible, instead of "the universal and perpetual revelation of reason," as Cousin calls it.

That the brethren and Prof. Richardson may be reminded of our religious position before completing our statement of the New Theology, we may freely declare,

1. That we do not believe it is in man that walketh to direct his steps, either *ab intra* or *ab extra*, or from "self-consciousness," or external nature, as Prof. R. maintains.

2. We teach, that we are to depend upon the revelations in the Bible, for our belief in things invisible, or in better style, that "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Now, reader, we are prepared not only to show what Prof. Richardson's system is, but we also feel it due to our brethren to show from whom he received it. Not that we assert that he has read all the authors we may quote, but he has admitted the authority of one of them in opposition to Locke, and they all teach the same thing.

From two points of observation we may be enabled to survey Dr. R.'s whole system.

1st. He repudiates, as useless, the understanding in the investigation of spiritual truth.

2d. He adopts the old heathen doctrine of direct spiritual knowledge, by something he calls his self-consciousness. We quote but few words to establish the truth of our statements. He says, "*The scriptures themselves do not reveal truths to him who relies upon his understanding.*" "*The understanding could never comprehend a single scriptural truth.*" "*But it is the Spirit itself that can perceive the truth presented.*" "*The divine word addresses itself to our higher spiritual nature—to our self-consciousness.*"

We will notice a few authors in order to show the full import of these things.

1st. *Victor Cousin*, Prof. R.'s first authority, states the *a priori* dogma, which is identical with his "self-conscious" knowledge, thus: "I may neglect the external world and fall back upon myself, in the entirely interior world of consciousness; and even there I may derive from reason, a single idea which becomes the basis of a demonstration of the existence of God." Further, he says, "The idea of God is a primitive idea." This system he denominates "Modern Spiritualism." Again he says, "I unfolded the fact, instantaneous but real, of the spontaneous perception of truth, a perception which passes into the inner consciousness, and becomes a necessary conception."

The reader can have no doubt as to the identity of the teaching. Victor Cousin is not a believer in revelation or a friend to Christianity.

2. *F. W. Newman*, a despiser of the Bible, says, "The soul is the specific sense in which we come into contact with God." "No book can teach us, if our hearts do it not." "The spirit within is the real guide, and not the text any more than the scriptural example." "A book revelation is impossible." "An instinct of the soul is higher than all law." Dr. Richardson calls it "the higher law of our nature." Mr. Newman says, "The instinct is God's provision for the progress of the moral sentiment." The teaching is still the same.

3. *Henry James*. Prof. R. informs us that truth is "beyond and above the outward forms," and we are not "to trust to words alone." But Henry James is bold enough to place this doctrine in a satisfactory light. He informs his readers, that "the letter," as he calls the word of God, "is the rudest and most perishable husk of the Spirit, and is the only enemy the spirit knows." "The letter of a law must be seen to be intrinsically servile and worthless, before we can do the least

honor to its spirit. The longer we preserve the shell of a nut the surer the damage to the kernel."

Still Henry James states the difference between the Christian religion and modern animal impulses in a clear manner.

He says, "The Natural theologian"—Prof. R. defends Natural Theology—"contends that we know God's character sufficiently by the light of nature, to understand our duties towards him. The advocates of revealed religion, on the other hand, maintain, that some additional light is needed to instruct us."

He says our knowledge of spiritual matters is all "*from within.*" This is equivalent to Dr. R.'s direct perception of the spirit.

4. *Theodore Parker*, advocates the "intuitive knowledge of God," and speaks of making the Bible "*an idol.*" Prof. R. and J. B. Ferguson speak of persons glorying in the "*letter.*" Parker says, "Conscience remains;" "God's voice is nature, his word in the soul." "We have the standard," he adds, "of Moses, David, Socrates, Zoroaster, Paul, John and Luther." "It takes nothing from the Bible," he adds, "but its errors." "It calls us from the outward letter to the living word within." He is as good a "higher law" man politically, as Dr. Richardson is religiously.

5. *David Frederick Strouss*, the apostle of modern infidelity in Germany, says, "*When the mind has gone beyond the sensible history,*" (or as Prof. R. says, "The things sensible, external, and historical—the mere machinery of religion—a mere mechanical affair,) and entered into the domain of the absolute, the former (the history) ceases to be essential." This is the direct perception of Prof. R., and in the speculative world is known as "*Transcendental philosophy.*" Theodore Parker calls it "absolute knowledge."

We have made these extracts in order that all who are concerned may know Prof. R.'s teachers. No form of infidelity has exerted so pernicious an influence. It professes a direct spiritualism, claims the authority of philosophy, and its advocates affect a haughtiness that is insufferable. We still defer the discussion of the merits of the system. When the brethren see what it is, the discussion of the matter will not be difficult.

T. FANNING.

BALTIMORE, June 2, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—The May number of "The Gospel Advocate" is at hand, containing my communication of the 9th of March, upon the Scriptural Propriety of the State or other Co-operation Associations

for the spread of the Gospel, and your brief reply to my interrogations.

In a previous communication you say, that "It will be for the brethren to decide the question as to the utility of such organizations to keep the church alive." So far as I know, no person has ever advocated such co-operations for the purpose of "keeping the church alive." Do you know of any, Bro. F.?

1. They have been advocated as necessary to the increase of the number to be saved. In speaking of such associations, you say, that "all sects declare their creeds compatible with the spirit of the New Testament." Who has heard of any State meeting making a creed? Do you consider an agreement made by the messengers of churches, and approved by their congregations, purely in reference to the preaching of Christ, either among congregations or otherwise, to be the work of creed making, when there is not one article of faith embraced in the agreement?

2. In answer to your statement above, that "It will be well for the churches or brethren to decide the question as to the utility of such organizations to keep the church alive," I replied, that such a decision had been given by the brethren in the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, and I thought Tennessee. To which you reply: "It is singular to hear a teacher of Christianity refer to State authority to prove that a principle is good." You have made a sad mistake when you say, that I have referred to State authority for any such purpose. I only referred you to the action of those States in order to show that they had decided the very question which you say it will be well to decide. I did not say that their decision was to be received as of divine authority. Right or wrong, however, they have given in their verdict.

I asked this question, "May two or more congregations unite in their means and efforts to send the Gospel to a destitute State or Nation?" You reply, "Yes." "If so, state the authority of the apostles for such a co-operation." Your proof, you say, will be found in 2 Cor. viii, 19. "And we have sent with him the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches: and not that only, but who was chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, (or gift or contribution,) which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind. Avoiding this, that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us." 18-20th verses.



It must be admitted that the churches did co-operate in both the contribution for the poor saints, and in the selection of a messenger to accompany Paul and Titus to Jerusalem; (who was probably Doctor Luke;) but can it be fairly argued that this case is justly applicable to the work of evangelizing by them as congregations? In the 19th chapter of this first letter Paul charges the church at Corinth, that they lay by upon the first day of the week such an amount as they were willing to give for the poor at Jerusalem, and that when he should visit them, "whosoever they should approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality to Jerusalem."

The work of gathering the contributions was evidently by the direction of Paul and Titus, and not by the action of any one congregation. If you say that such actions apply equally to all cases of co-operation, some difficulties must first be removed in order to my conviction. Let us admit that ten or one hundred congregations unite in an evangelical effort to send the gospel to the destitute, either at home or abroad, and for this purpose it is important that a conference be had upon all the premises. How then can such a conference be obtained? Must this be done by a general mass meeting of all the congregations, or by their messengers? Who shall collect the men and means necessary for such efforts, and how shall the general objects of such an agreement be accomplished? It will not do to refer to Cor. viii, 19, for the details. We cannot see what you think is to be seen. There is not one case of church co-operation to be found in the New Testament for evangelizing as far as I can see, and it devolves upon you and those adopting your views to furnish one if you can. A divine model for such a co-operation appears to me to be wholly unnecessary. Neither the Council at Jerusalem, or the sending out of Paul and Barnabas by the Spirit and Prophets at Antioch can be plead as a warrant. The love of God must ever be the moving cause of all such efforts, and the general tenor of the Spirit's teaching the foundation or guide in all such cases.

3. The word of God must be translated, printed, bound, and circulated by the church, because she is the ground and support of the truth.

4. But how can this be done without a conventional arrangement? And who would ever think of asking for divine authority for so doing; and a model plan to work by? You say, "Send the gospel into all the world, and when the church is not able to send a messenger let her ask the aid of others?" Brother Thompson, of Louisville, seems dis-

posed to complain that the churches both in Kentucky and Missouri are unwilling to give their money to him as agent of the Louisville congregation in order to send an Evangelist to England; but what right has that or any other congregation to appoint agents to collect money for any such purpose without first obtaining their consent to such work? Where is to be found a precedent for it? Would you give your money to such agents and churches without first being advised of the wisdom and propriety of such movements? All such efforts will fail. No one congregation can assume such a position and hope for success. What guarantee have they that the church will pursue the course most approved by them? Whatever the churches do advisedly by their messengers upon any subject, they will be held to do by their own act, and it is not in my power to see how such a co-operation can be judiciously gotten up, and controlled without such messengers.

The State meeting of Kentucky claims no authority over any congregation, nor do they exercise any control over any evangelist farther than to direct him to the proper field of labor, connected with such other objects as belong exclusively to the work of their voluntary agents. No church is bound either to send money or messengers, and consequently it can have no existence or executive rule only as they are pleased to give it. It is, therefore, purely a creature of their making; and I give it as my deliberate judgment, that without co-operative efforts our progress must continue comparatively small. Since the organization of the Kentucky State Co-operation a great improvement has been manifesting itself among the brethren. They are learning the spirit of general benevolence, and not to look altogether upon their own things but upon things or interests of others.

A missionary spirit is essential to the vitality of any congregation. "The Spirit and the Bride say come; and let him that heareth say come; and let him that is athirst say come, and whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely." This principle must pervade the whole body of Christ. It is in fact the test of its fellowship with Christ the body. We want no *ritual* or special form for such a work, but you think that the use of the word "*ritual*" is unfortunate. How so? Does it not clearly indicate the correct or prescribed way of doing a thing? We have no such model, nor can I perceive the necessity for such a rule to be given by divine authority, no more than I would feel its necessity in the building of a house of worship.

It is the business of parents and husbands to provide for their children and companions, but who can find a ritual for such provision?

The principle or duty is clearly defined or given, but the how is left to them. The church must convert the world, because she is the light of the world, and this can only be done by preaching Christ; but all the prudential means for the accomplishment of the work has been left to the good sense of the church.

These are important matters, brother Fanning, and if you can show a better way I hope you will do so. It is important that we seek for unity of action as far as obtainable in all the Master's interests.

Yours truly,

G. W. ELLEY.

P. S.—Since I last wrote you we have had twenty-four additions to the church. Eight of whom during the past week. We have now with us brother John O'Kane, from Indianapolis, who has labored with much acceptance here and at other points where sixteen additions were gained to the church.

G. W. E.

#### NOTES ON BRO. G. W. ELLEY'S ESSAY REGARDING CO-OPERATION.

It occurs to us, that Brother Elley and we are much nearer together than when we began; and we see no good reason for sincere men differing in the least. Perhaps our approaches are owing to a better understanding of each other's teaching, and more especially to a better understanding of the word of God. It may be necessary, however, to notice a few points in Bro. E.'s remarks.

1. In regard to our intimation, that some maintain the authority of human institutions to keep the church alive, brother Elley asks, "If we know of any one who advocates such a co-operation?" Bro. E. seems to us to answer his question in his next sentence. He says: "They," (human institutions—the creations of church members,) "*have been advocated as necessary to the increase of the number to be saved.*" If the church is the light of the world and the salt of the earth, we should calculate that as a body she is God's choice for accomplishing all his grand designs in the moral world. If correct, we see no "necessity for other bodies to increase the number of the saved." Brother Elley says, "There is not one article of faith" in these agreements. In a previous number we pointed out "articles of faith" in regard to one institution.

2. Bro. E., in the second place, makes some very good suggestions indeed in reference to the co-operation of the churches in ancient times, in "choosing messengers and sending contributions;" but, finally, defies us to show authority for "*one case of church co-operation for evan-*

*gelizing.*" Bro. E. has not understood us. We never admitted the right of several churches agreeing to *make* evangelists: or even of colleges, or certain officers of co-operations doing so. The only body on earth authorized to educate, ordain and commission an evangelist is the church of Jesus Christ. Even the practice of calling in evangelists and members of other churches to ordain ministers of the word, is utterly subversive of the order of the New Testament.

But, if we are not very much mistaken, we can show most clearly church co-operation for evangelizing purposes. As stated, each church in the apostolic age commissioned her own evangelists, and sent them forth into the world to preach, plant churches, put in order the things wanting in the respective congregations, and in fact to exercise a watchful care over them. Regarding the support of evangelists, the church which sent them was bound by every consideration of duty to God and man to supply their individual wants, and make provision for their families; but the churches planted by the evangelists and congregations, for which they labored, were also specially bound to give them food and raiment, with every needed comfort for their families. Paul was recommended by the church at Antioch, and no doubt received help from it, yet he said to the Corinthians, "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service." (2 Cor. xi, 8.) Paul gives a general rule in reference to church co-operation in evangelizing. He says, "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their, (the Jewish Christians,) spiritual things, their duty also is to minister to them in carnal things." (Rom. xv, 27.) One other passage will give all the light required. Paul was not a member of the congregation at Philippi, but he planted it, preserved it in the faith, and received aid from it in his evangelizing labors. He said, "Even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again to my necessity. Not because I desire a gift; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account."

From these scriptures we learn, that evangelists were assisted by the congregations wherever they labored; and in this view there was, in fact, co-operation by the churches in evangelizing. To be sure there were no written rules of agreement or of confederation, or articles of faith regulating this co-operative labor; but upon the principle that "The ox that treadeth out the corn" is not to be "*muzzled*" all acted authoritatively and safely. The churches should recommend their ministers for the work of evangelists, and they who are able to accomplish the work of the Lord should have the support of the brethren wherever they labor, but such as upon trial should not prove them-

selves skilful workmen, should not have reward of the brethren, and, indeed, should not be encouraged in the gospel field. Nine times out of ten the preachers who complain at the brethren because they do not support them, do not deserve it. Our candid judgment is, that every teacher who performs his duty faithfully to the world, the church and the brethren, will lack for no good thing. The Lord will put it into the hearts of the saints to sustain him. John T. Johnson always had enough and to spare. He worked for the Lord, and his Master was not unmindful of his wants. The same may be affirmed of all true ministers. From this very full statement, we flatter ourself that we are more inclined to encourage co-operation than Brother Elley. The difference seems to consist in a necessity on his part, to create bodies for co-operative purposes not known in the Bible; and which, in our judgment, are not only useless but well calculated to obstruct the operations of the churches by engaging to perform their labor.

3. Brother Elley's enquiry as to the manner of publishing and circulating the Bible, we answer in a few words. We have examples in the New Testament of messengers of the churches carrying out the operations of the various congregations, and we see no difficulty whatever in any number of churches agreeing to translate or revise and publish the scriptures, by men chosen by the churches for the purpose, just as messengers were selected to bear the contributions "into Judea."

4. Brother Elley asks, "What right has the congregation at Louisville to appoint agents to collect money for sending evangelists to England, without first obtaining the consent of the congregations?"

We answer, that the Louisville Congregation and Messenger are wrong in every particular, except the first step. The brethren at Louisville in a most praiseworthy manner, proposed to encourage the sending of a few Evangelists to England; but instead of consulting the congregations with the view of securing a large co-operation, sent Bro. Thompson through the country to collect funds for the Louisville church to appropriate. This error wellnigh obstructs all co-operation, and makes it mainly the work of a single congregation. In this particular, the church at Louisville, regarding the labor of sending preachers to England, occupies precisely the ground of the Missionary Society of Cincinnati, and the State Co-operation at Lexington. The officers of these respective bodies say to the churches and the brethren, "We have a noble enterprise in view, and if you will send *us* your money, we will wisely appropriate it, and publish our proceedings in the papers and tell all the world what each member does." This is a



fair translation of the matter. We say still, that there is a scriptural plan for such labor. If the church at Louisville, will send competent members to England as Evangelists, and ask any number of churches in Ky. or elsewhere, to consider the magnitude of the service, and co-operate in their own way, we hesitate not to say, that the Louisville Missionary's wants would be liberally supplied, as they would make them known to the respective congregations agreeing to carry out the good work. In this manner, another congregation in Ky., and still another might send successful ministers abroad, and have them well sustained. But each church must be left free to perform her own duty at her own time and in her own way. But on this plan the active energies of the respective congregations are called forth, and success is made sure.

Our want of space forbids further details at present. T. F.

#### VISIT TO THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, NEAR CASTALIAN SPRINGS, SUMNER CO., TENN.—DEDICATION, CONSECRATION AND SANCTIFICATION BY BLOOD ONLY.

THERE are occasions, when it is proper to notice the good works of brethren, for the encouragement of others to do likewise. It is known by many that for many years there has been a congregation of disciples a few miles east of Gallatin in the county of Sumner. It was planted on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, and whilst the brethren performed their own service, they were certainly a spiritual people. For some considerable time the disciples could boast of quite a large proportion of their number who "*Were able to admonish one another.*" We may mention among other Bro.'s Peter Hubbard, Dr. D. W. Mentlo, Willis Bush, Albert G. Branham, Carroll Kendrick, Page Parker, etc., etc., but Bro.'s Hubbard, Bush and Parker are no more, Bro. Kendrick is in Texas battling still for the truth, our quondam Bro. Branham has gone into modern spiritualism, and others have almost let the cares of the world, the deceitfulness of riches and the lusts of other things choke the word. Yet there is good material in that section—none better. It is one of the fairest sections of God's beautiful earth, and the population will compare favorably with any other of the country. Years ago, the brethren were inclined to hire out their worship—and if we are not mistaken it was taken to a great extent, by a family of preachers, who

brought much reproach on the cause in Tennessee. These are our conclusions, we care not to discuss and we are not inclined to say anything which should produce the least unkindness even in our bitterest enemies, with such as have even threatened our personal safety for years.

Suffice it to say that through this influence, universalism, latitudinarianism, modern spiritualism, strife, debates, backbiting, and much that is disagreeable to mention, got amongst the brethren. The effect has been to forever blast the religious prospects and hopes of some who were once regarded as pillars in the church of God. Not only has all Christian love fled from these members, but even the friendship that once existed as citizens has been disturbed. A few months ago, however, a few of the brethren determined to arouse themselves to greater effort, and the first work attempted was the removal of the old meeting house from an almost inaccessible point, and its erection into a new, commodious and beautiful room, on the turnpike road near Bledsoe's Creek, at one of the most handsome and convenient sites for the purposes known to us. Perhaps it is not wise to mention the names of brethren who have been active in this labor, but the impression rests upon us that brethren Dr. Bush and J. Harlow have been efficient, but we heard no complaint against any, and we believe all the beloved members saved from the wreck, were not only zealous in the work, but now rejoice in having the conveniences of worship. It is but an act of justice to say, that the godly women of the neighborhood, took no small interest in arranging an attractive place for the meeting of the saints.

It was our good fortune to be called to the opening of the house, on Saturday and Lord's day the 16th and 17th of May, 1857. We delivered two discourses on Saturday and buried two determined souls with the Lord in baptism, and preached on Lord's day to as intelligent and well disposed audience, in our judgment, as we could wish to see. We left on Lord's day afternoon with regret, but should we be spared, we will return; and if the brethren will now keep house for God, he will send them many angels to minister the bread of life to their neighbors and children. We hope it will not be out place to say that in obedience to expectations created by denominational influence, we delivered a discourse on Lord's day forenoon on

#### DEDICATION.

We endeavored to make the following points, viz:

1. To dedicate, is to consecrate, devote and separate for a special purpose.

2. In the year of the world 2514, and B. Christ 1490 years, God ordered Moses "To anoint the Tabernacle, and hallow (*dedicate*) it with the promise that it should be holy." (Ex. xl. 9.)

This is the first dedication of a house or tabernacle for the worship of Jehovah.

3. Solomon built a house or temple for God, which was finished 1004 years before Christ, and was dedicated by sacrificing "Two and twenty thousand oxen; and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep." (1. Kings viii, 63.)

The furniture of this house of God remained undisturbed only 33 years. Shishak, king of Egypt pillaged the temple and took away the most valuable articles.

It was utterly destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar 588 years before Christ. (2 Chron. xxxvi, 19.)

4. This temple was rebuilt by the order of Cyrus king of Persia, after laying in ruins 52 years, Zerubbabel, was the chief director. It was dedicated by the children of Israel, the priests and Levites 519 years before Christ. "They offered at the dedication of the house of God, a hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hundred lambs; and for a sin-offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats." (Ezra vi, 16-20.)

There can not be a remaining doubt, that the tabernacle, and the temple prefigured the temple of Jesus Christ or church of God under the new dispensation. The dedications also pointed to the consecration of the spiritual temple.

It is proper to state that the consecration of the temple was not an idle ceremony or meaningless ordinance. In the temple the *name of Jehovah* was inscribed, and he could be approached only through his name. Hence David prayed, looking towards Jerusalem, and was heard, in that he called upon the name of his God where it was written. From this idea, the Samaritans, and even the heathen received the impression, that worship was acceptable only through certain consecrated houses and places. Hence also the notion amongst religionists even of our own times, is that houses and grounds can and should of right be consecrated to God. What is more common than for persons to speak of "*the house of God*," "*the sacred desk*," meaning a structure of wood, stone or earth, and a platform or box, from which the orator deals out his philosophy.

A few quotations from the New Covenant, will best explain our views.

The woman at Samaria said to our Lord, "Our fathers worshipped

in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John iv, 20-25.)

Christians are called, "The temple of God." (1. Cor. iii. 16.) "Living stones, a Spiritual house, and a holy priesthood." (1. Pet. ii. 5.) Consequently, the practice of calling a house, the temple or church of God is out of the question, and the idea of dedicating brick and mortar to God is foreign from the teachings of the spirit. To be sure, we are in favor of neat and comfortable houses in which to worship our Father; but the disciples of Christ as congregations constitute His church, and the churches of the Redeemer, constitute the grand temple of the Almighty.

We have noticed that the temple of Solomon was dedicated by blood, and the temple of God now is, and must be sanctified by the blood of the Lamb slain for sinners.

The Apostle says, "We are come to Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,—to the general assembly and the church of the first-born who are written in heaven,—to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel." (Heb. xii. 22-24.)

Again he says, "We (Christians) have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary, by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Let us go forth, therefore, to him without the camp, for here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come. By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." (Heb. xiii, 10-15.) In our consecration we are all made kings and priests to God, and have the unalienable right to offer our own sacrifices to God through our Lord Jesus Christ. The idea of human priests to sacrifice for the people, has contributed much to the notion that dedicated temples or houses are necessary. The theory is wrong, for the idea of dedicating a house, man or thing without blood, is certainly mere solemn mockery of the true consecration of the tem-

ple of God by the blood of Christ in the hearts of members. This blood reaches us through the appointments of the New Testament, sealed with the precious blood of Christ. T. F.

---

#### TO EDITORS OF PERIODICALS AND PAPERS DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

DEAR BRETHREN:—Think us not presuming for addressing a few words to you upon the momentous responsibilities resting upon us as writers in reference to the cause that cost the richest treasure of heaven. To some extent we are the teachers of a great people, and upon us, to a very considerable extent, depends the prosperity of our Lord's cause in our generation. Should we teach the truth, the people will rejoice in it, but should we promulge speculations for the will of God, the brethren will be blinded under their influence; disunion and strife will ensue, and moral death will blight all our fairest prospects as the disciples of Jesus Christ.

The first important point with us should be, if possible, to understand each other. We had thought, brethren, that we could harmoniously plead the authority and spiritual value of the new institution; but never were men further apart than some of us seem to be. What is the cause of this? Are the creeds of the denominations better calculated to bind men together than the platform of Christ and the Apostles? Or is it true, as has long been charged upon us, that we have no standard in religion, and in fact believe nothing? We had fondly thought, that the scriptures of truth constitute a perfect rule of life for Christians, and that all who believe could walk together in love. Have we been mistaken? Are the scriptures not sufficient? And must we admit that all the labor that has been performed by our veteran brethren in the last half century is in vain?

We have been led to make these enquiries from the fact, that several of our editorial brethren have recently thrust most poisonous darts at us for denying Christian fellowship to certain teachers who would move heaven and earth if possible to satisfy the brethren, that inspiration is "*universal*," and is not confined, as we had thought, to the writers of the Bible?

We give a single example in order that the brethren may see our idea clearly. In the Christian Sentinel, conducted by brethren O. A. Burgess, J. N. Carmon and John Lindsey, at Peoria, Ill., we find an



essay on the "*Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*," taking the ground that "*there is a higher reason in the soul, spontaneous, giving all men inspirations—the elements of thought, which elements are universal and necessary, and have their cause in the higher Intelligence*," and we are to be responsible alone to the "*higher laws of our being which are the laws of God*."

We state, in much kindness, that all men who believe the Bible and are acquainted with this pompous, shallow declamation, are aware it is stolen from some of our "*higher law*" politicians and European rejecters of God and the Bible, and is, indeed, the most cunning, and yet the most glaring, insidious and damning form of infidelity of our times. Our main purpose though is not to examine this unblushingly animal philosophy, but to call attention to the course of some of our editors. The editor of the *Sentinel* calls special attention to the essay, and says, "*It is the first of a series which we trust no reader of the Sentinel will pass by because of the somewhat abstruse nature of the essay; but if any are unwilling to do laborious thinking, they might as well not begin. The subject demands a philosophic treatment, and such essays are more appropriate in some heavy quarterly, yet, as a people, we have not yet attained to that order of literature, but we deem it far better that a little extra "strong meet" should go forth in our monthlies than that such discussion should be untouched.*"

The first point with the editor, it seems to us, is to degrade the brethren in their own estimation, by attempting to convince them that they "have not attained to that order of literature"—what have our old writers been doing for the past fifty years? Secondly, the editor wishes to satisfy the ignorant disciples that they must content themselves with a "*little strong meet*" in our monthlies, from these young teachers of an empty, vain, deceitful and infidel philosophy. Above all, the editor desires to impress his readers with the idea that, so far, little has been done by us, but now we have a different order of *men*—philosophic thinkers—who will be able to lift us from the literal word, "The outward and perishing" of J. B. Ferguson,—"*outward forms*" of Prof. Richardson," to "*the higher, spontaneous reason*," to "*the intuitive reason, or conscience*" of the correspondent of the *Sentinel*.

We respectfully suggest, that most of the religious periodicals amongst us have not only published articles of this class for a year or two, without expressing the slightest dissent, but in circumstances to lead us to the belief, that the editors heartily approve of the teaching. Have you, brethren, carefully examined the subject, and have you determined to adopt the direct, "self-conscious" knowledge? We hold

ourselves responsible to prove, in any way that may be desired, that no one can maintain the authority of *intuitive* knowledge without rejecting the Sacred Oracles. We wish to be entirely respectful, but we believe the time has arrived for taking our position in reference to this heartless paganism under the imposing style of modern spiritualism. We have more sensibly felt its ruinous effects in this section, than in any other, and we feel that it is a sacred duty resting upon us to do what little may be in our power to resist its influence. Christianity is as incapable of making a compromise with it, as it was when attempted by Scotus Erigena, in the ninth, or St. Anselm in the eleventh century. No element in modern direct spiritualism can be tolerated without a sacrifice of the spiritual teaching of the Scriptures. As to the final result of the present controversy we cannot be mistaken; but we pray the brethren to say plainly whether they are still for the authority of Christ and the apostles or the vain and deceitful philosophy of the age.

T. F.

#### SPIRIT OF CONTROVERSY.

DEAR BROTHER FANNING:—In the June number of the Gospel Advocate, just received by me, I have read closely and with painful interest the critique upon you, by Prof. Richardson of Bethany College, extracted by you from the *Millennial Harbinger*; and I must confess that I have felt deeply mortified and pained both at the spirit and matter of his article. While I regard the latter as containing sentiments at war with the teachings of the Bible, I look upon the former as inconsistent with that spirit of love and brotherly-kindness which characterizes the gospel of Christ, and which it is calculated to produce. The exhibition of such a spirit and temper of mind in a brother seems to me to furnish proof of erroneous conceptions, and that obliquity of mind which results from them. Such should ever be our conduct, lives and intercourse with each other, that it may be said of us as was said of the primitive disciples of Christ: "See how these Christians *love one another*."

And I am sorry to say that I cannot reconcile with the foregoing such expressions as the following, made use of by our brother R., of Bethany, in reference to yourself:

"The oldest things in Christianity are indeed, in these days of apostasy, often the greatest 'novelties.' But I do not blame Bro. Fanning for not discovering any of them, as I do not doubt that if it had

pleased God to bestow upon him the gift of discovering new things, he would have employed it. Certainly, I am confident that his failure to present any thing of this nature to the brethren, has not proceeded from the fact that he has long since exhausted the treasury of divine truth, or that there is no longer any thing new to be learned from the Holy Scriptures."

And then speaking of certain declarations made by you—"emanating as they do from the President of Franklin College, and being, as we have every reason to believe, his sincere convictions, they will receive all the consideration to which they are entitled."

And lastly, and which is the worst and most insulting of all the article: "Surely, then, unless President F. thinks incorrectly or not at all, it must be admitted that John Locke is the author of his thinking, and that he is, however unconscious of it, a philosopher of the school of Locke, or what is usually termed *a sensualistic dogmatist*."

The irony, ridicule, satire, and sarcasm, (I cannot say *wit*), which can be easily seen running through these extracts, are utterly inconsistent with the character of a disciple of Christ; and are excusable on no ground whatever. The last expression, "a sensualistic dogmatist," is positively insulting!—and the whole article shows a disposition to insult and deride!

The inconsistencies into which Brother R. has somehow been led, are as palpable and strange as the temper and matter of his article. After using the expressions we have quoted from him, how singular and inconsistent does it sound, to hear him say: "For himself, [President F.,] personally, I entertain all due respect and kind wishes; and, I trust, I know how to appreciate his zeal and long continued labors in behalf of the Bible, as the only safe guide in religion." Can brother R. really believe what he says? And such a man too (as President F.) not having been able to discover any of the "things" of the Christian religion!—and pronouncing so decisively on "subjects" and "facts," with which he has had no time to make himself acquainted! A man of such acknowledged ability, (as President Fanning,) and having done so much for the cause of primitive Christianity; and yet of those who "imagine themselves to have entered the most holy place, when they are, as yet, only in the vestibule of the Divine temple. They fancy themselves to be in possession of Christianity in all its fullness, when they have as yet but laid hold of the skirt of its mantle, and they assume the position and authority of teachers when, like some in the apostles' days, they have need to be taught even 'the first principles of the oracles of God.'"

Another inconsistency equally as palpable and glaring: "I would take this occasion," says Brother R., "to express my concurrence with him [Brother F.] as to the unlawfulness of introducing human philosophy, of any kind, into religion. In this, I am happy to say, we are perfectly agreed. We certainly have no business with human philosophy in religion." This is admitting, in substance, what President Fanning has been contending for. But how will this accord with Brother R.'s defence of Natural Theology, which every where runs through his article?

Prof. R. endorses the infidel sentiment of Lord Bacon: "Lord Bacon regards the evidences of Revelation as founded upon the previous demonstrations of Natural Theology. The latter," he says, "is a *key* to the former, and opens our understanding to the genuine spirit of the scriptures, but also unlocks our belief so that we may enter upon the serious contemplation of that divine power, the characters of which are so deeply graven in the works of the creation."

We have been led to these remarks, and to make these quotations, in order to give some illustrations of the spirit of controversy, as exhibited among our own brethren; and to show how one man, in assailing the views and opinions of another, may be guilty himself of the very things he condemns, and into what self-contradictions and inconsistencies he may run, in endeavoring to expose another. And, in conclusion, we would say to the brethren, let us, by all means, avoid controversies among ourselves as much as possible; and when they do happen, let us endeavor to be governed by the spirit of the gospel; and be cautious not to suffer ourselves to be betrayed into a spirit of an opposite character.

SENEX.

---

#### TERMS OF PARDON.

DEAR BRO. FANNING:—Having given what I consider the teaching of the Bible on the necessary preparation of the heart of a sinner before he is entitled to membership in the church, I now proceed to the second proposition, to-wit: THE LORD HAS ORDAINED BAPTISM AND NOT PRAYER FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS. In order to be better understood, we will subdivide the subject into three heads. 1st. The law of Moses on the subject of forgiving sins. 2d. The preaching of John the Baptist, and the law of Christ while on earth; and, 3d. The Acts of Apostles and their Epistles.

In the law of Moses we learn the first lessons on remission. Moses commanded that "the sinner shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord and unto the priest—a ram without blemish—and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him for any thing of all that he hath done." (Lev. vi, 6.) This was a sacrifice, a sin offering, and a burnt offering, and his sins were not forgiven until the last act was done. Prayer constituted no part of these works; for neither sinner nor priest was commanded to pray for this forgiveness.

2d. In order to connect and explain the preaching of John the Baptist and of Christ we will give the character and office of John the Baptist as detailed by the prophet Isaiah. He said, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." (Isaiah xl, 3.) John acknowledged that "I am that voice." Highway signifies a public road free for all persons to travel in a lawful way. Thus we understand that John the Baptist was to prepare a public road for our Lord Jesus Christ. The language of the prophet being figurative we must infer what is its literal meaning. We understand that it means all that John the Baptist said and did after he commenced his ministry until Christ began to preach. For the purpose then of giving a more perfect idea of this road, we will present some of his principles and practice as recorded by the Evangelists. Mark says, that "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." And he said, that "there cometh one after me mightier than I." (Mark i, 4 and 7.) Matthew says, that John the Baptist said to the people, "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance." (Matt. iii, 8.)

John informs us that John the Baptist said, pointing to Christ, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and that this is the Son of God." (John i, 29, 34.)

Here is what we understand to be this public road, which John the Baptist made for Christ; and it was free for all sinners who chose to travel it on lawful terms from earth to heaven. This road was composed of faith in Jesus, that he was the Christ, the Son of God. 2d. Of repentance towards God. 3d. Of a change of heart, to-wit: the bringing forth of fruits meet for repentance; and 4th. Of Baptism for the remission of sins. Here, as in Moses' law, prayer constituted no part of the works to be done by the sinner to obtain remission or forgiveness of his sins. Neither mourners nor priest was commanded to pray for it.



When Christ began to preach he commenced in this road, and preached these same principles as taught by John the Baptist. They both taught the same doctrine and discipline as far as John went. Christ enlarged the road, but did not repeal or change this road.

Under John's ministry both the principles and practice of Moses' law were changed. John preached a Savior to come, and Christ was the end of Moses' law to every one that believeth on him. The sinner was now commanded to bring his own body instead of a "ram to the Lord," and he must bring it to John instead of to the priest, and John made the atonement instead of the priest, not by sacrificing of his victim for a sin offering and a burnt offering, but by baptising him with water for the remission of his sins, once for all time to come, and the last act was performed before the remission of sins took effect.

But we will give some of our Lord's teaching, that we may see that he traveled the same road that John the Baptist had made for him. He began to preach to the people saying, "Repent and believe the gospel." (Mark i, 15.)

He said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii, 5.)

"Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke xiii, 3.)

"If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." (John viii, 24.)

And he said that whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my father which is in heaven. (Matt. x, 32.) And He made and baptized more disciples than John. (John iv, 1.)

Here is in substance the same principle and practice that John taught. From this we understand that John and Christ were both baptizing in the same country, and at the same time, and Christ making no objections to John's baptism. We infer from this that Christ or his apostles baptized in the same way, and for the same object that John did, to-wit: for the remission of sins. By these declarations of the Savior, we understand that the sinner must believe, repent, confess and be baptized before he can be saved, and consequently before his sins can be remitted. And finding no change on record, we presume that this baptism continued to be practiced as long as the Savior remained on the earth, and that sins were not then remitted by means of prayer.

3d. We may learn the principles and practice of the apostles after Christ's resurrection, and throughout their epistles by the first sermon preached, to-wit: Peter at the day of Pentecost; he said to the sinners,

“Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” (Acts ii, 38.) Here is John’s baptism, except that it was now commanded to be done in the name of Jesus Christ. The object being still the same. Cornelius, his kindred and friends, and all who heard Peter preach at the house of Cornelius, were baptized for the same purpose, to-wit, for the remission of their sins; to remit the name sinner and take the name disciple or Christian as a door through Christ into the kingdom of God, and to give them an inheritance in heaven, and a token that they would from henceforth walk in newness of life. Acts x.

This appears to have been the design of baptism; as long as the apostles remained upon the earth we find no alteration. Sins were not in those days forgiven by means of the prayers of the mourners or priests, but by baptism. But this principle and practice is at the present day different with many people. Some of our friends, who are teachers, are telling mourners to pray to God to forgive their sins, and the teachers themselves pray to God to forgive these mourners their sins. Thus putting prayer in place of submission to Christ.

We would be glad to be informed when, and where and by what authority this change was made.

“If any man be a worshipper of God and doeth his will,” he should “pray without ceasing;” prayer being as necessary to the happiness of the soul of a Christian as bread is for his body. But the Lord Jesus and his apostles did not direct sinners to work in this way to obtain the forgiveness of their sins.

JAMES YOUNG.

REMARKS.—Paul prayed before he was baptized or pardoned, and his prayer was heard. His prayer was, “Lord what wilt thou have me to do.” Jesus did not, and could not consistently answer it, for the work of reconciliation he had given to the apostles; but Ananias was sent to answer it. This he did in exhorting Saul to “Arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” (Acts xxii, 16.) Prayer should never be separated from obedience.

T. F.

### IS THE WORD THE SPIRIT OF GOD?

Prof. R. Richardson attempts to show that I have taught the identity of the word and Spirit of God. The following are my words:

“There are but two ways in which the Spirit has been known to act in the accomplishment of its mission under the new reign:

"1. By immediate and miraculous agency, the objects of which were to teach truth by direct inspiration, and to confer miraculous powers in confirmation of its testimony.

"2. Mediately through the gospel, which it gave and sanctioned as 'the power of God unto salvation.'"

The miraculous manifestations of the Spirit were known only in the primitive, creative age of the church; and I unhesitatingly affirm the proposition, that

*The Spirit of God now acts upon the hearts of the children of men only through the word of truth.*

Prof. R., of course, takes the opposite ground. He must maintain (just as we suspected months ago) that the Spirit of God exerts an influence upon the heart otherwise than through the word addressed to the understanding. At whose door then, I ask, lies the sin of heresy? Who has proved recreant to the advocacy of the *ancient gospel*?

I regret to see that the style of Prof. R. manifests too much of the spirit of the religious controversies of the day. He has made an effort to be very severe upon that class of *professed advocates* of the "plea for the Scriptures," of which he has seen fit to publish us as examples. He assumes to dogmatize with reference to the teaching of the "present reformation," denouncing our advocacy of the authority and efficiency of the Scriptures, as "an ignorant, pretentious adulation, a blind, unreasoning partiality," etc.

We have only to say to him that we think we understand the matter perfectly. We have no need of consulting a new oracle to learn what the principles and practices which the brethren have always maintained; and we are willing to submit the whole matter to a candid brotherhood, that they may decide for themselves who adheres most tenaciously to the simplicity of the Gospel. F. M. C.

## THE NEW COVENANT.

SHELBY COUNTY, TEXAS.

BRETHREN:—To what people and time did the 8th chapter and 11th verse of Acts have reference? If it has reference to the present time, ought we not to cease to proclaim the word?

P. F. SOUTHERN.

We apprehend that the passage referred to by Brother Southern is not in Acts, but in the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. The language is, "I will put my laws in their minds, and write them in their hearts,

and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his brother, saying know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest." (Heb. viii, 10, 11.) There are many passages of similar teaching to be found in the New Testament. Jesus himself says, (John vi, 45,) quoting from the prophet, "And they shall all be taught of God." In the 10th and 16th of Hebrews we have the same teaching. Again in 1st Epistle of John, 2d ch. and 27th verse we have language of the same import. The very clear teaching of all these passages, and the many prophecies of the old Testament, to the same effect, is the superior excellence and spiritual glory of the new covenant—the Christian Institution. The old covenant was an institution of the flesh, and could not make those coming thereunto perfect. Men and women were members of this institution not from choice, but because they were the natural offspring of the Patriarch Jacob, and his descendants. No perfection of character was required to constitute them subjects of this covenant, and no offence undeserving of death could separate them from it. The new covenant, the reign of the Gospel, is presented in contrast to this fleshly kingdom. Men and women are not members of the new covenant by a birth of the flesh but a spiritual birth. They are quickened and made alive by the spiritual agency of Heaven, and born into the kingdom of Christ according to the form and manner appointed of God, and thus become heirs of the blessing, and promises of the new and perfect covenant. No man can enter the Kingdom of Christ, who is not taught of God, and in whose mind and heart the law of God is not written, and all who are in Christ, from the least to the greatest, know the Lord. The idea that persons ignorant of the law of Christ,—ignorant of the law of pardon, redemption and love presented in the Gospel, can be subjects of the new covenant and enjoy its blessings, is most destructive of every thing like intelligent obedience to the commands of Heaven. The notion that poor ignorant mortals unacquainted with the glorious and merciful message of Heaven, can by blindly trusting to human direction, become sons and daughters of the Almighty, is one of the most fruitful sources of the mysticism, doubt and scepticism that beclouds the minds of the people on the subject of the religion of Jesus Christ. Men must be taught of God. His law must be written in their hearts and minds before they obey him with any proper understanding of the Truth. The means by which God teaches us, is the word or Gospel—the proclamation of the good news of salvation, and the calling of the minds

of the people to Christ as the author of redemption to wretched and hopeless mortals.

The difficulty of our brother doubtless arises from applying to the whole world, promises intended only for those enjoying the blessing of the new covenant. God has never promised to men who will not hear and receive his teachings, that they should know Him from the least to the greatest, nor that he will be to them a God, and they should be to him a people. To Christians alone are all such promises applicable, and to them alone pertain all the glorious privileges, blessings and honors of the new and better covenant. Instead of it being time for us to cease the proclamation of the word, as our brother would seem to intimate, it becomes us to double our diligence and more and more earnestly labor for the spread and universal spread of the Gospel, that alone has power to make all who believe it and submit to its heavenly requirements, sons and daughters of the Almighty, and heirs of all the exceeding great and precious promises of the New Institution.

It should be a thought full of the noblest encouragement to us, my friends in the kingdom of Christ, that we are thus favored and blessed of our Maker. God has given us his whole will concerning us. His laws have been written in our hearts just in proportion as we have given earnest heed unto the Heavenly instructions of his word. Herein we have the full "mind of Christ," and we have no excuse for ignorance of the whole duty of man. Upon our own heads must rest the entire responsibility. If we are faithful to God and to all the high privileges with which he has blessed us, we must grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord. W. L.

---

#### CHRISTIAN ECONOMY.

That Christians should exercise economy in all things is, we presume, as necessary as that farmers and tradesmen should economise in their secular affairs. But to conclude that the ends and means of Christianity are the same, and subject to the rules and decrees as those of husbandry and commerce is evidently erroneous and unscriptural. Christianity, being unique in its nature, operations, and effects, holds communion with nothing of inferior origin and design, but personates its own efficiency and transcendent glory by promoting its own institutions and executing its own laws. It is immutable in precept and in-



fallible in decree. It solves all doubts by the decision of its own statute, the word of God, and ratifies its decrees in the omniscient and plenipotent council of heaven. Emanating from a God who is a "jealous God," the Christian religion must necessarily partake of that nature, and from the supremacy of its origin and isolate and divine excellency, repudiate any assimilation to, or affinity with, other systems or politics. Secular economy reaches only to the body and effects of mortals, while that of the Bible has to do with the welfare of souls, the temporal and eternal destiny of the children of God. The aim of the one is the emoluments of time; that of the other unfading wealth and joys eternal. What is riches to one is chaff to the other. Hence the defeat of worldly wisdom in attempting to accomplish the purposes of a spiritual institution by the fleshly organized and financially finished inventions of men. The wisdom and power of Jehovah have furnished means adequate to the performance of His divine purposes, that will result in His own glory and their exaltation; therefore, He will not permit the cupidity and presumption of his erring creatures to supercede the goodness and excellency of his righteous requirements; nor, indeed, can any carnal policy supply the place of the divinely constituted agencies of the Spirit. But if there is any analogy between the economy of earth and that of heaven—the doings of the children of this world and those of the children of God—let us profit by a contemplation of it. We see in the affairs of this life hosts of individuals employed under the control of a single person, who, by virtue of law and custom, is their common Lord. Suppose one of these masters of men wish to visit his kindred abroad or transact some business in a foreign land; and this without hindering his domestic improvements, Overseers are engaged to take charge of the business and execute his orders. He commits all to their care and departs. When he is away awhile these overseers ("undershepherds") become weary of painstaking, grow careless, and the servants neglect their labors. Disorder and decline in their lord's business consequently follow. Being friends to him and well-wishers to his interest and theirs, a remedy is heartily sought. Loosing sight of the orders and requirements of their employer, they begin to devise plans to better the condition of affairs. After some consultation in regard to plans of "expediency," that would seem most convenient to themselves, they resolve to employ mercenaries to perform the business of the lord's laborers, and both overseers and servants, for a small tribute to pay their deputies, can roam at large in luxury and indolence. These prosecute the business with a

zeal according only to the wages allowed. The servants grow indifferent concerning their master's cause. Seldom visiting the manor and receiving little or nothing of advantage from it, they soon become anxious to throw off all dependence, and thus they go.

Thus are the goods of the owner wasted and his people dispersed. Surely when he comes he will hold these overseers responsible, and his servants to judgment. Where stand you, O elders in Israel, overseers in the kingdom of Christ? Is this the policy of earth? Is it heaven's law?

Then, brethren, let the vineyard of the Lord be kept from the hands of foreigners, and the people of the Lord ever be found a pure people. Withhold its offices from the use of money-seeking sycophants and "mercenary priests." Whether they be impostors or deluded brethren, the consequences of serving God by proxy are invariably depressive to piety and tend to apostasy, therefore watch ye and pray.

"Feed my sheep," said the Master. Will the "undershepherds" tend the flock? Let the heirs of the kingdom till the garden and subsist on fruits until the day he comes, that they may grow in grace and enrich their inheritance. Let us come together on the Lord's day to attend to the ordinances of his house, in "prayers," in breaking of bread, in singing praises, and exhortation and instruction from His holy word, that we may know and do our duty, thereby receiving spiritual strength; and finally be prepared for the reception of our Master when He comes the second time.

J. R. W.

McKinney, Texas, April 11, 1857.

#### REPORT FROM ARKANSAS.

BROS. FANNING AND LIPSCOMB,—I returned last evening from a tour of two weeks through this, Johnson and Carroll counties. Saw many of my old acquaintances and friends. One young lady at Salem, Johnson county, made the good confession and was immersed. The brethren were revived, and we trust much good was done. Here I introduced the Gospel Advocate and obtained a few subscribers. The position you have assumed in regard to separating Christianity from human organizations and the philosophy of men, was the strong inducement in their taking the Gospel Advocate (a name I hope it will ever deserve). Dear brethren, the time has come when the pure gospel, in all its simplicity, must be pleaded for by its friends.

There is too great a blending of the wisdom of men with the wisdom of God; too great a desire among Christians to enjoy the approbation of the world. Until the proper distinction is drawn between truth and error, false and true religion, and the practice of the world and that of Christians, the cause of Christ must and will suffer. Nerve yourselves therefore, brethren, for the contest; don't be discouraged at opposition; fiery trials await all those who have the boldness to stand up for the truth of God. But let them come, let us put on the whole armor of God, that we may be able to withstand the wiles of the Devil, and be able to stand in the day of trial. Let us look back to the trials and sacrifices of the apostles and primitive Christians, to the Lutheran struggle, and even to the dawning of the current reformation, and see what they endured for the truth's sake, and from their example take encouragement. Twenty years ago I started out a *one book man*, and am still the same.

At a meeting the third Lord's day in last month, at Mount Carmel, (a new meeting house,) in this county, three young persons, one lady and two gentlemen, obeyed the Lord. We have also had some six or eight at other points in this county since my last report.

Yours in the hope of the triumph of the truth,

J. S. ROBERTSON.

Washington County, Ark., April 8, 1857.

### QUERIES.

WE are asked to notice the following Scriptures, viz:

1st. "*Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.*" (Col. iii, 18.)

2d. *Ephesians* v, 22-31.

The writer says: "*The point is to learn how far wives should obey their husbands.*"

We reply, that the apostle in these passages is speaking of *Christian* husbands and wives, and the language is by no means applicable to others. It is presumed that the Christian husband would not require his Christian wife to do any thing contrary to the name of Jesus Christ, and when he transcends not this limit, the wife is bound to obey him in all things. Should, however, the husband interfere in the least with the wife's Christian obligation, she is required to obey God rather than her husband. In Paul's judgment, If the husband even believe

not, the wife should not put him away if she can live with him; but if she find that she cannot enjoy her religious liberty, she must leave him, but not to marry another. (1 Co. vii, 10-13.) The same principle is applicable in the husband's case. But we do not know that we ever saw a necessity for a separation from religious opposition of husband or wife. A Christian woman rarely fails to sanctify her husband; and a truly Christian man will generally find it an easy matter to teach his wife. Genuine piety is most difficult to resist. T. F.

### FRANKLIN COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT.

The thirteenth annual Commencement exercises of Franklin College tookplace in the College Chapel, July 2, 1857, in the presence of several hundred anxious, and to all appearance, deeply interested auditors. Addresses were delivered by the following young gentlemen, viz:

1. J. L. Van Zant, of Marshall, Texas.—Subject—“*Literature.*”
2. W. F. Fulgham, of Fayetteville, Tenn.—“*Signs of the Times.*”
3. H. R. Moore, of Mississippi, delivered “*The Valedictory.*”

A. J. Caldwell, member of the *Alumni* Society, read an essay, which was received by the whole audience with the profoundest interest.

In conclusion, the degree of A. B. was conferred upon the three students who gave addresses, and also upon Mr. A. L. Anderson, of East Tennessee, who had been a student of the institution, and who is regarded by the Faculty as a worthy graduate.

### CHURCH NEWS.

Bro. J. S. Robertson, of Washington, Ark., under date of May 17, 1857, writes: “The good cause is still advancing. Since my last we have had some five or six additions.”

Nine students of Franklin College and Mrs. Fanning's School recently submitted to the Gospel of Christ.

Love worketh no ill to neighbors.

### FEMALE SCHOOL.

MRS. C. FANNING'S FEMALE SCHOOL will open September 14th, 1857.

### MINERVA COLLEGE,

WILL open on the first Monday in September, 1857. Address

S. E. JONES, near Nashville.

---

 TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.
 

---

 A BAD PICTURE—THE NEW BIRTH—SECTARIANISM  
AND THE BIBLE.

FROM a gentleman with whom I have no personal acquaintance, I have just received a letter which certainly reflects no honor on the present popular profession of Christianity. A few extracts will prove this. He says:

"After long study, and many wakeful hours, I have come to the conclusion that, if there is any such thing as getting religion, I can never find it. I have devoted much time to the subject of religion for the last three years. When I first came to Texas, I was about two months in your town, and heard you preach several times; I noticed the order and walk of the members of the Christian Church. I never saw so orderly members elsewhere. I conclude, therefore, to address you, being much concerned about my soul's salvation."

He then proceeds to give his "experience;" he "professed hope," and was immersed; but adds: "I doubted whether I was born of the spirit even before I was baptized, but supposed I should feel more relief after baptism; in which I was mistaken. I soon found that, if there was any such thing as getting religion, I had mistaken the shadow for the substance."

"Now, therefore, I ask you prayerfully to answer me soon and candidly, etc. \* \* \* \* There is no church of the Christian order in ———. The Methodists have no church organized. The Baptists and Cumberland Presbyterians quarrel sometimes, and each has preaching once a month," etc.

If these things, or *such* things, were not already "public," it might be wrong to speak of them here, to the great shame of the religion of the times—not the *Christian* religion. The Bible, blessed book! is not chargeable with any of these sad blunders. In it we do not read—

1. Of "getting religion." The term is used only five times—3 times after the *Jews'* religion, 1 time of *vain* religion, and 1 time of pure and undefiled religion. It is said that the term means, etymologically, binding back again, or making fast; but it is, I believe, used every time in the Bible to mean a system of worship, or the practice of it. It certainly has no reference to *goodness*, necessarily, else there could not be a *vain* religion. And it is clear that the *Jews'* religion is not the *Christian* religion; nor is the religion of the Old Testament exactly



either. It is just as correct to call Mohamedanism a religion, as to call Christianity religion. So we have Papal religion, and Protestant religions—by the wholesale. Religion cannot be a change of heart, the pardon of sins, the new birth, or any such thing, because that which deserves to be, and is called *vain* is as truly a religion as is the Gospel of Christ. Moreover, to make it either a change of heart, pardon or new birth, would be to confound all religions, Jewish, Mosaic, Papal, Mohamedan, Protestant, Idolatrous, etc., into one religion. Upon the whole, it would be as easy to account for the phrase, "getting religion," as for the "Roman Catholic religion," or any other absurdity; just as easy, and no more so.

2. The Bible knows nothing about the doubts of my correspondent, as to the birth of the Spirit before he was baptized. All his difficulties are of the same parentage.

3. I need scarcely say, the Bible knows nothing of the Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian church, of their monthly meetings, or their quarreling—and it does not make known, or authorize any of these things.

4. The Bible is silent about the Christian denomination, the church of the Disciples, our order, or your order, my church, or yours. It speaks only of the church of God, and the churches—congregations—of Christ, which make up the one church of God. What a pity we cannot express *our* ideas in the inspired and infallible language! Is there not danger that our ideas are incorrect, when we have to use such varied and unscriptural phrases to express them? If we pretend to be governed by the Bible, why not adopt its style, its names, its church, its ordinances, etc? How can he be consistent without?

Touching the inquiries about the new birth, (John iii. 3-5,) and those who are born again not committing sin, (John iii. 9,) I will only suggest—

1. These are not so important as more practical and plain matters. A common error, even with sensible men, is, perplexing themselves with foreign, figurative, or impractical matters, instead of attending closely and solemnly to the paramount inquiry—What must *I do*?

2. The entrance into the Christian kingdom, was symbolised by a birth, a *new* birth, a birth from above, before the kingdom was fully established, and while the King spoke to the people *only* in parables. (See Mark iv. 34.) He told his disciples, however, that he would, after his coronation in heaven, speak to them plainly—without a figure. (See John xvi. 25.) The same, therefore, that was taught

only in figures before, was, after the resurrection of Christ, and from the day of Pentecost onward, taught plainly, without a figure. Observing this, enables us to see that, understanding the conversation between our Savior and Nicodemus—the new birth is not so practically important to us, as understanding what Peter meant, on the day of Pentecost, when he said: “Repent and be baptised for the remission of your sins.” (Acts ii. 38. The best practical comment on, and the clearest and most satisfactory explanation of the new birth, is the practical manner in which the Apostles and Evangelists introduced persons into the kingdom. They certainly were born of water and spirit, though there was not a word said about it, and there is no reason to suppose they ever thought of it, because without they never could have entered the kingdom. All Christians were in the “Kingdom of God’s dear Son.” (Col. i. 13.) They were all born again. Still, the apostles said nothing to them on the subject, so far as we are informed. They heard the gospel, believed it, repented, confessed their faith in Christ, and were immersed. This was all—and enough. They were born of water and spirit—from above; were regenerated, converted, changed, etc. all in this simple process.

John said, whosoever is *begotten* of God sinneth not—i. e., he does not *habitually* sin—he is a good man; the Holy Father does not get, beget, or induce any one to sin. An incorrect translation goes far to support error. Let us read the Bible closely, prayerfully, constantly, not to pry into figures, or what some call deep things, but to find our duty—simply what God desires us to do.

C. K.

Salado, Bell Co., Texas, April 29, 1857.

#### EXPLANATORY.

Occasionally I still receive a new subscriber for the Christian Philanthropist, and others enquire whether it will be issued again. To such it may be proper to say here, that the Gospel Advocate was sent to all who had paid for the Christian Philanthropist vol. 3, for six months, ending, I think, with January last; the Philanthropist having been sent for six months. My removal, difficulties in collecting money due, and above all, the bad mails, induced me to make this arrangement, as the best, I thought, for the time being, and perhaps for the future, though of this I need not speak. I chose the Gospel Advocate because I thought it better suited to the wants of Texas than other papers; and in this I have not changed my opinion. I regret to find

no more copies of the Gospel Advocate where I go. Cannot those who are readers induce others to pay for and read it? I think that, if they desire their neighbors to understand Christianity, they could hardly render a better service.

The money sent for Christian Philanthropist I forward with the names etc. to the Gospel Advocate, hoping this may prove satisfactory. C. K.

Salado, Bell Co., Texas, April 30, 1857.

### OBITUARIES.

Sister Mildred Franklin died at the residence of her husband, Bro. John Franklin, near Hartsville, Sumner County, Tennessee, on the 5th April, 1857, aged 47 years. She was a daughter of the venerable and lamented brother Col. Thompson Crenshaw, of Barren County, Ky., who left the Baptists and united with the disciples of Christ in the commencement of the reformation. Lived a devoted Christian until May 21st, 1856; was 75 years of age, bade adieu to the church at Mount Zion, of which he had been a faithful shepherd for many years, and his spirit took its flight to the God who gave it.

When he joined the Christian Church his example was soon followed by his pious wife and all his children; thus forming a happy Christian family. His wife long since went to reap the reward of a godly life.

Sister Mildred was married to Bro. Franklin on the 3d March, 1831. She was then a Christian and he a devoted and consistent partisan, but he was long since taught the way of the Lord more perfectly, and mainly by her godly walk. With the Bible in her hand, she could easily put to silence the gainsayers. Her example as a Christian, companion, mother and neighbor, I have not known surpassed. I feel thankful that she lived to see many of her relations, neighbors, and two out of her four children, walking in the ordinances which she so much delighted to keep, and also to see her companion a valuable Elder in the church. We shall miss her examples, but hope they may live in our memory while she is resting in the bosom of our Heavenly Father.

She died of consumption, she had been quite feeble for several years, but was confined to her bed only three weeks before she died. She was fully apprised of the nature of her disease, but was not alarmed

in the least, was not seen to shed a tear, exhorted her family and friends to faithfully discharge the duties they owed to each other and to God, saying it cost nothing to do right and would pay well in the end.

I visited her frequently and can confidently say I never witnessed such manifestations of faith, love, patience and hope. She would recite many passages of scripture, upon which she built her faith and hope, and said it was no excited enthusiasm that made her willing to leave a kind, agreeable husband and four loving obedient children, and other relations and friends, but it was because of the word, wisdom and great benevolence of God, that the thoughts of death were no terror to her.

She asked the prayers of her brethren and prayed herself, that her patience might not fail and that her journey across the Jordan of death might be an easy one; which she fully realized. For about two hours before she died, she fell into a sweet sleep, and when she waked some one handed her a drink of water, and she said, "they that hand her a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple shall not loose their reward." She closed her eyes in sleep again and awoke no more. She breathed her life out sweetly, without a moan or a motion. It is consoling to visit a house of mourning under such circumstances.

O let us live the life of the righteous, that doing the commandments we may have a right to the tree of life and be permitted to enter through the gates into the city of the Heavenly Jerusalem.

W. C. H.

Millennial Harbinger please copy.

---

Died, at the residence of her father, near Chestnut Bluff, Dyer Co., Tenn., on the 2d day of May, 1857, Mary, daughter of Elder James Gilliland, in the 19th year of her age. Seldom has it been our lot during our ministration at the bed of the sick to see a more perfect spirit of patience and resignation. She possessed a gentle and affectionate disposition; seeking more the good and happiness of others than her own pleasure. As a daughter she was most dutiful to her now bereaved parents. Her brief, bright dream of earthly life has passed away as a sunset cloud, but only we trust to find a purer life in that bright world where peace and joy immortal forever bloom fadeless in the skies.

W. H. TRIMBLE.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, AUGUST, 1857.

NO. 8.

---

## PROFESSOR R. RICHARDSON'S PHILOSOPHY.

WITH increased anxiety we invite the brethren to a serious and prayerful consideration of the *matter* and *spirit* of Prof. Robert Richardson's essay in the July number of the Millennial Harbinger, under the head of

### FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY.—No. 6.

"BEWARE lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—Paul to the Colossians.

"THE investigation in which we are engaged is one of the utmost practical importance. The questions before us have respect to the very life of religion—to the fountains of religious thought and to the motives of religious action. They relate to the chief matters of the reformation for which we plead, and must be elucidated and settled before any real progress can be made in the work which we have undertaken.

We have just endeavored to show how false is the position assigned to the Scriptures by those who are secretly imbued with the sensualistic philosophy, and how completely, under this system, words are substituted for things, and Christianity is evacuated of all its substance. It is necessary to our ultimate design, that we should now direct the attention of the reader to the view which this same philosophy takes of Christian faith. This also, will be found to be quite characteristic, divesting this faith of all its spirituality, and confining it to the earth, like a bird which has been deprived of its plumage is no longer able to mount towards the skies.

"In speaking of the means through which philosophy may have introduced itself into the reformation, we said that CONTROVERSY afforded great facility in this respect, and that it was often the case that considerations used merely as *arguments* would be misunderstood as a



*philosophy* or *theory*, when they had any tendency to *account* for the facts or processes of which they were designed to furnish merely a *logical proof*. We have a striking illustration of this in the theory which many seem to have adopted in regard to Christian faith.

"The extravagant and unscriptural notion which many among the various religious parties of the day have entertained in relation to faith, that it is a peculiar and mysterious work inwrought upon the heart by the direct power of God's Spirit, independently of the written word, has justly been regarded as calculated to render the word of God of none effect, and to render nugatory the invitations and claims of the gospel. This notion is itself a theory of hypothesis introduced to account for the familiar fact that certain individuals only, out of the multitude who hear the gospel, are induced to believe and obey it. It is in opposition to this theory that the argument from cause to effect has been employed, showing that, in conformity with the laws of human nature, and in harmony with the express declarations of Scripture, the gospel facts are and must be the foundation of the Christian faith, and that the evidences and assurances of the Divine word are amply sufficient to produce a true and living faith, without having need of recourse to miracle, or to any kind of mystical Divine interposition for its origination. It is effectively urged that when the result can be satisfactorily accounted for upon principles which are entirely accordant with the laws of the human mind, and with all human experience, it is quite unnecessary to substitute for the ordinary and natural avenues to the human soul, the miraculous approaches of spiritual being, presenting itself suddenly within the most secret chambers, as Jesus to the disciples when the doors were shut. And that, moreover, it is especially to be deprecated that a theory should be adopted which detracts from the power of the gospel and is irreconcilable with some of the plainest statements of the Scripture.

"The argument which is thus employed, traces the chain of cause and effect as follows—It places facts first, then testimony, then faith, then feeling, then action. It endeavors to show how it is that the gospel is the power of God to salvation through the facts which it reveals, and how reasonable a thing it is that men should believe and obey the gospel upon its own proper evidences and invitations without hesitation or delay.

"Thus far, and so far as *argument* is concerned, all is well. But our sensualistic philosopher, seizing upon the theory which this argument involves, adopts it at once as the true *philosophy* of conversion, and, not content with this, proceeds to modify and fashion it so as to bring it completely into harmony with the dogmas of Locke. The power of facts must be exaggerated, the verbal narrative must be either endued with unwonted efficacy, or faith itself must be reduced within more convenient limits, and provided with a more material form. The Christian faith becomes now merely the belief of the historic facts presented in the gospel. To believe upon the testimony of apostles and prophets that Jesus lived and died and rose again as recorded, is to be at once in possession of the Christian faith, and it is asserted that this faith is not at all different in its nature from our confidence that

such a one as Julius Cæsar lived and bled and died as history reports. Faith itself, indeed, in this scheme, is made of little or no account. It is not in it, we are told, that the power resides—the whole efficacy is in the facts believed. These are in themselves the subject-matter—the terminus of faith—the *ne plus ultra* in this philosophy, the genius of which is ever to resolve, as far as possible, every thing into words, propositions, arguments, and to reduce all spiritual phenomena to the forms of the ordinary understanding.

“It is in propagating this theory of the *nature* of faith that an industry and zeal are manifested which are never exhibited in behalf of righteousness and the weighty matters of Christianity. It seems to be adopted as not only of divine authority, but as constituting the very essence of religion, so that no one is to be regarded as sound in the faith itself, unless he admits this view of its nature and makes confession accordingly. It is thus that each sect loves its own philosophical theory of religion better than religion, and labors more earnestly for its diffusion, rejecting from its communion individuals of acknowledged piety because they do not acquiesce in its opinions. It is the natural tendency of human philosophy thus ever to magnify itself against the simplicity of the truth, and completely to supplant the gospel in the hearts and minds of men. It is on this very account that the present reformatory movement was designed to banish it entirely from the precincts of Christianity, and abandoning all speculations, to enjoin nothing upon any one as a ‘matter of faith or duty for which there could not be produced a ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ either in express terms or by approved scripture precedent.”

“That the maintenance and inculcation of the above philosophy of faith is a plain departure from this great principle of the reformation, is obvious. For it is nowhere propounded in the Holy Scriptures, and it is not in the power of its advocates to show that Christ or the apostles have anywhere announced ‘facts’ as the ultimate object and terminus of the Christian faith, or that they have ever propounded such a philosophy of faith as this, that it consists in a simple conviction of the historic truth of facts. Could such Scripture authority be produced, it would end all controversy on the subject, and there would be no need of endless disquisitions upon this favorite topic.

“The absence of Scripture authority for this theory, is of course, on our own principles, a sufficient reason why it should be denied a place in the presentation of the gospel. But the propriety of this will be still more manifest when we consider it more closely, as we shall find it actually at variance with express Scripture teachings, and calculated in itself to prevent those who embrace it from ever attaining to the true Christian faith. This last end it readily accomplishes by becoming a substitute for that faith itself, since men are prone to mistake the adoption of a *theory* of faith for *faith*. But even when this is not the case, when the theory is really applied in its fullest extent, it must necessarily prove a barrier in the way, since it leads the mind to adopt *facts* as the object of the Christian faith, and as the legitimate *terminus* of its contemplations. The facts, whatever their nature, will be

viewed in the light of this theory, as *facts simply*, rather than in regard to their personal and practical bearings, and the mind, convinced that the mere recognition of their historic truth is a true and sufficient faith, will rest in this and seek not to go beyond it. The question to which this theory naturally tends to confine the mind is, Are the facts true? This being decided in the affirmative, the mind rests content, reposing upon its acquiescence in the verity of the facts for salvation, without having any tendency to make a legitimate application of the facts themselves. - To stop short thus, with the mere admission of the truthfulness of the gospel narrative, is to remain wholly destitute of the Christian faith, for which the individual has neither desire nor hope, and to attain which he makes no effort, for the simple reason that he supposes himself already in possession of it.

"If any one be disposed to doubt that there are many who thus mistake a mere acquiescence in the truth of the gospel facts for Christian faith, he must have either a very inaccurate perception of the existing state of things, or be himself deeply imbued with this same false philosophy. It is this theory which manifestly constitutes the very essence of *orthodoxy* in the estimation of many scribes; and which, coupled with the usual glorification of the 'word alone,' and spiced with the savory condiment of ridicule of 'spiritual operations,' forms the *stabulum* of a multitude of essays, declamations, and orations. The attempt is made to establish this theory as the *chief feature of the reformation*, and to make its adoption a test of orthodoxy or soundness in the faith. For this class of persons have an 'orthodoxy,' as clearly defined and as inexorable in its demands as that of any sect in Christendom. There is no such thing as a universal orthodoxy. Each party is orthodox to itself alone, whatever charity may pretend. The theory of each sect is its own orthodoxy, for which it contends with far greater earnestness than for the important matters of salvation. The class to which we refer, adopting the above theory of faith as *their* standard of correctness, have learned, like ancient Israel, to do as those who are round about them.

"I am aware that the particular point now under consideration is one of great delicacy, and that, as there are comparatively few whose minds are accustomed to make those distinctions which are essential in such cases, one is naturally exposed, in treating them, to hasty misconstruction and misrepresentation. Let the reader, however, have patience with me, and I will render to him his due. I have to regret, indeed, that the Harbinger can convey it to him only by piece-meal in monthly instalments, and that these, being separated, and presenting but a single aspect of the subject, are the more liable to be misinterpreted. But it is my design to consider the matter in various lights, and to examine also certain specious and dangerous philosophies of an opposite character from that before us, in order that my views of the *whole* subject may be understood.

"I have just said that there are certain distinctions which are essential to a clear comprehension of matters like that now under our view. I would add, that these distinctions are often extremely nice, and that

it is hence difficult to render them evident to the common mind. This, however, does not detract from their value. They are not on that account, less essential to the knowledge and enjoyment of the truth. In all things that are *radical*, *fundamental*, or *elementary*, distinctions are of necessity minute, because the things to be distinguished are so. A variation of a single degree from the true bearing at the starting point, though scarcely appreciable in the beginning, will make a most palpable divergence in the end. The difference between the germinative vesicle in the egg from which a serpent is produced, and in that which gives origin to a bird of Paradise is wholly inappreciable at the earliest period of development, but there is no difficulty whatever in distinguishing from each other the things respectively evolved. Now faith is the very germ of religion, and a mistake here, in this most elementary matter, however slight, or even imperceptible at first, must necessarily issue in an ever-widening divergency from the truth, and may ultimately produce a result as different from the one desired, as is a serpent from the magnificent bird which displays its gorgeous plumes amidst the aromatic groves of the isles of Arroo.

"I have not the slightest desire to be hypercritical or censorious, but being convinced, from long continued and careful observation of the progress of affairs, that many labor under the mistake above indicated in relation to the actual nature of the Christian faith, I think it most important that it should be clearly pointed out to those at least who are disposed to learn 'the way of God more perfectly.' The evils resulting from this error have, I think, become sufficiently obvious, to forbid any doubt as to its character and its ultimate tendency, however slightly it may seem to vary from the truth in its inception.

"Let it be observed, then, that the true Christian faith reaches *beyond* the recorded facts to the PERSON concerning whom the facts are related. It is CHRIST himself, and not any, nor all of the facts in his history, that is the true and proper object of his faith. But the error which we are considering, makes the facts themselves the terminus of faith, and thus prevents the mind from attaining to that personal trust or reliance in which faith essentially consists. When facts themselves are made the object of faith, the mind, as we before remarked, stops there, and relies on them as having some innate or inherent power to effect salvation. The person is forgotten and left out of view. The action is contemplated, and not the actor. Faith itself is misconceived as confidence in the truth of facts when it is trust in the love and power of a *person*. Whatever prevents the attainment of this personal trust, is a hindrance to faith. If the mere truth of facts is substituted for it, true faith is wanting.

"It is, indeed, undeniable, that a belief of the facts related concerning Christ, is essential to the Christian faith. A belief of the facts is the very *basis* of this faith, but it does not *constitute* this faith. The facts are important, as they lead the heart to trust—the soul to rely on Christ. They are not an *end* but a *means* of faith. *They are themselves, indeed, the testimony on which true faith rests.* We trust, be-

cause of the facts which have been presented to us. They are presented upon evidence, but they are themselves the evidences of our faith.

"Thus we believe the recorded actions and miracles of Christ. We believe the attested facts that he died for our sins, was buried and rose again according to the prophecies of the ancient Scriptures, as set forth in the gospel. These form the basis of our trust in Christ as our Savior. These facts were recorded not merely that we might believe *them*, as would have been the case if our faith was to terminate upon the facts, but that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing [*this*, and not the facts only] we might have life through his name. Here the personal nature and terminus of faith is clearly stated. It does not terminate on the facts recorded, but these are recorded that our faith might reach forward to something else—to something which is not recorded; to something which could not be recorded; to something which passes wholly beyond the vision of this wretched objective philosophy under review, even to the power, the love, the personal and official character of our blessed Redeemer himself, realized *subjectively* in the inner consciousness and affections of the soul. Of this *something* that is more than the belief of facts; this something which is not and cannot be recorded in the material forms which alone the sensualistic philosophy admits, we have a noble illustration in the case of the father of the child possessed of the dumb spirit. It was this something which words could not express so well as tears, and which caused him to utter that remarkable sentence, 'Lord, I believe; help thou my unbelief,'—an utterance emanating from the inner spiritual being; an appeal which, in the very confession of unbelief, evinces the truest faith; a personal application which is a clear and unerring exponent of the nature of that faith—a *trust in Jesus*. This alone is the Christian faith. The belief of the facts recorded, is now necessary to it, but the belief of facts is not *it*. The Christian faith has thus with us a historical basis, but the belief of history is not the Christian faith.

"Nowhere in the Scripture is the Christian faith spoken of as a belief in facts. Every where is it referred to as a belief (*εις*) on or into Christ. 'Dost thou,' said Jesus himself to the man who had been born blind, 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' He does not ask 'Dost thou believe facts?' Nor does the one addressed in turn inquire, 'What are the facts?' but 'Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him.' He asks for a person in whom to trust, and to his heart, prepared to trust, a simple declaration was then sufficient: 'Thou hast both seen him and it is he that talketh with thee.' And, he said, 'Lord, I believe, and he worshipped him.'

"Let it here be observed that neither this individual, nor the many others who are expressly stated to have 'believed on Christ' during his personal ministry, had heard the gospel facts, strictly so called, at all. These facts had not yet occurred, and, though predicted, were not anticipated, nor were they comprehended, as to their true nature, until after the ascension of Christ. Yet many are said to have 'believed on him,' and various individuals, as the Centurion and the Canaanitish



woman, are highly commended for their faith by our Lord himself, and although it is not to be for a moment supposed that this rested upon the facts of the gospel, there was not only no defect in their faith, but it was of the noblest, truest and purest character. All such cases, however, will be at once comprehended, when it is perceived that the Christian faith is not the belief of the gospel facts, but a *simple trusting in Christ as the Son of God*. This trust, we see from Scripture, may be based upon *prophecy*, as in the case of Philip, (Jno i: 45), upon *special revelation* as in that of Simeon, (Luke ii: 26), and the Shepherds, (ver. 11); upon the *divine wisdom of his teaching* as in that of the Samaritans, (Jno. iv: 42); upon *miracle* as in that of the nobleman at Capernaum, (Jno. iv: 48-53); upon *sensible demonstration* as in the case of Thomas, (Jno. xx: 25-27-28); or upon *presentation of the entire plan of redemption* embodied in the *gospel facts* as in the case of the multitudes who were converted during the ministry of the Apostles and of all who have been converted since; the record of the love of God, as exhibited in the gospel, being now the only real and legitimate basis of our faith.

"That the Christian faith, however, is not the mere reception of the historic testimony, but a subsequent result of this, is exhibited strikingly and in few words by Paul when he says to the Ephesians that the Jewish converts who 'first TRUSTED in Christ' had obtained an inheritance in him, 'in whom,' he adds, 'ye also TRUSTED after that ye heard the Word of truth, the gospel of your salvation.' With them, 'faith came by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God,' but it did not consist in either hearing or receiving the Word as true, but it was a *trusting in Christ*, based upon the gospel facts—a *personal* and not a mere *logical* reliance; an assurance of the *heart*, and not a mere conviction of the *head*, or *ordinary understanding* which is all that is concerned in the verification of facts. It would, indeed, be absurd to speak of 'trusting' in facts or believing *into* or *on* (εἰς) facts. We trust or believe in *persons*. We also believe persons and we believe facts, but such belief is never in the Scriptures confounded with the Christian faith. The use of the preposition εἰς to express the relation of belief to Christ is a matter of so frequent and, indeed, constant occurrence in the New Testament, that it is surprising to me how it can be so generally overlooked. Surely in connexion with belief it does not lose that well marked significance of which so much is said when it occurs in the formula of baptism.

"To make the difference still more clear we would further remark that if faith consisted in the belief of historic facts, it could admit of no *increase*. It might in one sense be enlarged in its *extent*, provided we could increase the *number* of facts believed. But as the gospel facts do not admit of any addition, it is impossible for such a faith to be increased in this way. It is equally impossible for it ever to be increased in *degree*, for when the gospel facts are once received as true, this faith has attained its highest power. The facts can never be received as more than true. They must be sincerely believed in the very first profession of faith, and never afterwards can be more than sincerely believed, Hence this faith can never be increased in degree.

But the Christian faith is a growing and increasing principle of religious life and action, and consequently a mere historical belief of facts cannot be the Christian faith.

"When, however, we understand the Christian faith to be a *trusting in Christ* we may comprehend how it admits of increase. We are induced to trust in Christ from our conviction of the truth of the gospel in the first instance, and under the influence of this reliance upon Christ we give ourselves up to his guidance and enter into fellowship with him, into the nearest and most intimate spiritual relations. The more we know of him, the more we experience of his infinite love, mercy, wisdom, and power, the more we confide in him—the more reason we have to trust in him. As our trust in those who are worthy increases, the better we become acquainted with them, so does our faith in Christ increase the more we have fellowship with him—the more we learn of him—the more we experience of his perfections. An increase of faith thus depends, not upon external and remote testimony, upon mere declarations of ancient witnesses, but upon *an actual and present Christian life*, which itself springing from faith, produces faith, as the grain of corn produces the stalk which in turn produces the 'full corn in the ear.' The righteousness of God is thus revealed in the gospel from faith unto faith, and it is thus most truthfully and appropriately written, 'the just shall live by faith.' As the powers of life, feeble in the infant, increase in strength up to manhood, so does faith or trust in Christ, the very life of the Christian soul, grow in capacity and power, the more it is exercised during that spiritual progress which is at once the indication of its presence, and the means of its own development. And faith thus increases in perfect harmony with all the Christian graces—and necessarily involves their increase, as the extension of the roots of a tree is accompanied by a corresponding development of its branches, its flowers or fruits.\* An increase in knowledge is indispensable to the growth of faith. He must be a poor *disciple*, indeed, who has ceased to learn from so competent a teacher as Christ. In order to healthful growth, the intellect must be constantly gaining new insight into the sacred mysteries presented in the gospel, and a more accurate and clear comprehension of the Scripture teaching. The more deeply the soul becomes imbued with this divine knowledge, the more faith it has in Christ the more it can trust him as a teacher; because it is the more impressed with the wisdom of his instructions, with 'the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God.' But the false philosophy of faith which we are endeavoring to expose, admitting of no increase of faith, necessarily arrests all spiritual progress. It produces, as the thoughtful and pious brethren every where must notice, a perfect *stagnation* in every thing appertaining to Christianity. No progress is made in the religious life; there is no growth in knowledge or in grace. Its advocates have not a new thought, drawn from the Sacred Scriptures,

---

\*"We are bound to thank God always for you, brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity of every one of you all towards each other aboundeth."—2 Thess. 1: 3.

with which to gladden the soul. If they are writers or preachers they continue to *repeat themselves* from year to year without the slightest improvement. They are ready to argue, debate, discuss, at all times, in the usual round of the stereotyped philosophy, into which their minds have been cast, and will spend hours in the earnest defence of their favorite theories, but are indisposed to converse either with their own hearts or with one of the spiritually-minded brethren, for five minutes, upon the character, the sayings, the doings, the perfections of Christ, or upon their own inward and spiritual state. In the absence of a prayerful, humble, thoughtful, earnest spirit; a teachable and inquiring mind; a persevering and daily devotional study of the Bible, and the consolations and aids of the Holy Spirit, what manifestation is to be expected of religious light or life of spiritual progress or enjoyment?

"To return, however, I would remark further before leaving this part of my subject, that if the Christian faith was the *direct* result of testimony as the theory in question supposes, then the degree of faith would depend upon the amount of testimony. It is certainly true that where there is no testimony there is no faith, for here the basis on which alone faith can be built is wanting. But is it true that where there is the *most* testimony there is the *most* faith? Does a foundation necessarily imply a building? And do men never begin to build without being able to finish? or possess a foundation on which they do not even begin to erect a superstructure? The Savior's rule for the estimation of faith would, indeed, seem to be very different from that required by this philosophy. It is, indeed, the very reverse, and hence it is so far from being true that where there is the most testimony there is the most faith, that the very opposite appears in the various cases in which the faith of individuals is commended. In these it would appear that the faith was *great* because the evidence was, in regard to that presented to others, comparatively *small*; or, in other words, because with a very moderate amount of evidence, there was exhibited a ready and confiding trust. That child-like and ingenuous condition of mind which 'hopeth all things,' 'and believeth all things,' is most pleasing to God. I would not be understood to say, however, that faith should ever be *out of proportion* as compared with the testimony on which it rests. We may have testimony without faith, as we may have a foundation without any building. Or we may have much testimony and little faith, as we may have a large and wide foundation with a very low and mean building upon it. Or, finally, we may have less testimony and greater faith, as we may have a smaller foundation with a more noble and lofty superstructure. This last is the faith commended by our Lord. The first is the sort approved by our sensualistic philosophers. They seem to think that a foundation necessarily implies a building, or that the foundation will naturally, and of itself, grow up into a building. This is one extreme. The opposite one is that of some of the popular religious parties who seem to think that faith is something communicated by a direct spiritual supernatural operation, without, or independent of testimony. This is to have a superstructure without any foundation, which, when people exercise

common sense, (as they, by the by, too seldom do in religious matters) they regard very justly as a 'castle in the air.' There is again, an approximate error, which consists in believing more than the testimony warrants. This is credulity, and is fitly represented by a building too large for the basis on which it rests.

"It will be, then, apparent how true and just is the plea so forcibly urged by the advocates of the present reformation, *that testimony is indispensably necessary to faith*. This has been so often and so clearly presented, especially by Bro. Campbell, that we regard it as placed for the future beyond the reach of controversy. And we cannot sufficiently estimate the vast amount of benefit which has resulted to religious society in general from the establishment of this single position, which is at once a guard against fanaticism and a security for truth.

During the discussions which have occurred in relation to his matter, great emphasis has very properly been placed upon *testimony* and upon *fact* in opposition to the animal excitements and idle dreams which modern religion has introduced as substitutes; but, so far as the argument is concerned, it has not been thought necessary to trace the relation of testimony further than to the facts themselves. It is of this that our sensualistic philosophers have taken advantage, so as to make the impression that faith is regarded as resting immediately upon testimony, while the truth is, that the facts rest upon the testimony, and that faith rests upon the facts. Facts then, stand in pretty much the same relation to faith, as testimony does to facts, and it is this link in the chain, *connecting believed facts with Christ himself*, that is wanting in the scheme of these philosophers. Now the absence of that single link is sufficient to dis sever the soul from Christ.

"In endeavoring to elucidate this important matter, we have shown from the Divine testimony that the Christian faith is belief on Christ, a trusting in Christ, a personal reliance. We have seen, that in this view of its nature alone, faith may be increased so as to effect spiritual progress, and I would here remark further, that it is in this scriptural view of it alone, we can clearly comprehend how it is that 'with the heart, man believeth unto righteousness.' To 'believe with the heart,' here is not to believe *sincerely*, as some imagine who fail to perceive that 'heart' is here in antithesis with 'mouth' in the next clause of the sentence, and that it represents the inner nature with its powers and affections. Faith being understood as a trusting, the meaning is clear, for it is with the *heart* we trust. Trust is inseparable from *regard*. In whatever respect we trust an individual, in that respect we have regard or esteem for him. Faith then in relation to Christ, is necessarily associated with the affections, and it is, thus, part of its very nature that 'it worketh by love.' No one has a right to philosophize and make distinctions unknown to Scripture, as to any numerical order of succession in the origin of the religious convictions and emotions of the soul. These may be simultaneous, for aught we know, as our perceptions and our instincts seem to be, and there

may be no succession, but a perfect synchronism. If there be a succession, it is for the *philosopher* to define and mark out the intervals by his chronometer, but it is for the *Christian* to trust in Christ, and to hearken with reverence to the indications of his word. Moreover, it is his duty to keep his mind wholly free from that vain philosophy which, as we have formerly shown, seeks to resolve spirit into word, and which, as we now see, would fain reduce the Christian faith to the mere historic belief of facts, divesting Christianity of its energizing life, its beautiful trust, and its saving power.

"But I must close, and I cannot do it more appropriately than with the following forcible sentences from the pen of Bro. Campbell, in the last number of the Harbinger.

"The foundation of the Christian Church is not a creed—is not a philosophy—is not a mere polity; but a grand official personage, a Divine personage, as human as Divine and as Divine as human—Emmanuel.' 'It is a living faith in the Divine person, mission and sacrifice of Jesus the Christ that capacitates a fallen man for a mansion in the skies. Philosophies, orthodoxies, abstractions, have no place in the oracles of God, enter not into the Christian faith, hope or love, and are not to be demanded of any man preliminary to his baptism, or to his personal introduction into the church of the Lord Jesus Christ.'"  
R. R.

### THIRD REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERT RICHARDSON.

COURTEOUS READER:—Although some have intimated that we were hasty in our judgment of the new theology, Prof. Richardson fails not in each number to approach nearer to the legitimate tendencies of his system. On witnessing his course in the July Harbinger, we had thought we would not more than respectfully refer to his effort; but some of our best brethren said, "No; if these things are true, we have no further use for the Bible, and we desire to have the whole teaching examined." We have, therefore, laid the entire essay before our readers. We present our views of this teaching, and if they are wrong we are willing to have them exposed.

Hitherto our main purpose has been to show what this strange doctrine is; but we think it now due to the cause to examine a few of its features with reference to their practical bearings.

We consider no labored argument requisite, and, therefore, our notes shall be brief.

1st. The caption of these essays,

"FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY,"

implies that Prof. Richardson is teaching *Faith in opposition to Philosophy*. But do the facts in the case warrant such a conclusion? At the very outset, Prof. Richardson made an effort to connect us with the



system of induction—discursive reason—deducing conclusions from facts, as inculcated by Francis Bacon, John Locke, and all others who have been of the least service as teachers of the world. At the same time his purpose has been to introduce a dreamy and mystic philosophy, which professes to arrive at *truth* by the “inner consciousness” and independent of facts and arguments. All who know any thing of the German, French and American higher-law view are aware that its friends repudiate and despise all law and all constituted authority. Such persons must see, that Doctor Robert Richardson and his coadjutors have not only taken the initiatory steps, but they are to all intents and purposes, teachers of this *philosophy*. They attack philosophy *in word*, while they endeavor to teach it *in fact*.

2d. We fully agree with Prof. Richardson, that “*the investigation in which we are engaged is one of the utmost practical importance. The questions have respect to the very life of religion, and they must be settled before any progress can be made.*”

The questions are so vital, that if the teaching of Prof. Richardson and friends is true, all that has been done in the last half century to convert the world by the Living Oracles is delusive; and we must now reluctantly admit that God has not owned our labor. Worse still, we are required to adandon our senses, our “*ordinary understanding*,” the written word—indeed the Bible—for the fables of Neologists and direct Spiritualists. The brethren will see before “the case is disposed of” that a clear elucidation of the questions at issue is of momentous consequence to Christians.

3d. We call the particular attention of the brethren and friends to Prof. Richardson’s statements regarding the difficulties in inculcating his system, owing to the *exceeding obtuseness of his readers*. He says:

“*I am aware that the particular point now under consideration (Faith not through the word alone) is one of great delicacy, and that as there are comparatively few whose minds are accustomed to make those distinctions which are essential in such cases, one is naturally exposed in treating them, to hasty misconstruction and misrepresentation.*” He says again: “*These distinctions are extremely nice, and it is hence difficult to render them evident to the common mind.*”

It will be observed, that Prof. Richardson is preparing the way for charging such as may oppose his new doctrine with “*misconstruction and misrepresentation.*” In all sincerity, we tell Prof. Richardson that we understand him perfectly—we know the whole system, and we will not designedly “*misconstrue*” his teaching in the least particular. We

deem it due to ourself, however, and an act of justice to the Disciples in Tennessee, who have suffered "death oft" from the influence of this crazy and haughty system, to mention, in the most respectful terms, that we have heard of one person who intimated that we *did not understand* Prof. Richardson. Such an insinuation we cannot suffer thus to pass unnoticed. It is an unfair course of warfare upon us, and we beg the preachers of "this reformation" if they are friends of the system to say so plainly. We wish to know our brethren, and we say, in all kindness, that while we regard the word of God as the only authority in religion, we can fraternize with no one who countenances the new theology. It is the most dangerous form of infidelity known to man. It is covert, it is insinuating and it is double faced. But the reader must see, that if the "*questions are of too delicate a character and the distinctions too extremely nice, to be rendered evident to the common mind,*" they differ widely from the questions and distinctions of the scriptures of truth. Men of great soul and great intellect never thought of important questions being too abstruse for "*the common mind.*" Why does not Prof. Richardson speak plainly, and tell his readers that the "*distinctions*" of his new system are entirely too abstruse for plain Christian people? We have never noticed an effort made by the friends of this system, in which the first attempt was not to convince those addressed that they were exceedingly ignorant, blind and incapable of seeing its beauties. "The common people heard the Savior gladly," and the way of the Lord was to be so plain that a "fool should not err therein." The beauty and transcendent glory of the Christian religion consists in its matchless simplicity; and in its entire appropriateness to the understanding and wants of such erring and fallen creatures as ourselves. From the days of Simon, the Magician, who "bewitched the people of Samaria by giving out that he was some great one," to this hour, men have deceived their fellows and themselves by affecting wisdom above what is written. This mere pretense affords indubitable evidence of the danger of the theory.

3d. Regarding FAITH, Prof. Richardson makes some remarkable statements.

1. He thinks the brethren have greatly erred in making "Faith consist in the belief of the facts of the Gospel." In reply, we regard it respectful to say, that "Jesus of Nazareth commissioned his apostles to 'Go into all the world and preach the gospel'—the facts concerning his birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension to the throne of the universe; and no "*nice distinctions difficult to render evident to the com-*

*mon mind.*" These facts, wherever believed, proved the power of God unto salvation.

2. Prof. Richardson speaks of something he regards as a dangerous "philosophy" which teaches, that "*the power resides in the facts believed.*" Why does not Prof. Richardson tell Alexander Campbell at once, that all his teaching on this subject is false? Does he lack independence? Brother Campbell says, "No testimony, no faith; for faith is only the belief of testimony, or confidence in testimony as true." Again he says, "The value of faith is in the importance of the facts which the testimony presents." "True faith is the belief of truth," says he. To conclude the matter, Brother Campbell says, "If faith purifies the heart, works by love, and overcomes the world, *this power is in the facts believed.*" If Prof. Richardson would take his position openly in opposition to the teaching of the brethren, we might respect him for his honest independence, but we are not pleased at his apparent readiness to advocate at the same time two systems—direct faith, and faith through testimony—as opposite as the poles. To our mind contradiction is the most striking feature of his essays.

3. He reaches the climax of his system and new discovery regarding faith, in charging some of having "Announced facts as the ultimate object and terminus of the Christian's faith;" and in stating "That the true Christian faith reaches *beyond* the recorded facts, to the *person* concerning whom the facts are related." "Christ," says he, "is the proper object of faith." Does Prof. Richardson intend to insinuate that our brethren are simpletons? He regards "his distinctions too nice" for the "common mind"! We have been in the gospel field almost thirty years, and we testify that we have never found a man or woman, black or white, so consummately ignorant as to suppose the "*facts are the ultimate objects of faith,*" or that Christian faith could exist short of belief with all the heart on the Savior, or confidence in the person of our Blessed Redeemer. On this subject we have always delighted to quote the words of our Lord, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." These living words needed no expounder in the days of the apostles. Why, in the name of all that is good, will Prof. Richardson combat a phantom? Some of our colored brethren recently waited on us to say, that they knew of no son of Ham in all these borders who regard the mere facts of the Bible as the objects of their faith. They all *trust* in the Lord Jehovah, who is the Father of all, and in his Son, our Blessed Savior, who is exalted to the right hand of God. Christians

love God with all the heart, soul and strength, and they regard the word of God as the lamp of life, the sure word of prophecy that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

4. But to prove that "faith consists not in the belief of (*through*, it should be. T. F.) historic facts," he says, "*It could admit of no increase.*"

When we read these words we did really hope that Prof. Richardson might possibly be able to suggest something, at least new in form, regarding the growth of faith; but we have looked in vain. He gives us no new light. He says: "*We trust in Christ from our conviction of the truth of the gospel.*" This is what we all have taught, "*and under the influence of this reliance*" he adds, "*we give ourselves up to his guidance and enter into fellowship with him, into the nearest and most intimate spiritual relations.*" "*The more we know of him*—(But Prof. Richardson is arguing against *knowledge* increasing faith)—"*the more we experience of his infinite love, mercy and wisdom. As our trust in those who are worthy, increases the better we become acquainted with them, so does our faith in Christ increase the more we have fellowship with him, the more we learn of him*—(this is fatal)—*the more we experience of his perfection.*"

It is apparent that Prof. Richardson is fighting a shadow. He presumes that men can comprehend the whole length, breadth, height and depth of the meaning of the gospel at first glance—a thing impossible—and that consequently no growth of faith can take place from their influence; yet he admits an increase of faith from "learning more" of the Savior. Whilst we are not disposed to object to some things said by Prof. Richardson on this point, we are quite as well pleased with the teaching of the apostles, to which we respectfully invite attention.

Paul speaks of the faith of the Thessalonians growing *exceedingly* under persecution and tribulations, and Peter says, "The word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. Wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies and all evil speaking, as new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word that you may grow thereby." What is this sincere milk of the word, by which babes in Christ grow but "*the love of the tru'h*," by which we are saved? But says the Apostle, "God shall send," some, "strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth." Condemnation results from a failure to believe the truth. But we forbear. Christians grow

in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, and their faith increases in exact proportion to their devotion to the Lord's word and the Lord's service in the church.

But it strikes us that Professor Richardson is endeavoring to expose a heartless, soulless, unfeeling, ignorant, sensual, and materialistic people, who do not exist amongst the disciples of Christ. There is a meaning, however, in this which must be obvious.

5. Professor Richardson, in his sixth essay, seems to rise above the "ordinary understanding" to "something which is more than a belief of facts;" "something which is not and cannot be recorded in material forms"—forms of words—to something "*realized subjectively,—in the inner consciousness,*" and he finally attains to a region in which he speaks of the "order and origin of the religious convictions and emotions of the soul," as possibly being "simultaneous, as our perceptions and instincts," and so soon as he rises with his pupils in Missouri to a state in which an "Innate faculty, with his instincts, furnishes the primary data of all knowledge," there will be no room to doubt as to his religious position.

6. But last, and worst of all, Prof. Richardson quotes from Alexander Campbell to sustain his system, when he certainly knows that Bro. Campbell never taught, or admitted the truth of such doctrine. From the first line in the Christian Baptist to the last line in the Millennial Harbinger, there is not a full sentence from the pen of President Campbell that gives the least countenance to the infidel teaching of Cousin, Strauss, Newman, and Theodore Parker, recently adopted, we regret to say, by men we once regarded as Christians and sincere friends to the Church of Christ. But *facts alone* have changed our mind, and we regret most earnestly their existence.

We have spoken with as much leniency as the subject seemed to us to admit, and our fervent prayer to God is, that his servants may be "kept back from presumptuous sins."

T. F.

#### PERSONAL.

In reply to many kind brethren, who have earnestly urged us to spend more of our time in the gospel field, we take this means of assuring them that we not only appreciate their motives, but we are making every effort in our power to narrow down our worldly engagements, and so soon as we can see Franklin College so organized as to relieve us from our hitherto weighty responsibilities, it will afford us heartfelt satisfaction to consecrate whatever ability we may possess, in a more direct manner, to the cause of Christianity.

T. FANNING.



## SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS.—NO. 5.

## MONTHLY MEETINGS.

It is evident, I suppose, that the prime object, on the part of the evangelist, in his monthly engagements generally, is to gain support. Hence the connection between monthly preaching and the support of evangelists. *Generally*, I say, not always. Some are, no doubt, far superior to such considerations, while others, with equally good heads and hearts, make monthly engagements for stipulated salaries, when the salaries are secondary considerations. Nor would I be understood as saying, that those who allow the salary to be the *main* cause of their engagement, are not equal in every good quality and grace to the best. Circumstances may, perhaps, cause them to *think* it best for them to go where the largest sum is offered, if they can, though they must travel far, and pass by many poor churches, and neglect many urgent opportunities to do good. Still there is something about monthly evangelical engagements for money so exceedingly suspicious, that it is somewhat difficult to avoid associating the *hireling* with them. "And unto the poor the gospel is preached," will come before the mind, especially when *large* sums are received, and the poor and better opportunities for doing good are neglected.

The churches, too, we are liable to regard as *selfish*, particularly since it is generally true, that the churches best able to pay for monthly preaching are, also, best able to do without it: they have larger numbers, more wealth, and hence it is easier for them to get a congregation, and overcome prejudice and persecution; and *they* not unfrequently think they have more sense, more education and general intelligence, etc. The poor sometimes conclude, that it is because they are able to hire others, that they are not more ready to lay their own hands to the "hewing of wood and drawing of water." They think it so generally with the rich, cases only here and there excepted. For themselves, poor souls, they work as the only chance, feeling that no thanks are due them, and that, upon the whole, they may be the better for their *misfortunes*. They think that if these rich churches were really like the first church, they would, besides doing their own preaching and teaching, raise up, educate, send out and sustain evangelists to reap the world-harvest; that if they could not send out some of their own members as Evangelists, they might sustain some poor evangelist, who, for want of support, is not doing much, and allow him to enter the doors, and occupy the fields opened and prepared by the Lord of the harvest that they are rather calling in those sounding out the word of the

Lord, etc. Hence an unpleasant feeling between the rich and poor churches.

There is, however, something worthy of consideration in *regular* appointments, whether monthly or semi-monthly, weekly or quarterly; and when *all abuses* are guarded against this regularity should be secured, if possible, in all church services. Suppose a congregation to meet every Lord's day, and observe the ordinances, the members generally attending, whether the evangelist is present or not, that when he is present, he preaches the gospel, and encourages the congregation to go on with their own worship; that if he takes part in the regular weekly worship, he does it as a *servant*, and not as the *pastor* of the church, in the present popular sense of the term; that he holds himself ready to aid in more perfectly setting in order whatever may be wanting, to continue the meeting, if need be, to visit, etc., always as the servant of the church, and always putting the church *forward*, giving it credit, acting by its authority, and securing respect for it in his absence; then, I suppose, there could be no reasonable objection to his monthly meetings, provided there might not be more good accomplished by the same labor elsewhere; nor could there be any objection to his receiving a reasonable amount of money, or food and raiment, proportioned, somewhat, to his labors and his expenses. I say not his *necessities*, for I think an evangelist has a right to receive an amount *sufficient* for his support, though he might live without it.

Perhaps I should leave others to say what is the course, and what the influence exerted by the common hired monthly preaching. But I am free to give my opinion, risk what I may. I knew one evangelist to travel near two hundred miles to a monthly appointment, for a time, and the church, or at least the wiser part of it, concluded they were the worse for his visits. Another evangelist had his monthly meetings near enough generally, if not always, for him to make the entire trip, and perform the entire labor on Lord's day, so that he lost no time, more than other people, in attending church. During the week he attended closely to his merchandise, and did, I believe, a very thriving business. Still he received, as I learned, a pretty fair support for his Sunday labors. Others receive more or less for similar labors, which, instead of hindering, perhaps in some instances aids their other business.

I desire no war with any one, nor would I bring the labors of evangelists into disrepute. They are not generally appreciated as they should be. I scarcely know an evangelist, really devoting himself to

evangelising, who is properly supported. Indeed, such are not generally, so far as I have learned, supported as well as the mere monthly preacher, who devotes nearly or quite all the time the Lord allows him for the purpose to the increase of his earthly store, and with as much earnestness as others! In fact, if a man lives by the gospel, he must, with rare exceptions, do it by one of three ways: 1. Traveling and holding *successful* protracted meetings—adding many to the church. 2. Occupying the place, and doing the work, to a large extent, of a sectarian *pastor*. 3. Holding monthly meetings where the largest sums are offered, or where the pay is best. This last is decidedly the best plan for support, for many reasons. Churches will pay more for such labor than for any other. It allows more time for other things. The marriage fees will be greater, and the traveling expenses and loss on account of absence from home will be less. Hence the *popularity* of such monthly preaching. I do not expect to see it broken up. It would be almost as easy to destroy the love of money. Few things could be more unpopular than opposition to the popular hired monthly preaching. I may have presumed too much in daring to launch my feeble bark with such freight; but if it is blown to atoms and sunk, I trust the atmosphere will be somewhat purified by the explosion.

Each congregation anciently had a plurality of *pastors*. We profess to follow the apostolic examples and precepts. Still we, like our neighbors whom we would reform, have *one* pastor only for our *city* churches, and *four churches* for one pastor in the *country*! Very often, too, these pastors, (*we* call them *evangelists*, sometimes,) are not always very rich—not half so good as that which our stock find even in the parched and thirsty prairies! It may not be prudent to suggest the possibility of *poison* in the most popular evangelical pastures of the age in which we live. Nor need we say 'tis no wonder the flocks are no larger, stronger, or more healthy. Like pastors like flocks, is the natural order. It would be absurd to expect it otherwise.

But as I have not learned, like "*parson Brownlow*" and other *political parsons*, to say hard things quaintly, or at all softly, I may, for the present, at least, drop the *parsons and pastors* just here together, as twin brothers or nearer akin.

In my own monthly engagements, I have had the privilege of going elsewhere when I thought, upon the whole, more good would result by it; and I am free to say, I could not allow myself to lose this privilege—to sell it for any sum.

Nearly eight years ago, I knew a congregation to have the labors of

two evangelists monthly—preaching twice a month—by those they regarded as amongst the ablest evangelists in the country—and the evangelists of no country surpassed those in that. The preachers were paid liberally, and all went on without the least dissatisfaction, I believe, and with, at least, as much good as common. The other Lord's days the church met without an evangelist, had Sunday school, Bible class, broke the loaf, exhorted one another, sung, prayed, and made contributions—all just as when the evangelists were present, except the *sermon* and the other labors of the preachers. I asked one of the most intelligent members—a candid, sensible man—whether he thought the church was more profited the days they had preaching, or the days they met without. He promptly answered in favor of their own meetings. There was, however, a *worldly class of members* and some of the world, who would not attend without preaching. It was customary—fashionable, and they must have it. I have now before me a letter from an intelligent physician, who says of the congregation with which he worships, that they are, except for the world, quite independent of the preachers. Indeed, I have talked over the matter with several of their members, and they say they generally learn more when the preacher is absent. There are many such congregations; nor can there be any reason, I think, why all may not do better without the *common* labors of the *common* evangelists—(*pastors?*)—except as they may *aid* in the conversion of sinners occasionally. Young churches, of course, for a time need aid, as in ancient times—the evangelist laboring continuously to “commit the word to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also”—that is, to qualify men for the bishop's office.

A few conclusions, or inferences from the facts before us, may end these articles.

C. K.

Salado, Bell county, Texas, June 12, 1857.

REMARK.—No congregation can long breath the Spirit of God, but in the performance of the only service favorable to its enjoyment. The members must be “*living stones*.”

T. F.

---

#### A BAPTIST “EXPERIENCE”—REPENTANCE BEFORE FAITH—GOSPEL ORDER TRANSPOSED.

By a very common illusion of the sight, when a ship on the ocean is approaching the shore, the ship appears stationary and the shore seems to be moving towards the ship. For many years past our Bap-

tist friends have been evidently approaching us in sentiment and practice, but it seems to be generally unknown to, or unperceived by themselves. That we are coming nearer together, is as obvious to them as to us; but they will have it to be the other way, and that it is we who are going to them, instead of them coming to us. Well, we are willing for them to have it as they please; and hope that their ship will continue moving on towards the shore, until they land safely upon the *terra firma* of the gospel, and get rid of the stormy sea of sectarianism, where so many of these sectarian crafts are afloat, and so many of them have been wrecked! In fact, as has been justly remarked, there is not a pulpit in the land, but has felt, to a greater or less degree, the influence of the principles and teaching of the current Reformation.

We have been led to these remarks, by witnessing the proceedings of a Baptist meeting, from which we have just returned, and hearing a couple of discourses delivered at it. The first preacher stuck so close to his text, that he never left it at all; and the second, never left his but once, and that was when he began his discourse, and never returned to it any more! The first was a labored effort to reconcile Baptist principles with the Bible, or rather, the Bible with them, and to interpret it so as to force it to harmonize with their inconsistencies and jarring and conflicting tenets. The second, was a sort of rambling and discursive dissertation over the sacred volume—a kind of “scatter-gun,” or series of “random-shots,” so that, if one missed his aim, another might strike and have the desired effect. Some of these did so, for on an invitation being given to “join the church” a colored woman came forward, and presented herself before the church. As usual, she was told to relate to them “the dealings of the Lord with her soul.” Being rather backward in doing so, the preacher put a few questions to her; as, whether she reposed confidence in Christ, felt herself changed, and believed she was accepted by him; but not a word whether she had felt her sins pardoned, and had afterwards doubted whether it was so or not! These used to be regarded as all important and essential; but seem now to be disregarded pretty generally—an evidence of the progress among the Baptists, of which we have been speaking. Instead of the long experience formerly told, a few pertinent questions, as those mentioned above, seem to be all that is required. Of course the woman’s replies in the affirmative, were deemed satisfactory to the church, and she was received. And here I could but think of the contrast between the apostolic order and



that of the Baptist church, which receives the individual first and baptizes him afterwards, while the apostles baptized first, and the church received the person afterwards. That this was the primitive order is plain from several places in Acts and the Epistles. It is said that on Pentecost, "as many as gladly received his [Peter's] word, were baptized; and there were added to them about three thousand souls." Mark, they were baptized first, and then added. Again, shortly afterwards it is said: "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved;" or, as correctly rendered, "The Lord daily added the saved to the church." How saved? "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." First faith, then baptism and salvation from past sins, and then added to the church. As to "relating experiences" to the church, where was the church, when Paul was baptized, to hear his experience?—where, when the Jailor and his household at Philippi?—Lydia and her family?—and in every other case recorded, where was the church? If telling experiences was the apostolic order, we should have at least one clear, decided case of it, whereas we have not a single one on record in the New Testament! If that was the order, how could they have possibly baptized three thousand in one day, as on Pentecost? It cannot be shown, either by positive testimony or inference, that the apostles either practised such a custom or permitted it in any way. Then, why should the Baptist churches persist in a custom for which they have no authority whatever in the word of God? Why not discard it, as well as all other inconsistencies with the word of God? Certainly, if honest they should do so as soon as convinced from the Bible. As while the Savior was on earth, the Jews had "made void the commandments of God," by their traditions, and by them had "made the word of God of none effect," so now as regards the gospel, the Baptists have, by their "experiences" completely "made void" or nullified the good confession, that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God," the only one ever required or authorized by the apostles, of the subject for baptism! And here too they have inverted the apostolic order, in receiving members into the church before being baptized!

So also in preaching up and requiring repentance before faith. Because Paul, in speaking of the Jews spoke of "repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," being required of them, our Baptist friends preach it, and contend for it as the gospel order!—not considering the impossibility of repenting before having faith! The Jews already believed in God, but were required to reform (repent)

towards him before they could have faith in Christ. Hence the proclamation: "Repent, (reform,) for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and: "Repent therefore and believe the gospel." But why elaborate a subject so plain and easy of comprehension?

As the Baptists here are such sticklers for taking the order just as it reads, why not do the same as regards the passages: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for (in order to) the remission of sins?"—and: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord?"—and: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved?"—But no, this will not do—it conflicts with their theory of conversion! It is said to be "a good rule that will work both ways," and of course a bad one that will not. Of the latter character, is this rule of interpretation of our Baptist friends. And here we leave them for the present, hoping that they may "have the eyes of their mind enlightened" to know what is the truth.

J. R. H.

#### WILL THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST ABANDON THE WORDS OF ETERNAL LIFE FOR THE SPECULATIONS OF MEN?

It is a time of deep and painful interest. Many are inclined to faint by the way, and turn aside from the truth, but we entertain great confidence in the stability of most of the brethren. Ambitious men, who are not satisfied with what is written, and who vainly profess light beyond and above all that is revealed in the heavenly oracles, may disturb a few; but we entertain no fear in regard to such as read and understand the mind of God. We receive many encouraging letters from the brethren, and we think it becoming to give our readers a few extracts.

Bro. Green Ferguson, of Lowndes county, Miss., writes under date of June 14, 1857.

"Dear Brethren:—Each number of the Gospel Advocate inspires me with greater love for its editors, and especially for the truths it so earnestly defends. I have long desired to offer a word of encouragement, but this is the first time I have had the opportunity to do so. Indeed, I feel that I cannot refrain longer. I was many years a member of the Baptist Church, but from reading the word of the Lord and some of Brother A. Campbell's writings, I became satisfied that the church of Christ demanded all my service, and consequently I have been for some years past associated with the disciples.

"Let me say, that if your teaching in the Gospel Advocate is not correct, I am still ignorant of the truth. That you take the right view of the sufficiency of the scriptures and the church for all religious purposes, I am as certain as I can be of any thing. But you will meet with much opposition. I am for sustaining the '*ox that treadeth out the corn,*' but, with you, I believe the whole clerical hireling system is not only corrupt, but such a class of preachers cannot, and will not, teach the religion of Christ.

"May the Lord bless and support you in the defense of the cause of the Redeemer. G. F."

The school teacher of our youth, Brother Ross Houston, of Sutherland, Texas, writes us a most encouraging letter. We must take the liberty of publishing a few extracts. He says:

"Dear Brother Fanning:—I learn from the Harbinger, which I read, that you are publishing a paper, and that Dr. Richardson has been handling you pretty roughly for believing the Bible teaches all we know of God, of heaven and hell, of right and wrong. I know nothing about philosophy, but I know my children have learned all they know, and I would be glad to ascertain what any one has learned of God and things divine that did not come through words. I have seen nothing but the Harbinger, and your views have not yet appeared in it, but I would be glad to know who W. Lipscomb and F. M. Carmack are? They seem to write the truth; but what is to become of one who has advocated the word of the Lord for more than twenty years, as has R. R. and is now disposed to rid himself of it? Dr. R.'s system is dark and dreary. The Bible is our only source of light, and although I am now old and grey-headed—almost ready to depart—I have seen nothing to shake my confidence in the plan of salvation presented by the Savior. My health is precarious, and this may be my last letter to you. May God bless you in your good work is the wish of my heart. May we meet in heaven. ROSS HOUSTON."

May the Lord sustain Brother Houston and family.

Brother C. C. Scott, of Jefferson County, Tenn., writes: "My soul was pained when I read Bro. Richardson's attack upon you; but on reading the reply, I revived. Cry aloud and spare not."

Brother A. Padon, of Texas, writes: "We are not of that class that flatter, we have conversed with many of the brethren regarding the controversy with the brethren of the Harbinger, and you have the approbation of all."

---

“LOVEST THOU ME MORE THAN THESE?”

Such is the language of our Blessed Savior to Peter, who, after seeing his Master betrayed, and having himself thrice denied him, had gone back to his old occupation—as a fisherman. What burning humiliation must have stung him after his boasted devotion to his Lord? What must have been his mortification when Jesus, as if to pierce to the inmost depths of his soul and overwhelm him with shame for his forgetfulness and want of faith, again and again puts the trying question, “Simon, Son of Jonas, lovest thou me?”

To how many of us, my brethren and sisters, might not, and does not, our Savior put the same earnest question, “Lovest thou me more than these?” When worldly plans and speculations beset us and allure us away from the cause of our Master, let us remember that Jesus, through his gospel, addresses us as pointedly as he did Peter: “Lovest thou me more than these?” How do we answer him? Do we stop and consider the allegiance which we owe to Him as the first great concern, and determine that we will engage in nothing in this world that will prevent us from faithfully attending to all the requirements of our Master, that will impair our usefulness as servants of Heaven or bring reproach upon the cause of our Redeemer? Or do we rush madly and recklessly in every wild worldly speculation, engage in all manner of disreputable and dishonest schemes for the acquirement of wealth or honor, and fritter away our days in the foolish, senseless, and soul-destroying dissipations of fashionable life and pleasure? What answer can we, in the fear of God, with a deep and earnest sense of accountability to Him, give to these questions? Do we love Christ and his glorious work of redemption more than these things? Are we ready to give them all up for him? Are we ready and do we make a sacrifice of all that stands as besetting sins to ourselves or stumblings block to others for the love we have for Him? If not, I do not see what claim we have to his favor—what hope we can have for salvation in his name. If while professing to be alive in Christ we are dead to every interest that pertains to his cause on the earth, and to every sacred vow we have made to him, we cannot expect the slightest share of his blessings. O let us beware, my friends, lest we too may be covered with shame in the day of accounts, when Christ shall say to us: You loved the things of the world more than you loved me. I say again, let us beware lest shame, awful shame and humiliation and degradation cover us in that fearful day.

W. L.

---

 OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT.

MR. T. FANNING,—Sir,—Will you be so kind as to give an explanation or teaching of your (the Christian) Church on the operation of the "Spirit" through the word. I want information not a controversy.

WILLIAM SMITH.

Cane Creek, Miss., June 25, 1857.

REPLY.

DEAR SIR,—With such enquiries we are always pleased. If our friend desires us to give information as to the teaching of the brethren regarding the *manner* of the Spirit's operating *through* the word, we are unable to do so. As to the *fact*, however, we have no doubt, and the best exposition is found Gal. iii, 2-5: "He that ministereth the Spirit, doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" The Spirit convinces the world by the hearing of faith, as on the day of Pentecost; and from that day to the present, we have no well authenticated case of a nation or even an individual coming under the influence of the Spirit of God but by the hearing of the word of life.

T. F.

---

HANNIBAL, MO., July 6, 1857.

BRO. T. FANNING:—I write to you a few lines, especially as I have been noticing some pieces in your paper regarding church authority. I presume you have noticed one or two pieces in the Christian Age, written by Brother Isaac Errett, some months since in regard to the office of evangelist's authority, etc. I was somewhat surprised, (indeed I may say no little,) to see his position as to the authority they possessed over the churches. I was pleased with the position you had taken in regard to what the church ought to do, (I might say her authority, etc.,) and what evangelists should do. You make one remark perhaps I do not understand. You say, "The evangelists have the general supervision of the churches." I would be pleased to see your position defined. I am much pleased with your reply to R. R.

J. P. SMITH.

REPLY.—The brethren must not understand us as maintaining any special or official authority of evangelists over the churches, further than what springs from their *obligations* to the congregations they may address, either by word or letter. It is undeniably the duty of the preachers of the gospel to see that the churches are in order, and with this view the care of the congregations should rest with great weight



upon their hearts. Further than a right and duty to endeavor to profit the churches by teaching, earnest exhortations and fervent prayers to the members, to cleave unto the Lord and the word of his grace, preachers possess no authority. T. F.

GREEN COUNTY, Mo., May 18, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—I notice in the February number of the Advocate a remark from you to the effect, that you think it right for the evangelists to have the general supervision of the churches. With my limited knowledge of the Scriptures I have been unable to ascertain how they became entitled to such supervision. You will, therefore, confer a favor on an enquirer after truth by pointing me to the chapter and verses of scripture where I can find answers to the following interrogatories: 1. Since the ceasing of spiritual gifts to the church who is an evangelist? 2. How and by whom is he appointed? 3. What is his duties?

A few disciples of Christ have been worshiping from house to house in this vicinity this winter and spring, in which meetings our children have formed a kind of portable or traveling Sunday school; a history of which you shall have at some future time, if we and our children continue to gain gospel knowledge as we have, and we think we have both the zeal and ability to improve and approach nearer to apostolic teaching. Yours in hope of more light on earth, and life eternal beyond the grave, SAMPLE ORR.

ANSWERS.—Evangelists are preachers of the gospel, and, like Paul, they not only preach to sinners, baptize, plant churches and confirm the members, but they also are the properly authorized agents of Jesus Christ, to set in order what is wanting in the churches, to ordain elders—not to an elder's office, for there is no such office, but to the bishop's office—to see that no other doctrine than that of the Scriptures is taught, and "*the care of all the churches*" to some very considerable extent rests upon them. (2 Cor. xi, 28.) T. F.

WHITE OAK, TEXAS, June 29, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—Dear Sir,—I wish to say (through the Gospel Advocate) to the brethren composing the North-Eastern Texas Co-operation. that it will meet at Forest Grove, seven miles West of Clarksville, Red River County, Texas, on Thursday before the third Lord's day

in September next. At which time and place we hope to see a general representation from all the congregations in Northern Texas. Brethren, the time has come when we must arise from the lethargy into which we have fallen and work while it is called to-day, for the night will soon come when we cannot work. Brethren, we have but few preaching brethren, therefore let us come up to the work prepared to do something. Brethren, come one, come all; preparations will be made to accommodate all who may come.

Yours in the Lord,

JAMES M. BAIRD.

### OBITUARIES.

Brother John G. Tompkins, long known and acknowledged in Kentucky as an excellent teacher of the Christian religion, died at the residence of Brother Christopher Brown, in Matthews county, Virginia, January 24, 1857. His sufferings were long and severe, but he bore them with Christian fortitude, and left the world in full confidence of the truth of the Bible, and that there is a rest in preparation for the people of God. Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord; they rest from their labors and their works do follow them.

Will not our brethren who for several years co-operated with Bro. T., editorally, notice his demise? Do we forget our fellow laborers in the vineyard of the Lord?

T. F.

SISTER THEODOSIA A. STILL, wife of Brother E. J. Still, of this vicinity, died, in the full triumphs of a living faith, May 21, 1857. It is rare to find one with fewer faults or stronger faith. She looked for the messenger for months and was ready to go. Will the Lord support her husband and motherless children.

Our beloved Brother CROCKETT McDONALD, of Moulton, Ala., is no more. He was to see us in June, in feeble health, returned home and died on the 30th of the same month. We knew Brother McDonald intimately for many years, and we feel that we are not saying too much when we give it as our opinion, that no one in his county, and, possibly, no one in N. Alabama, for the past thirty years, has exerted so good a religious influence. Brother McDonald was a slave to public business, and for some years past was not only post master, but Judge of the Probate Court, and was really worked to death. Judge Ligon and Judge McDonald both fell in the same town, but both fell at their post. We deeply sympathise with sister McDonald and the family. We feel that this death is really a calamity to the church and to the country. We pray God to raise up other laborers in his vineyard. Did brother McDonald leave no son who will rise up in the place of his lamented father?

T. F.

---

# FRANKLIN COLLEGE.

---

## SESSION FOR 1857-8.

The Directors of Franklin College, in obedience to a settled conviction as to the great importance of the measure, have determined to make several changes in reference to conducting the school in future.

In the first place it has been thought advisable to make changes in the Board of Trustees. Not that any who have so kindly given their services are regarded incompetent, or not interested in the subject of general education, but some of the members have not found it convenient to attend the meetings; and with the view of receiving the advice of persons immediately interested in the Institution, the Board will be composed mainly in future of her own graduates. Most of the members of the *Alumni* society attend the commencement meetings, and feeling the deep concern they do in their *Alma Mater*, they will no doubt make efficient guardians of the college.

### NEW BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

T. FANNING, *ex-officio*, President of the Board.

EDWARD TRABUE, Nashville, Tenn.

ISAAC PAUL, Esq.

J. W. RICHARDSON, M. D., Smyrna, Tenn.

HON. A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Columbia, Tenn.

JOHN HILL, Lavergne, Tenn.

T. W. WATKINS, Murfreesboro', Tenn.

A. L. JOHNSON, Hopkinsville, Ky.

E. D. WARDER, Louisville, Ky.

DAVID LIPSCOMB, McMinnville, Tenn.

P. R. RUNNELS, Jourdon's Valley, Tenn.

JOHN GOODRICH, Fayetteville, Tenn.

HON. J. L. GOODALL, Carthage, Tenn.

J. E. SCOBY, Lebanon, Tenn.

N. B. SMITH, Salem, Tenn.

HON. E. H. VONTREES, Georgetown, Texas.

JAMES B. CLARK, Jackson, Miss.

W. H. D. CARRINGTON, Austin, Texas.

JOHN VANDYCK, Paris, Tenn.

JO. ROULHAC, Esq., Hickman, Ky.

A. H. APPLETON, Esq., Tenn.

JOSHUA K. SPEER, Lavergne, Tenn.

JAMES HOLMES, Mason's Grove, Tenn.

W. LIPSCOMB, Secretary.

## PREPARATORY DEPARTMENT.

For several years past the institution has labored under serious embarrassments, in consequence of not being able to conduct such a Preparatory School as the officers desired. Juveniles and pupils have been thrown together in college with the vain hope of success, but this has proved impracticable, and thereby much injury has resulted in the instruction. To secure the ends therefore for which the college was originally established, arrangements have been made to open a Preparatory Department under the most favorable auspices. A serious difficulty has been to secure the services of competent teachers. Many can teach the higher branches, not at all qualified to manage a Preparatory School. The purest scholarship is indispensable to a well qualified Juvenile teacher. Pupils seldom, if ever, recover from the effects of ill-directed early education.

The Trustees and Faculty are much pleased to inform their friends that Professor F. M. Carmack has consented to devote his entire time to this most important department of a well regulated school. The "Elm Crag" buildings, occupied many years past by the President of the college as a preparatory school, and more recently by Professor Lipscomb as a private residence, have been secured for the purpose. The location is favorable, the buildings are well adapted to the object, and Professor Carmack and lady are esteemed as admirably qualified for the service. The Principal will board the pupils, supervise their dress and rooms, guard them in their conversation and habits, and make them, as far as practicable, an agreeable and parental associate. The purpose is to give parents, who wish to send their sons without advancement, from home, the highest assurance that they will be most favorably situated for improvement, physically, intellectually and morally.

## COLLEGE PROPER.

Perhaps the most important change is in reference to the property of the college, and the influences therewith connected. Much to the relief of the President, arrangements have been made in part for others to take interest in the property, and share the labors in directing the business. Such *gradual* changes will be made in this direction, as will place the success of the institution upon a much firmer basis than through the influence of one or two individuals. In future, therefore, either all of the Faculty will be the *bona fide* owners of the premises,

or so far responsible for their use, and so dependent upon their own personal exertions for a support, as to secure their unremitting devotion to the college.

With the view of properly dividing the labor, a new officer has been created under the title of Vice President, whose labor will be to so far share in the duties of the President as to take the supervision of the classes, direct in the order of the institution, and to aid in the general business. The want of such an officer has long been sensibly felt, and the best of results are anticipated from it.

---

## FACULTY FOR 1857-8.

T. FANNING,

*President and Professor of Natural History and Intellectual Moral Science.*

WILLIAM LIPSCOMB, A. M.,

*Vice-President, and Professor of Ancient Languages.*

A. J. FANNING, A. M.,

*Professor of Mathematics.*

T. T. BAUDOUIN,

*Teacher of the French Language and Assistant Teacher of Languages and Mathematics.*

---

## PECUNIARY REGULATIONS.

Students who enter within one month from the opening of the session are charged for the full session. No student will be received, except upon special contract, for less time than a session, or from the date of entering to the close of the term. No reduction of bills will be made but for absence from ill health and by permission of the Faculty.

Persons unknown to the Faculty will be expected to give satisfactory reference before their sons or wards matriculate.

Inasmuch as all who enter are presumed to be gentlemen, to obtain an honorable dismissal, the Faculty must be satisfied as to the deportment of students.



One-half the amount of charges is required when students enter the school, and the balance is due at the close of the semi-annual session. Interest is charged upon all sums from the time they are due.

Parents and guardians are respectfully requested not to furnish their sons and wards with more money than may really be necessary for supplying their real wants.

Young men destitute of means may have educational advantages, by securing payment at a future day. This security may be obtained in several ways:

1. By personal security.
2. By liens of property.
3. By students inducing friends to keep a constant insurance on their lives.

The fourteenth Annual Session will open September 15, 1857, and continue ten months or forty weeks.

#### CHARGES—IN PREPARATORY DEPARTMENT.

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| 1. Students will be furnished with board and rooms per week at           | \$2 50 |
| 2. Washing per month,  | 1 00   |
| 3. Tuition per session of forty weeks for beginners, -                   | 30 00  |
| 4. In Grammar, Geography, Arithmetic, and higher preparatory branches, - | 40 00  |
| 5. Fuel and lights per session, -  | 10 00  |

Pupils will furnish their own bedding, tables, and all that is required in their rooms as in college, but all purchases will be directed by their teachers.

#### COLLEGE PROPER.

- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| 1. Board and rooms, per collegiate year of 40 weeks, - | \$100 00 |
| 2. Tuition, -  | 50 00    |
| 3. Fuel—at cost, -                                     |          |
| 4. Washing per month, -                                | 1 50     |
| 5. Matriculation—but once paid, -                      | 5 00     |
| 6. Graduation fee, -                                   | 5 00     |

Modern languages *extra*; also a very small fee is charged for vocal music.

**T. FANNING,**

*President Franklin College.*

W. LIPSCOMB, *Secretary.*

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

VOL. III.      NASHVILLE, SEPTEMBER, 1857.      NO. 9.

PROFESSOR R. RICHARDSON'S PHILOSOPHY, AS SET  
FORTH IN THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER FOR AU-  
GUST, 1857.

WITH feelings of the deepest interest, we again invite the brethren to an examination of Prof. Richardson's philosophy. In both matter and manner it is unique and well calculated to create apprehensions of a serious character.

1. "I know not that any one has imputed to Bro. F. either '*imbecility* or *madness*,' but such a representation will serve a purpose, viz, to excite a sympathy on the part of those who will take it for granted that he has been so charged. While his writings show a manifest deficiency of logical power and a striking inability to make or recognize those distinctions which are essential to the proper investigation of any subject, we are happy to acknowledge that in various other respects Bro. Fanning possesses very respectable abilities.

2. "If it be designed to insinuate here that I 'fancy the impulses of humanity to be inspirations of the Almighty,' I must beg leave to deny the imputation in any and every sense. My views on this matter are, however, so well known that it is quite unnecessary for me to undertake a serious refutation of such a charge.

3. "I do not pretend to notice all the misconceptions and mistatements contained in this 'reply,' of many of which the one in this connexion may serve as a specimen. When it is said by way of apology, that a man may not have had 'time' to make himself acquainted with any particular subject, it is not necessarily implied that he is too *young*. The usual and obvious meaning is that he has been too *busy* with other matters. A man may be so occupied, for instance, with *training horses for the turf*, with the company of *sporting and betting gentry*, and

the carrying out of various schemes of selfish and personal aggrandizement, to attend much to matters of a religious nature, and thus, from not having devoted sufficient time to the examination of such subjects, be found grossly ignorant of them, even when he is advanced in life.

4. "From the interest I have in the cause of education, I am extremely happy to learn that Pres. Fanning not only does balk at the word philosophy in natural science, but that he even includes in his college course, both moral and intellectual philosophy. He says above, 'with the view of furnishing the students of Franklin College all the aid in *mental discipline* that speculative philosophy can afford, we give the subject in our classes unusual attention.' He goes on to enumerate the books he uses, as Morell, Cousin, Upham, Paley, Wayland, Butler, etc., including in fact the chief works used in Bethany College and other literary institutions of the country.

"But while I am glad to learn all this for the sake of education, what must be thought of Pres. F.'s denunciations of such subjects and such books, and what of the charges against the schools that use such books that they are 'making infidels?' Let me here again quote his own express language on the subject. 'Furthermore, if we are not much mistaken, there are striking contradictions in the professions of school directors. For instance, in all the schools amongst the Disciples of Christ, the Bible is represented as the only foundation in morals, and still the directors have introduced the various philosophies mental and moral of the times, [just as Pres. Fanning now says he has done himself in Franklin College]. The revelations of God and the philosophies of the world agree in no particular. Moreover, no one can believe in the truth of miraculous revelation and of any system of professed wisdom originating with men. All metaphysical systems and moral philosophies are not only subversive of the truth of religion but we declare our solemn conviction that no one who respects the Bible can believe in any system of philosophy in existence. Hence we think the schools generally are well calculated to make infidels.' Gospel Advocate, Vol. 2, p. 337. In Vol. 2, p. 35, he says: 'It is somewhat remarkable that this doctrine [to-wit, that taught in the philosophical works he himself uses,] prevails in all the schools and colleges of the land, or if there are exceptions (save F. C.) we know not of them. They all use the books which advocate the *intuitive divine knowledge of feeling*, which is above the understanding.' This language, whether so intended or not, conveys the idea that no such 'books' are used at all in Franklin College. Now, Pres. Fanning declares they are used, and that he pays to the subject of speculative philosophy in his classes, 'unusual attention'!! It is true, he again repeats, that he thinks 'metaphysical works in schools and colleges well calculated to encourage scepticism and make infidels,' and adds the qualification, 'unless teachers should be careful to show their true place in a course of education?' But how does President F. know that other teachers besides himself do not 'show their true place in a course of education?' If it be true of such books, as President F. declares, that they 'agree in no particular with the revelations of God,' that they are 'false' and 'sub-

versive of the truth of religion,' ought they to have any place at all in a course of education? What are we to think of President F., who, after teaching us the danger connected with the use of these terrible 'books,' has after all failed to teach himself? What can we say of that consistency which denounces these books and the schools that use them in the most unqualified language, when treating of 'metaphysical discussions,' and which, when the absence of philosophy from a college course of study is charged as a defect, can come out and announce that in the very college which had been held up as an exception to all others in this respect, such 'books' and subjects receive 'unusual attention?'

5. "Brother Fanning must excuse me if I do not agree with him in the opinion that his 'language is as sound as the declaration of Holy Writ.' He says: 'The Apostles were in some sense, at least, a part of both the foundation and the superstructure.' This proposition perhaps, would be true if it read thus, The Apostles were *in nonsense*, at least, a part of both the foundation and the superstructure. The Christian church was 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.' Does Brother F. imagine that *some* of the apostles only were in the foundation and *others* in the superstructure? Or does he suppose them all to have been in two different places at the same time? How profitable it would be to undertake a discussion with one who seems unable to distinguish, not merely between truth and error, but between sense and nonsense!

"This, however, is a fresh specimen. In the former case, in relation to which Pres. F. objects to my criticism, he remarked that 'in the schools among the Disciples of Christ, the Bible is represented as the only foundation in morals,' and from this took occasion to censure school directors for introducing 'the various philosophies *mental* and *moral* of the times.' Now, if we were to admit that the Bible is the only *foundation* in morals, does it follow upon such premises that it is also the *superstructure* in morals? Or if it be admitted that the Bible is both foundation and superstructure in *morals*—that it forms the whole edifice of *moral science*, does it follow that it also constitutes the edifice of *mental science*? I do not here enter upon the question as to what position the Bible really occupies in relation to these matters, but wish to point out merely the looseness of Pres. F.'s reasoning, and that his premises here have as usual nothing to do with his conclusions.

6. 'It is to be hoped that this *unique* and most *original* exposition of this important passage will be duly considered by those who have in hand the revision of the Bible. After such a display of scholarship and exegetical skill as this, I could not by any means presume to discuss the merits of the case with Pres. Fanning. I would therefore merely offer the reflection, that freedom from human philosophy is essential to a sincere belief of the *whole* word of God. No one who is imbued with human philosophy can possibly receive *all* that is taught in the Bible, and must therefore pervert or explain away all those portions which conflict with his theory. It is well to *profess* to take the Bible as the only guide in religion; it is good to urge its claims

upon others, but oh! it is better still to receive ourselves with meekness, that precious word of God which 'maketh wise the simple,' and which, when 'engrafted' upon the heart, is 'able to save our souls.' No sect believes *all* the scripture, because each has its own philosophical theory, and all those passages in the Bible which disagree with it must be explained away, which is equivalent to blotting them out of the book. It is perfectly natural that Pres. F.'s philosophy should produce the same result, and that he should, as we see, attempt thus to dispense with one of the plainest portions of the New Testament, in regard to the import of which the ablest translators and commentators are perfectly agreed.

7. "President F. seems to be in a great pickle about something which he calls Natural Theology, and woefully disconsolate to think that Brother Campbell should teach it. I cannot imagine what sort of a bugbear it is that has so alarmed him, but it must be something very extraordinary if it be as he says it is, 'the Natural Theology of the prince of atheists, Robert Owen.' I had been accustomed to think that *atheists* did not believe in any God at all, and it seems to me it must be a curious sort of Natural Theology that is taught by the 'PRINCE of *atheists*.' I hope President F. will calm his perturbed spirit and take a more cheerful view of things, especially when he reflects that he is himself teaching in Franklin College, as he declares, the works of Paley, Butler, etc., and I can assure him that Bro. Campbell is doing nothing worse at Bethany, and that if these books require that teachers should be 'careful to show their true place in a course of education,' we have good reason to believe President Campbell, to say the least, quite as competent to do this as President Fanning. We certainly consider it quite 'venturesome' in Bro. Fanning to pronounce what Bro. Campbell teaches to be false, particularly when he teaches it himself. Perhaps, however, we are to understand him as really believing speculative philosophy and Natural Theology to be false, and as teaching them merely, as he says, for 'mental discipline,' accompanying them with expositions of their falsity. By a parity of reasoning, to administer a dose of poison every day, and follow it up with an antidote, would be a most *healthful exercise* of the stomach!

"As to Bro. Campbell's views of Natural Theology, it is perfectly well known that he holds the opinion that man could not *originate* either from his own inner nature or from the material universe, the proposition that there is a God. He insists that this great truth can be communicated to the human mind only by direct revelation or tradition. On this point I think it would be 'venturesome' for any one to attempt to prove him in error. But the *originating* of the proposition and the *proof* of it, are two different matters, and it is here that President F. has, as usual, failed to make distinction. The world has never, since the days of Adam, been without the *proposition*, nor has nature ever failed to furnish the *proof* to every intelligent mind. The proposition once stated, the being and attributes of God—his invisible things, even his eternal power and divinity are clearly seen *ever since* (*απο*) the creation of the world by the things that are made.' This is what Natural



Theology is understood to teach—precisely what the Scripture says is taught by nature, and just what Bro. Campbell, in common with all intelligent persons, understands by Natural Theology—the proof of the being and attributes of God from the works of nature.

8. "The whole of this paragraph and the preceding one, is a tissue of misconceptions. I have not sustained Mr. Russell's *teaching*, except so far as to deny that he may be justly charged with infidelity; neither has Brother Campbell. I have commended his intelligence and piety, and what I believe to have been his design in the address condemned by Brother Fanning. As to his teaching, it will be time enough for Brother F. to condemn it when he comprehends it. If Bro. Russell be too much disposed to look at the Scripture through the medium of philosophy, I have not yet at least found him disposed to pervert the Scripture in order to make it agree with his philosophy. Should he do this, I will be quite as ready to censure him as Brother Fanning. It is not true that his address was 'the embodiment of his instruction' in Bethany College, or that there is the least authority for so understanding it.

9. "It is well known that Locke's Essay, is by no means based on *induction*. On the contrary, it rests entirely upon the ASSUMPTION that *there are no innate ideas*.

10. "President F. unable to escape from the proof which I adduced, that he is a philosopher of the school of Locke, is here forced to assert that 'Locke was no philosopher'!! Comment is unnecessary.

11. "President Fanning here affirms that these two propositions, 1st that man is incapable of learning the being and attributes of God from the works of nature, and 2nd that he is incapable of deriving knowledge from his own spiritual nature, are his belief through the word, and he objects to my calling these views a system of philosophy. Surely Bro. F. ought to know that there are no such propositions either in form or substance, anywhere in the Bible. How then can they constitute his 'belief through the word?' Thus it is that philosophy, latent in the mind, not only seeks to put out of the Bible what *is* there, (as in the case of Rom. i: 19-20) but (as in the present case) to introduce what *is not* there.

12. "In all the above quotations and notices, Bro. Fanning totally misconceives my meaning. I look for no spiritual light in religion from other sources than the Bible. I advocate no direct spiritual communications. I have a perfect contempt for the various forms of modern spiritualism, as any one conversant with my teaching ought to know. It is by far the worst feature in Pres't. F.'s course, that he has by various assertions and misrepresentation endeavored to excite suspicions in the minds of his readers that I am in favor of modern spiritualism, and likely, as he prophesies, (for he also is among the prophets) to follow in the wake of Jessie B. Ferguson. President Fanning has asserted, indeed, three very extraordinary propositions, viz:

"1. That the universe does not exhibit marks of design. 2nd. That John Locke was not a philosopher, and 3d. That Prof. Richardson is in favor of modern spiritualism.

"Now those who can believe the two first of these may well believe also the last, for they are all equally worthy of acceptance by that sort of minds whose censure is praise, and whose condemnation is an encomium. If I thought that an unworthy motive led Bro. F. thus to misunderstand and misrepresent me, I should have taken no notice of his effusions. But he is evidently too deeply imbued with sensualistic philosophy to receive or comprehend the spiritual things of Christianity, and it is perfectly natural that he should misconceive and oppose them. If I thought that any benefit would result from the discussion of such themes with Bro. F., I should be happy to undertake it. But this spiritual inappetency, and that absence of logic and striking inability to distinguish between things that are different, so conspicuous in his writings, forbid anything of the kind. He suspects me of a 'studied policy to introduce novelties,' because I wish to see the brethren grow in grace and knowledge; he intimates that I am in favor, or in danger of modern spiritualism, because he is unable to distinguish between *modern spiritualism* and ANCIENT SPIRITUALITY. As no benefit, therefore, could at present arise from any discussion with Pres't. F. upon these topics, I here, with all kind feelings for him personally, take my final leave of him and his philosophy, with the sincere prayer that 'the EYES of his understanding' may be enlightened—that he may be filled with a knowledge of the will of God 'in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,' and that he may 'walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God.'" R. R.

#### FOURTH REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERT RICHARDSON.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST:—The discussion with Prof. Richardson involves the truth of the Christian religion, and could we be provoked to retort on him, we have ample cause. It is our purpose, however, to avoid as far as possible personalities, and by the help of God, to examine the questions at issue calmly. We have confidence, the brethren who really love the truth earnestly desire a fair and honorable discussion, and whilst we hope to do justice to all concerned, it shall be our constant study to prevent, if possible, a diversion from the momentous subjects under examination. It may be regarded respectful to Doctor R. to call attention to matters in the order they are found in his notes.

1. Prof. Richardson seems not only anxious to discuss minor personalities, but also particularly desirous to satisfy the readers of the Harbinger, that we can not appreciate his talents and labors. The following, however, we think we understand. He speaks of our first notice of his new theology thus:

"What he (we) are pleased to call a reply," says we are, "*Disposed*

to enter into an elaborate discussion of our own merits;" that "A discussion with one who deals so largely in assertions, and so little in proofs, and who is so obviously defective in logic, would not be agreeable;" asserts that his "notice of us was incidental;" declares that our "writings show a manifest deficiency in logical power, and inability to make, or recognize those distinctions which are essential to the proper investigation of any subject;" that we are "unable to distinguish between truth and error, sense and nonsense;" speaks of our "display of scholarship and exegetical skill;" of our "spiritual inappetency;" of our incapacity to "comprehend" the views of Mr. Russell; intimates that we "think not at all;" says that our philosophy "seems to govern all our religious views, whether the subject be the church, or preaching for a salary, or metaphysical discussions, it is all the same;" and yet Prof. Richardson declares that he has not charged us with "imbecility or madness," and that our purpose in intimating it is "to excite sympathy." Regarding all these things, we have but a remark or two to make. We have no appropriate name or reply for them. If Prof. Richardson really entertains such views in regard to our writings, it occurs to us, that he should be entitled to no credit for refuting them; and from our childhood we have been taught that it exhibits extreme cruelty and unpardonable cowardice to waste the strength of a giant in demolishing pigmies. Such a mode of attack we do not recollect to have witnessed from any one conscious of his ability to sustain himself. We should not be surprised if the brethren were to conclude that his notice of us was not "incidental." If we are not mistaken he has frequently thought of us, and our writings, and in order to establish his new doctrines on a firm basis, he may have thought it would be best to administer to us a few death blows to insure our silence. We are glad to have it in our power, however, to inform him that his weapons are not adequate. He has thrown away the Jerusalem blade and is now staggering upon a broken reed, whose slightest touch is certain moral death.

2. Prof. Richardson thinks we are "deeply imbued with the philosophy of Locke," or the "Dirt Philosophy," and at our suggestion that Locke was not strictly a philosopher, he exclaims, "comment is unnecessary." We are happy to know, that this is a matter that can be examined authoritatively, and we hope that our readers will not hesitate to make the effort to ascertain the differences between Dr. Richardson and ourself. We have felt much mortification at meeting with good brethren, and even preachers, who seemed to think that ours is a controversy in relation to no vital question. Brethren, you are mistaken,

and we beg you to divest yourselves of all unpleasant feeling, and hear patiently what we have to say.

The word *philosophy* is not generally understood. Etymologically it implies a *love of wisdom*, and a philosopher is *merely a lover of wisdom*, but *tecnically* and *ecclesiastically* it means quite a different thing.

The various systems of philosophy attempt to explain, in the language of Schwegler, "the construction and disposition of the universe; the arrangement and functions of the human body; and the doctrine of rights." They assume to discover the Cause of all things—God and the moral duties of men. While the word *Metaphysics* refers merely to the investigations of the mind, its advocates rely on it to tell who made man, what is in him, and his destiny. Moral philosophy, in the words of Sidney Smith, "*comprehends every thing spiritual.*"

It is used in this sense by Berkley, Hartley, Hutcheson, Adam Smith, Hume, Reid, Stewart, and the Germans, French and even the modern spiritualists. Its professed purpose is to grasp spiritual ideas, not through the understanding, not by means of the external revelations of the Bible, but by the direct apperception of truth.

Cousin says, for instance, "That the idea of God is a primitive idea"—not received—"it is the necessary product of reason." F. W. Newman says, "The soul is the specific sense in which we come into contact with God." This precludes all revelation. Theodore Parker, the Boston "higher-law" infidel, says, that "A knowledge of God may be called, in the language of philosophy, an intuition of reason," and he makes Religion obedience to a law *written* in our nature, revealed through *instinct, reason, conscience*—God with us, and the *religious sentiment*," and he informs the world, that this knowledge comes not "through grammatical, logical, and rhetorical sense" of the scriptures. Dr. Richardson also speaks of certain "*materialists*" who are "*dependent upon revelation*"—"upon words," "*divine communications addressed to the bodily senses.*" Which of these philosophers borrowed from the other?

David F. Strauss, the notorious German infidel, gives the modern philosophical view of religion in the plainest manner. He very gravely informs the world, in his 3d vol. of "The Life of Jesus," that what "was once sacred history for the Christian, is for the *enlightened* portion of our contemporaries ONLY FABLE. The *revelation* of Christ," he says, "must be rejected." It must not be "*interpreted*," he informs us, "*by the understanding.*" He adds, "When the mind has gone

beyond the sensible history, and enters into the dominion of the absolute, the former (the history) ceases to be essential." This is strictly philosophical, in both manner and matter. Does not Dr. Richardson take the same view? He maintained, in the September number of the Harbinger for 1856, that,

1st. We must not depend upon the understanding in the examination of truth.

2d. "The veil of outward appearance must be lifted—(what is this but the "*sensible history*" of Strauss?)—from the face of Divine revelation before its beauty can be disclosed."

3d. His position is, that "It is the spirit alone (or soul, according to Newman) that can perceive the truth."

So much we have thought proper to give in order to show our readers the true philosophical stand point of Prof. Richardson and others, and now we are better prepared to notice the charge as to our "*Dirt philosophy*," taken, as Dr. Richardson supposes, from Locke. We said, with the forgoing definition of philosophy before us, that John Locke denied that it was in man intuitively to know God or his will concerning the world. This really excludes him from philosophers. His stand point was, that "*Faith is the assent to any proposition not made out by the deductions of reason, but upon the credit of the proposer as coming from God, in some extraordinary way of communication. This way of discovering truths to men we call,*" says Locke, "*revelation.*" Is this the "*Dirt philosophy*," or "*gross sensualism*" of which we have heard?

After all that has been said, we should not be surprised if Prof. Richardson and coadjutors, to hold a name amongst Christians, were not yet forced to avow their confidence in Locke's statement of the matter. We trust the brethren will henceforth be better able to appreciate Dr. R.'s opposition to belief through the facts of the Gospel. Those who apply gross sensualism to us, know not what they affirm. If sensualism consists in believing in God through the revelations in the full exercise of the powers God has given us, then all christians are sensualists; but, Voltaire and Helvetius, who advocated the unlimited gratification of the flesh, were *strictly* sensualists. The thief Rousseau, who had recourse to the *feeling* of his inner-consciousness, was a sensualist; and it may yet appear to the intelligent that our modern philosophers, who clamor so loudly in regard to rising, like J. B. Ferguson, above the Written Oracles to absolute truth, perceived by "our higher nature"—"inner-consciousness," of Prof. Richardson,



are themselves but the slaves of the flesh. The man who trusts God by means of his word, possesses the only spiritual faith; but such as look to nature outward or inward for Divine light, in the language of Jude, "speak evil of those things which they know not, but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, and thus they corrupt themselves." Inasmuch as we have failed to see an appeal to the Bible to sustain the New Theology, we sincerely regret Prof. R.'s declaration that we are "unable to endure the sound doctrine of the scriptures, in relation to the things of the Spirit." Years past, Prof. R. quoted the scriptures in a manner which gave evidence that he regarded them as the highest authority in religion; but since his adoption of his new theology, he makes no such impression on us. True, he quotes the word of God, but all conversant with his recent teaching are fully aware that the advocates of the doctrine are repudiators of the scriptures. In this connection he speaks of our "misconceptions and misrepresentations" of himself, Prof. Milligan and Pres. Campbell. We are not alone in opposing Prof. R.'s teaching. Many of the brethren in this section, pronounced it infidel long before we called attention to it. We never misunderstood Bro. Campbell. When Prof. R. affirmed that he taught "Natural Theology," from our entire confidence in his adhesion to the word of God, we expressed our doubts. Bro. Campbell has fully vindicated himself, by his essay on Natural Religion. We are sorry that he attempts to involve us with Bro. Campbell. It is unfair; but we doubt if his struggle for protection under Bro. Campbell's broad mantle can shield him.

4. Prof. R. speaks of his "views being so well known, that it is unnecessary for him to undertake a serious refutation" of the suggestion that he "fancied the impulses of humanity to be the inspirations of the Almighty." We simply state that Prof. R. is mistaken. The brethren believe the truth, and when their teachers introduce novelties, they are entitled to a reason for so doing. We hope that Prof. Richardson will not attempt to convince us, the teaching of himself and associates is what we have been accustomed to hearing. Our chief Tennessee apostate attempted, even after he had publicly adopted modern spiritualism, to convince his friends it was what he had always been teaching. His admirers said he was too well known to be misunderstood, and *too good a man* to do wrong. The consequences were fatal to the cause.

5. Prof. Richardson explains his statement, that "For want of time we had failed to make ourself acquainted with the subject of philoso-

phy," by saying, "*A man may be so occupied WITH TRAINING HORSES FOR THE TURF, WITH THE COMPANY OF SPORTING AND BETTING GENTRY, and the carrying out of various schemes of selfish and personal aggrandizement, to attend much to matters of a religious nature, and thus may be found grossly ignorant at an advanced age.*"

In this language Dr. Richardson intended to charge us with the following sins:

1. "Training horses for the turf."
2. "Keeping the company of sporting and betting gentry."
3. "Of carrying out schemes of personal aggrandizement."

If Prof. Richardson believes us guilty, we think it strange he desires so earnestly still to fraternise with us; and if he did not believe in the truth of his insinuations, we cannot see what *good* motive prompted him in making the charges.

Is this an exhibition of the "logic" in reference to which Prof. R. complains of our sad deficiency? Suppose the insinuations well founded, we cannot see their bearing upon the subjects under examination. If all the preachers of the land were to turn gamblers, we do not know that their sin would establish the truth of the doctrine of spiritual light above the word of God—by the "inner-consciousness." We have been forcibly struck with the vehemence of the opposition of all who adopt the doctrine of intuitive light above the understanding, to believers through the divine word. We seek not the sympathy of even the brethren to sustain us in error or in wrong doing. We cannot charge Prof. Richardson with originating these things, but it is our right to ask for the author's name.

We are happy, however, to say to all whom it may concern, that whilst we feel in our heart no disposition to make our character appear what it is not—for we are frank to admit that we have done much in life that we sincerely regret—we never owned or had the least interest in a turf horse, runner, pacer or trotter, or in the training of one for the turf in our life. We never owned one which became a sporting animal. God gave us a little farm and we have raised pigs, cattle, sheep and *using* horses, and we have had some of them prepared for exhibition at our Fairs. This is the head and front of our offending. We never had even an interest in an animal of the *blood* or *turf* class. We regard it also due to ourself and to the brethren with whom we have long had the honor of associating to say, that it is well known that we have a fondness for domestic animals, and, without boasting, we suppose it will be admitted that we have done more to introduce the improved

varieties of using domestic animals into the State than any other individual. All of our interest in preparing stock and attending fairs has been open. Our brethren, preachers and all, have witnessed every thing, and to this hour no one has intimated to us the least wrong, or even the appearance of evil in our course. We are, however, always ready to abandon any practice which is offensive to good men. We are proud to know, and that the best men of the country know, that for the last twenty years we have done more to prevent the breeding in our State of the almost worthless blood and sporting horse than any one of our acquaintances.

Regarding the intimation of associating with "*sporting and betting gentry*," we can only say, that it has been our good fortune to have the confidence and friendship of the best men of the country, and we have associated with no others. For the information, however, of the candid we wish to say, that we have the honor of being the representative of the Davidson County Agricultural Society in the State Agricultural Bureau, and by the appointment of the Governor there are some most worthy gentlemen who own blooded horses and have them trained for the turf associated with us, but it is reported on good authority that none of them ever bet. These we are glad to know are regarded honorable and high minded gentlemen throughout the country.

As to our supposed "schemes of selfish and personal aggrandizement," as Prof. Richardson has not specified, we know not his meaning. We labor with our own hands for bread, never engaged in speculation in property or religion, have endeavored to observe the common decencies of life, and we flatter ourself that we desire to detract from the fair character of no one. We hope, in the mean time, to prevent Prof. Richardson from diverting the attention of the brethren from the subjects under consideration. Our position before God and men is not the matter in hand. As previously intimated, we may yet be forced to look at men in their helpless deformities. We desire not such labor, and we beg Prof. R. to be considerate. He calls us "*Brother Fanning*."

6. Regarding our course in using works in colleges on the subject of philosophy, we have a few thoughts to offer. Some of these works contain much historical and critical matter of the greatest interest to students; and there are authors who do not adopt the system of the intuitive knowledge of the inner-consciousness to the exclusion of light through the Bible. If for no other reason but to detect and expose false teachers, we consider it the duty of Christian ministers particu-

larly to study most carefully the systems of speculation, such as prevail in Germany, France, England, and the colleges of this country. As a people the disciples have suffered more from false teaching, and especially false philosophy than any other cause, and we have now more to fear from the vain, deceitful, empty and impious philosophy, which turns the hearts of the brethren from the Gospel of Christ, to an imaginary direct knowledge, through the "inner-consciousness," than from every other cause. It is lucidly set forth by Prof. Richardson. Hear him, brethren, a few words. "All attempts," he says, "to reduce spiritual truths to the forms of the understanding, must be futile, and derogatory to that divine word which addresses itself to our higher spiritual nature—to our self-consciousness, as the only legitimate object and auditor of its communications." This open repudiation in high places of the written word, and "the understanding," which John says has been given us, "that we may know him that is true," must be met. If we suffer such things to pass without notice, we should speak no more of religion or the service of God.

After all Prof. Richardson's merriment at what he is pleased to term our "*unique and original exposition*" of Rom. i. 19, 20, we see no authority for concluding that Paul taught the ability of man, as Prof. Richardson affirms in the May Harbinger, to "*Learn the being and attributes of God from the works of Nature.*" His refusing further discussion with one of "Pres. Fanning's scholarship and exegetical skill," comes with bad grace. He has committed himself in a cause that will be discussed.

In answer to Doctor Richardson's exposure of us for referring to Robert Owen and others as Atheists, although they profess belief in some kind of divinity, we respectfully say, that we denominate all *Atheists* who reject the God of the Bible, whether *their* gods are, in the language of Theodore Parker, their conscience, their "*higher nature*," or their stomachs, in the style of the antiquated Paul.

Prof. Richardson "insists that Pres. Campbell is at least quite as competent as President Fanning, to show the true place of philosophy in schools;" but we say, once for all, we have aspired to no discussion with Brother Campbell. We have no positive assurance that he is with Dr. Richardson, and we are unwilling to be involved with him.

Prof. Richardson's statement that Bro. Campbell "holds the opinion that man could not *originate* from his own inner nature or from the material universe the proposition, that there is a God, that this truth is communicated by revelation or tradition," but that nature furnishes merely "the proof of it" is fatal. He adds, "This is what Natural

Theology is understood to teach, precisely what the scriptures say." Here is another attempt to take protection behind Brother Campbell. This is not what Prof. Richardson taught in the May number. Are we to conclude that Prof. R. would shrink from his own teaching. Then he said, that "*Natural Theology teaches that man can learn the being and attributes of God from the works of nature,*" but now nature only affords proof to the spiritually enlightened. This view is what we have always taught, but who does not see the palpable contradiction? First he maintained that we "learn things from nature," but now he tamely says, they can be "communicated only by direct revelation." Can Prof. R. say we do not understand him? Alas for human nature!! This is a sad commentary on the frailties of our race. We mock not Prof. Richardson for his awkward position, but from our soul we pity any one who lays himself so liable to exposure. We tell Prof. R. that his assumption, that Natural Theology attempts no more than to confirm the truth already revealed, is without authority. Natural Theology professes to *discover* God from nature. We hope it is not necessary to discuss this point. Dr. Richardson's reading of Rom, i, 20, "his invisible things are clearly seen *ever since* (*apo*) the creation by the things that are made," the external world is truly fanciful. The connection shows conclusively that the Apostle had not the external world in his mind. He was speaking of the Gospel—said, "*therein* is the righteousness of God *revealed*"—"that which may be known of God is *manifest in them*"—the disciples, and not in nature; and adds, "For God had *showed* (revealed) it unto them." In the 16th chapter Paul treats the matter thus: "Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my Gospel, according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began. But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Will the reader observe, that Paul was speaking of something "revealed," "shown," "now made known," (not *ever since* the creation,) but Dr. R.'s view now is, that he was speaking merely of something which he calls "*proof*" of a proposition previously given by revelation. The way of Prof. R. is truly a hard one.

7. Dr. R. says, he "has not sustained Mr. Russell's teaching." Then we admit our "*inappetency*" to understand Prof. R. He says, "It is not true, that his address was the embodiment of his instruction in Bethany College." Every one must see that Prof. Richardson and Mr. Russell teach the same higher law doctrine; and Mr. Russell has



written to a Brother in St. Louis, referring to Dr. Richardson's essay, to prove their teaching identical. Prof. R.'s declaration that we do "not understand" Mr. Russell, may not answer the purpose intended. Mr. Russell is *more independent* and *lucid*, and much less contradictory than his teacher, and, therefore, it is not so difficult to see his aim. But we trust a few months will enable us to survey the whole ground.

8. Prof. Richardson disclaims all idea of following "in the wake of J. B. Ferguson," and declares "perfect contempt for the various forms of modern spiritualism, as any one conversant," he says, "with his teaching ought to know."

We respectfully remind Dr. Richardson that many of his essays are of so remarkable a character that his age and former position will afford him no protection. He cannot explain away what he has written—as he is evidently attempting—without involving himself in contradictions endless and unpardonable. His only alternative, we think, is to retract the whole system. It saddens our heart to be forced to associate his teaching with the apostate Ferguson's, and with other modern spiritual infidels, but we must be pardoned for intimating that their doctrines are beyond all question the same.

A single quotation from each writer will answer our purpose. Mr. Ferguson says, "The disciples had beheld many manifestations of Christ's glory and confessed him; but their conceptions were gross, (sensual we suppose. T. F.) but they are such as human nature ever clings to until it *can rise above the outward and perishing to the spiritual and eternal.*" He spoke of the ordinances being a "round of outward ceremonies" and the "kingdom being *within us.*"

Dr. Richardson speaks of men who believe on God through his word as "materialists," and "*gross sensualists*"—says the mind "can never reach or rise to that substantive and spiritual reality which must be from its very nature beyond and above the outward forms." "All attempts then to reduce spiritual truths to the forms of the understanding must be futile, and derogatory to that Divine word which addresses itself to *our higher spiritual nature—to our self-consciousness.*" This is to all intents and purposes the style of Theodore Parker. Also Andrew Jackson Davis, the prince of modern spiritualists, on the 139 page of his famous *Penetralia*, mentions the "higher law of nature" as being "higher than the authority of any book;" speaks of the "guidance of our moral *intentions*"—same as Prof. Richardson's "self-consciousness"—and makes inspiration the direct apperception of truth, which is identical with Dr. Richardson's direct light by the spirit within us. The

spiritualists of Tennessee claim Prof. Richardson as a brother, but say he is contradictory, and unreliable. These are some of our reasons for concluding that Prof. Richardson and coadjutors in Illinois and Missouri, especially, are with transcendentalists or modern spiritualists. We are certain they are not with the disciples of Christ in letter or spirit; and no one can regret our convictions more than ourself.

We admit that Dr. Richardson pleads for the authority of the word, but on the same page he contends that we must rise above the word and the ordinary understanding. This was the course of J. B. Ferguson for years; and it is in fact the double dealing which Strouss, the master of the school, advises. He directs infidel preachers to "Adhere to the forms of the popular conception, (the scriptures,) but on every opportunity to exhibit their spiritual significance, (significance above the letter,) and thus prepare the resolution of those forms into their original ideas in the consciousness of the church.—*Life of Jesus*, vol. 3, p. 444.

9. Prof. Richardson's statement, that we maintain "*The universe does not exhibit marks of design*," is without proper authority. To the unenlighted the universe exhibits nothing but visible objects. It suggests not the being and perfections of its Author; as Prof. R. said in the May Harbinger, but with the truth of the Bible in our hearts, "The heavens declare the glory of God," and every object of earth shadows forth the handy work and the goodness of the Divine being.

We deem it unnecessary, at present, to proceed further in the discussion; but we say to the brethren, that we find in the writings of Prof. Richardson and pupils various strange things to which we have not referred, and to which we think it important to call attention. We feel no ambition to expose Prof. Richardson, and we trust that in future he will see the importance of adopting a different manner of procedure. We wish to stand or fall by the truth. T. F.

---

#### NOTES ON A TOUR TO MISSOURI.—No. 1.

HAVING accepted an invitation from the brethren at Farmington, St. Francis county, Missouri, to go there, in the ensuing autumn, and take charge of a school for them, with the object of building up a High School; I concluded, as I had never been there, or in the country, to make a preaching and visiting tour, in the interior, as I had leisure to do so, form their acquaintance, and make such prelimi-

nary arrangements as might be necessary. And as an account of my tour might not be devoid of interest, and perhaps of edification, to the readers of the *Gospel Advocate*, I have concluded to give it, in a series of numbers, of which this will be the first.

Acting on the maxim of the sage and philosophic Franklin, that "little boats should keep near shore," while "larger ones may venture more," or out into the "vasty deep," I do not expect to visit any of our large cities, the commercial and political emporiums of the country, or to see any of our Generals, Colonels, Majors, or wealthy planters, but to wend my course through the "unfrequented country," the lanes and by-ways of the world; but where, nevertheless, as much or more of real worth, genuine holiness, and sterling piety, are to be found. Indeed, it is not in our large cities, in wealthy and aristocratic neighborhoods, or among those whom the world regards as important and great, that these are generally to be found. The influence of *fashion*, and the prevalence of the artificial manners and customs of society, are too chilling in their effects and too formal, restrictive and cramping in their influence, for the existence and growth of that fervent piety and deep devotion which should ever distinguish the genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, and mark his disciples as "a *peculiar* people, zealous of good works" and of obeying his holy commandments. But I find myself digressing, and must return to my subject.

On Wednesday, the 15th of July, myself, in company with my Son William, set out from Henry county, Tennessee, on my tour. As we had neither horses nor carriage of any kind, and were not convenient to railroads or rivers, where we could take the cars or a steamboat, we had to adopt the *primitive* mode of traveling, used by our Savior and his apostles, while peregrinating the land of Judea. It was rendered somewhat unpleasant, on account of the excessive heat which prevailed during the greater part of our trip; but we took it by easy stages, without experiencing much fatigue; and it has the advantage too of being a cheap and independent way of traveling, besides being sometimes the most pleasant too, during very cold weather in winter, as we had experienced on more than one occasion before. We had the *tedium* of our trip relieved, and were much gratified on our way, by contemplating the well-cultivated farms, as we passed along. The thick standing shocks of *wheat* showed that an excellent crop of that valuable grain had generally been made; while the tall and well-headed *oats* gave evidence of an unusual crop of that grain, so important to the farmer in feeding his stock. The Indian *corn*, the most important

of all the grain crops to the farmer, had been remarkably well cultivated, and was in a flourishing condition, but later than usual for the time of year, in consequence of the backwardness of the season. Of the "filthy weed" I shall say nothing, only there appears to be an unusually large crop of it planted this year—the high prices and its being the principal money staple, were probably the causes. On the whole, with sufficient rain, and a late fall, the present year promises to be as good a one to the farmer for his crops as 1855.

We came through the neighborhood of brother W. W. Dugger, but had not the opportunity of calling on him, which we much regretted, as we had long been wishing to do so. His name and fame are in all the churches in the country, in consequence of his zeal, piety and successful labors for the Lord, in the cause of primitive Christianity; and for the same reason he is as much hated, feared and dreaded by the different sects, into which he has made great inroads, and, in some places taken off so many of their members as to have almost entirely broken up their churches! But in all their opposition to him, they cannot bring up a single charge against his moral or religious character—not a single stain lies upon it.

After sojourning a day or two with some connections, in Marshall county, Kentucky, we arrived, on Saturday evening, at our beloved brother's, Elder Jesse J. Shelton's, in Graves county, in order to attend with him the next day, the 3rd Lord's day in July, at Spring Creek Meeting House, not far from him, as we had heard that brother Dugger was to be there then and preach. But we were informed by brother Shelton that it was a mistake, but that it was their regular meeting and preaching day for the month; and as he had before, when I had called on him in passing, solicited me to attend with him on some 3rd Lord's day, he expressed much gratification at my being then able to do so. To add to the interest of the occasion, there were four young men to *immerse*, who, in the morning and prime of life had come forward to obey the Gospel, calmly, deliberately and of their own accord, without having to be excited or urged to it, or moved to obedience by the appliances too often resorted to. Such converts are of the right character to "stick," or remain firm. As they were to be immersed before preaching began, we set off early for the Meeting House, about four miles distant. On arriving we found a very large audience in attendance, which continued to augment. We soon repaired to the water, which was near, where brother Shelton took the confession of the four subjects, and, after singing by the brethren and

a short prayer by myself suitable to the occasion, he *buried* them with Christ in baptism, to arise and walk in newness of life. Any one who has noticed, has no doubt observed the great difference between the number of persons who attend the *immersion* of adults, and the number that attend the place where infants or others have the water *poured* or *sprinkled* on them! Let an immersion be announced, and the people will flock in a crowd to see it; but let it be a pouring or a sprinkling, and how small will be the company present! The reason of the difference is obvious. There is a solemnity and impressiveness in the *immersion* of adult persons—of an intelligent subject who has confessed Christ—the idea of a burial and resurrection, emblematical of Christ, connected with a renunciation of the world—a consonance with scripture teaching; while there is none of this in the *sprinkling* of a few drops of water on the face of an unconscious babe, which is fretting and crying, and shrinking from it, but a ridiculous absurdity—supremely ridiculous and farcical—without a shadow of scriptural authority, and nothing to support it but vague tradition! Hence, while the one is gaining in popular favor, the other is constantly losing! The immersion of the young men was performed by brother Shelton with an ease, propriety and beauty which showed, that while he himself believed in the right action and validity of the ordinance, he understood the proper administration of it. This contrasts strongly with some *Methodist* preachers I have heard of, who would preach long discourses against immersion, and then walk down from the pulpit, and go to the stream or pool, and *immerse* individuals!—generally members whom they were afraid of losing unless they did it, or persons whom they could not get without it!—a most glaring inconsistency, and which should forfeit them the confidence of the religious community. And then the awkward manner in which they perform the ordinance deprives it of its solemnity and sacred character, presents both them and it in a ludicrous position, and renders it a burlesque! I recollect to have read, a few years since, of some cases of immersion of ladies by a *Methodist* preacher, in a stream of *running* water, with their faces up stream! The writer said the result could be imagined! The *pædobaptists* speak of the *indecent* of the immersion of ladies, while it is thus they *make it indecent*. Another preacher invited a Baptist, who had been jeering him about their awkwardness in immersing, to attend and see *how well* he could perform it. Having to stand on a slippery limestone rock, when he performed the ordinance his footing gave way, and *both went under together*! Perhaps he had



never been *immersed*, and needed it. In another case, which occurred a good many years since, in Virginia, a Methodist preacher had a couple of sisters to immerse, who had demanded it. He immersed the first one in so awkward, rough and angry a manner, that the other one refused to be baptized by him, and declared that she would be immersed by "old father Richards," a Baptist preacher, widely known and of most excellent character. And such was the effect of the preacher's manner on the other, that she went partially deranged! These are all real cases—actual occurrences—and well authenticated. And there are scores of cases, no doubt, of similar character. Why is it that persons suffer themselves to be immersed by such persons, having no faith in it, and performing it in such a manner?—and who, too, most generally, have never been baptized themselves, and are not scripturally authorized to administer the rite! But we must close this number of our tour, as it is long enough for one.

J. R. H.

Oak Grove, near Paducah, Ky., July 22, 1857.

---

### FAITH AND OBEDIENCE.

THE New Testament plainly and forcibly teaches the utter impossibility of attaining to a state of salvation, except through the belief of the gospel. It also teaches, equally plain, that every claim to the pardon of sins before obedience has been rendered to the command, which has annexed to it the promise of remission, is but the vain imagining of a deluded mind. The mere opinion, that the scriptures are of divine origin, does not constitute the belief of the gospel. It is possible to believe them to be a revelation from God, and consequently true, and yet not believe the teaching of the word in reference to the way of salvation. Just so far as men fall short of understanding the gospel plan of deliverance from guilt, just so far do they fall short of believing and obeying the word of life. The word must be heard before it can be believed; it must be believed before it can be obeyed, and it must be obeyed before salvation can be received. "Receive," says James, "with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholds himself and goes his way, and straightway forgets what manner of man he was. But whoso looks into the perfect law of liberty and

continue therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." (James i, 22-24; ii, 26.)

Whosoever diligently searches the word may understand and do the word, and the promise is, he shall be blessed in his obedience. Paul to the Hebrews writes, "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Without faith it is impossible to render an acceptable obedience to the command of God. He is pleased only to acknowledge and bless in that obedience that flows from a believing and understanding heart. We are told by the word of inspiration, that he who comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. None can come to him unless they believe in the God of the Bible. They must believe on him as possessing the character and the attributes which the scriptures ascribe to him. They must believe also that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, and this is believing that God has commanded, and promised, that in obedience to that command he will bestow the blessing. He that comes to God must believe that he through the gospel makes to the children of men, the offer of life and salvation upon the special condition that they believe and obey the gospel—the written word. Hence we learn that man must have faith before he can come to God. The word produces faith, and faith produces the necessary preparation of mind for obedience unto life. Paul to the Ephesians says, "By grace are ye saved through faith," showing evidently that they had faith before they received salvation; for it was through their faith that they received it. Paul speaks also of the source from which their faith was derived, or the evidence upon which it was based: "You are built," says he, "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

When the Messiah commissioned the apostles to go and preach the gospel, he plainly told them that those who would believe and obey their word should be saved, but those who would not believe their declaration should not inherit life.

John, writing some years after the organization of the Christian institution, informs us, that Messiah in establishing his kingdom gave to as many as believed on him the power, or authority, to become the sons of God. All who believed the word which the apostles declared,

were authorized to change their relation to God, and become in obedience that which by faith before obedience they were not, viz: the sons of God. For an example in illustration of this, let us go back to the beginning of the gospel dispensation, to the day of Pentecost, when Peter arose before the multitude assembled at Jerusalem, to make the first gospel proclamation ever made on earth. His first effort was to convince the audience that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God. Many hearing his testimony believed, through the word which he spoke. And when they were convinced, from the arguments and evidences which he arrayed before their understanding, that Jesus was the Messiah foretold by the prophets, they were smitten with fear and pierced in heart; for this truth, brought with it the knowledge of just condemnation before God. Now, we may here learn the office and province of faith, and also the effect which the belief of the word of the Apostles has and ever will produce upon the human mind, when fully and correctly comprehended. They began earnestly to inquire what they should do. Their solicitous inquiry gave full assurance that they believed on the Son of God. They then had faith, but they were not yet justified by it. Faith had produced in them an earnest desire to embrace some means of emancipation from sin and condemnation.

They were ready to do something in order to obtain salvation, but what that something was, in which they could receive the pardon of sin, they knew not. On this point they were not as yet informed, because that repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ, had not then been preached. The law given by Moses made no provision for pardon to be granted for crimes such as they had perpetrated. They had treacherously betrayed, falsely accused and crucified the Son of God. Nothing but a dispensation of favor, under a new law or new institution, could reach their sad condition and confer upon them the forgiveness of sins. Power or authority to become the sons of God was not given until Peter, in answer to the interrogation, what shall we do, preached unto them repentance and remission of sins, saying, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." A gift which they had not, nor did not receive until they obeyed the command of the Most High given by the mouth of Peter. And thus believing that which Peter taught them concerning the Messiah, they were led to repentance and became obedient to the command of the Holy Spirit, and in that obedience, viz, baptism, they were born of water and of the Spirit, and became the

children of God. They obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered them, and being then in that obedience made free from sin, they became the servants of righteousness. This is Paul's language to the disciples at Rome, but it may be used with equal propriety in reference to those that became disciples of Christ on the day of Pentecost. Paul, in the same chapter, to his brethren at Rome, said unto them, "Know you not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death. Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together (by baptism) in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. For he that is dead is freed from sin." Know you not that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness? The belief of the gospel, and obedience unto life, hold a relation to each other, similar to that relation which existed between the unbelief and disobedience of our first parents, that brought death with all its attendant woes upon the inhabitants of earth. Unbelief and distrust of God's word and promise led them to disobey the command of their Creator. Unbelief was first, then the offence, and after it then followed the penalty connected with the command. But the law had not access to them as violators until the forbidden deed was done—until the act of rebellion was perpetrated. Even so under the gospel plan of granting admittance into a state of favor and justification before God; faith in his word and promise is first; then obedience to the command, which has connected with it the promise of remission of sins, then follows the possession of pardon, peace and reconciliation with God, and the glorious privilege of enjoying the bright hope of a blissful immortality beyond the tomb. He, therefore, that believes the word is justified of God in obeying the command, on which is predicated the promise; and being justified in obedience, by faith, he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Moses, speaking of the coming of the Messiah and the giving of the gospel—the law of the spirit of life, said to the fathers: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me, him shall you hear (or be required to obey) in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear (or obey) that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people." Now, it is clearly evident from the word of the Lord, by the mouth of his prophet, that

under the reign of Messiah a full and complete obedience, an entire compliance with the precepts of the gospel, connected with the condition of pardon and justification, is required, and must be rendered before the promise of God and the blessings of salvation can be inherited. The prophet said it should come to pass, that under the gospel dispensation every soul that would not obey the Messiah in all things enjoined by his apostles (in order to deliverance from condemnation for sin) should be destroyed from among the people. Beyond a doubt the prophet spoke in this prediction with direct reference to the word of the Lord, which, according to other prophecies, was to go forth from Jerusalem. The proclamation, (there made, when the day of Pentecost was fully come,) that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, and the command to reform and be baptized, in order to obtain the remission of sins, together with all that Jesus taught by his apostles relative to the way of life and salvation constitutes the word—the commands—the things spoken by Messiah, which the prophet Moses said should be obeyed, (not in part only) but in all things whatsoever are spoken. He farther adds, that every soul that would not obey the Savior in all things which he commanded, should be destroyed from among the people. Moses, it seems from the language used, did not know nor even suspect that Messiah would give commands and make requirements, (and suspend, as it were, upon obedience to them the richest and most precious promises,) which commands would eventually prove to be of such a trivial and nonsensical character that they might be dispensed with without marring or deranging the symmetrical order of God's plan. This discovery was made by those who professed to be wise above what is written—by those who respected more the wisdom of men than the authority of the King of Zion. J. M. SELPH.

Mt. Pinson, Madison county, Tenn., August 5, 1857.

---

### THE CONQUEST OF THE TRUTH.

THE noblest victory ever achieved on earth is the victory of the Gospel of Christ. No worldly triumph can for a moment compare with the triumph of God's love over the heart of man. It finds him full of stubbornness, rebellion and corruption, the creature of passion, bowed down by the grovelling and selfish appetites of flesh. It finds him defiled with sin, and knowing no motive to action but the untamed, wild, and reckless impulses of a nature tolerant of no control. It finds him a being only of the present, unacquainted with, and re-



gardless of any destiny that may await him in the future, and the possessor of no hope that passes the narrow limits of this swift hour of existence, and shining with heavenly radiance above the gloom of this world of affliction and sorrow and disappointment, finally spans the awful gulf of death and points to peace and bliss immortal beyond its shades. To him in this hopeless, degraded and wretched condition comes the gospel of God's redeeming love. To him come the glad tidings of a Savior born into the world, and the still more glorious tidings a Savior crucified and slain but risen again. To him comes the affectionate entreaty of Jesus himself, "Come unto me all you that labor and are heavily laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and you shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." The proudest spirit is humbled before the power of such transcendent *love*. The stoutest heart melts at the tale of a Savior's sufferings and death, and he who never knew fear, trembles as the aspen before the unmasked realities of his own hopeless and wretched condition. Pierced by the living word he cries out in sincere penitence, "Lord what will you have me to do?" In humble teachableness the man or woman whose stubborn neck never brooked the least control, now bows and receives the words of the despised Galilean and yields allegiance to him according to his appointment.

Every purpose of wrath is gone, every impulse to vengeance is swept away, and the heart that before was full of all deceit and guile and crime and sin, becomes a dwelling-place of God our Father and the seat of every impulse and ambition that is pure, gentle, holy and divine. From the grovelling, sensual concerns that bow the unregenerate soul to the earth, every purpose of the heart, every aspiration is turned above, and indeed we become new creatures in Christ Jesus. This is conquest, which no earthly conquest can equal. Brute force may do much. Intellectual power may sometimes appear almost to perform wonders. But the Truth of God—the Gospel—the message of love and redemption, no matter how humble the instrument, whenever faithfully and earnestly presented, alone can effect victories which are to this day living miracles in attestation of its divine origin. Any conquest over sinful, rebellious men short of this unreserved subjection of the whole man, with his entire soul, body and affections to Christ, is not the conquest of the Truth. Its work is complete, whole and perfect, and its victory over humanity is without reservation or compromise. Nothing short of this is a conquest of the truth. W. L.

## THE WORD OF GOD.

IN the June number of the Harbinger Dr. Richardson publishes and comments upon an extract from an article of mine, in which he attempts to show that I teach that the Spirit of God and the Word of God are identical. I feel that with those who understand and believe the Truth, reply from me is unnecessary. How any man, whose whole purpose was not to make out his case, could come to any such conclusion, I can not see. There is not a word contained in the extract for which I fear the least reprehension from any man or woman to whom the oracles of God are the authoritative end of controversy. When men go beyond that and begin to appeal to other authorities, I have nothing more to say. They have full license to speculate and weave theories of metaphysical "bosh" and nonsense to their hearts content. I know nothing on the subject of the religion of Christ but the plain simple teachings of the Word of God, through divinely appointed messengers, and I have no use for any thing in Christianity which is beyond the comprehension of men and women of sound sense and good hearts. If this is not the character of the Gospel of God's love, I can see in it no grace, no mercy, and instead of being an offer of free and abundant favor to all, it is a system of the most exclusive partiality. Such a character I do not learn for it from His life and teachings, whose dwelling was with the humble, the lowly and the untutored and whose language is, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance."

Is this to be the fruit of the labors, the trials and the hardships of the last half century? Is this the end for which men have given up family ties and respect of friends and neighbors, and become almost a "hissing and a by-word?" Was it for this poor, pitiable mixture of mysticism, transcendentalism, and such like stuff that the many venerated men, some of whom are gone, while a few yet linger, devoted their time and their energies of soul and body? Shame and ignominy be upon us if we thus crush and consign to death a cause that has not only made those who enjoyed the full blessings of its influence a people strong in the armor of Heaven, and valiant in the defence of the Truth, but has sent its light into the darkest depths of superstition in our land and made men who scoff at it, feel its power, and forsake many time-honored practices. If we ourselves after all that has been done, all that has been borne and sacrificed for the sake of removing the films of superstition from the eyes of the people, are ourselves

to be led back into this murky darkness and miry gloom, it does seem to me that we present the most purposeless, useless and utterly vain project ever attempted by sane beings.

If the intention be to destroy this labor, why not strike it at its fountain head? Why not pronounce the labors of Brother Campbell, and the venerated men who have stood with him in this struggle, utterly senseless and pernicious? Why not charge sensualism, materialism and Bibliolatry upon those to whom we of this generation are so much indebted for our confidence in the Word of God? These men have taught from the beginning, that the gospel is now the only word of God—or will of God—the only proclamation and command addressed to the human race, and that every great moral change in man is through this word. Beyond this we have not gone. We are for the old gospel, for the Ancient Landmarks. It is the only light of the moral world. We know nothing outside of it.

We have no knowledge on any subject pertaining to the salvation, sanctification and final glorification of man that does not come through the written word of the living God. Therein we have his complete revelation concerning us. Therein is found the full mind of Christ in terms, language and conditions so clear that all men and women of common intellects and honest hearts can understand, receive and obey. There is no mercy—no favor in any other sort of a communication. God has not invited a favored few to share in the bounteous inheritance of his favor, but he “has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of this world to confound the things which are mighty.”

In honoring the words of my Master I honor him. In obeying His commands I do that which is pleasing in His sight. And in faithfully and earnestly devoting myself to his requirements I enjoy as fully as any being on this earth “all Spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.” I want no stronger assurance than Christ himself has given: “He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself unto him.” “If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him.” I ask no other word of assurance. What God by his wisdom has spoken I am willing to trust.

W. L.

---

 OPPOSITION TO TRUTH IN KY., UNPRECEDENTED.

DEAR BRETHREN.—Opposition to the primitive Gospel and order of things, both infidel and sectarian, in some parts of this country, is assuming an aspect of virulence, rage and revenge, not often manifested. An old gentleman, of no sort of religion, whose wife obeyed the Gospel and united with the brethren, has ever since manifested great hostility to the cause, and sometimes given expression to it in a very singular and blasphemous manner. On one occasion he *baptized a dog*, in a pond, *in the names* of Dugger, Starks, and Tribble, three of our *preachers!* On another occasion, his horse stumbled, and he exclaimed that he wished he had him at the creek, he would *baptize him*, to see if it would not make him *better!*

But this is all harmless compared with what some others have been doing, under the cover of the darkness of night; for, to use an illustration which it fits, such people “*love darkness* rather than light, because their *deeds are evil.*” And as “every one that does evil hates the light, neither comes to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov’d,” so do they; not so much because of the reproof that might follow, as the fear of punishment and the *penitentiary!* But to the circumstances. Bro. Dugger has been proclaiming the original Gospel with such force and power that he has nearly or quite broken up some party churches, the members of which have obeyed the Gospel and left these “*communions.*” Every means, “*lawful and unlawful,*” that could be devised by our opponents and enemies, to put a stop to it, has been resorted to, but all in vain. The people, by a spirit of independence and investigation, that always does honor to human nature, were determined to go and hear for themselves; and listening with unprejudiced minds, they were convinced, and actuated by the same spirit, obeyed the Gospel.

Enraged by brother Dugger's success, and moved by a diabolical spirit of revenge, with a view no doubt to intimidate him, and perhaps drive him away if possible; as he is a farmer and owns a good deal of valuable stock, an attack upon this was the next means resorted to. So a valuable mule, running out in the range, was *shot* by somebody, and found dead! Next a valuable horse was very badly cut in the stable, with a knife, but afterwards recovered. Not satisfied with killing and injuring his stock, an attempt must be made on his *life*, as an effectual and final mode of putting a stop to his influence! So one night his horses and mules were turned out of his horse lot into his yard, in order to get him out, where an opportunity could be had in

---

the darkness, to knock him down and perhaps put an end to his life! As it happened, his negro boy went out to attend to them, who was *knocked down* with a club, under the supposition that it was brother Dugger!—and stunned for a while by the blow, but fortunately not killed. The assailants made their escape in the darkness without being detected; and no clue has yet been had, by which to ascertain who they were. But as “murder will out,” such things as these cannot always be kept concealed. Such are the means resorted to by our enemies, instead of *arguments*, with which to arrest the progress of the true Gospel! It shows that the same spirit which put our blessed Savior to death, stoned Stephen the protomartyr, and has led so many to the stake, still exists; and all that it wants is power and opportunity to do the same now.

Brother Dugger has more mules, and says that he can spare one occasionally, for the sake of that liberty of speech for which our forefathers fought, bled and died. And well may his opponents and enemies dread his influence, and quail before him, for like Apollos he is “eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures”—not that fine-spun declamation and florid style, which too often goes under the name of eloquence, but that exhibition of the facts and truths of the Gospel, accompanied by illustration and elucidation, which convinces the mind, engages the affections, and leads the individual into obedience. He is one of the ablest preachers I have ever heard; and can strip sectarianism of its unauthorized claims, and expose its false pretensions to being the true Gospel, in a manner that is calculated to destroy it, and cause its votaries to forsake it for the truth. Hence the character of its opposition to him. May he be enabled to long continue his valuable labors.

J. R. H.

Near Davis's Cross Roads, Marshall Co., Ky., July 17, 1857.

---

#### MOUNTAIN DISTRICT CO-OPERATION.

The Co-operation Meeting of the churches in the Mountain District of Tennessee will be held at Ivy Bluff, commencing Friday before the second Lord's day in October, 1857. It will be a matter of general satisfaction to the brethren for each church to send a letter to the meeting, stating its condition and the number added to it during the year.

A. P. SEITZ, Sec'y.



## REPORTS OF EVANGELISTS.

ALEXANDRIA, TENN., July 18, 1857.

BRO. FANNING.—We had a meeting to commence here on the 11th inst., and to close on the 14th inst., and not without good results; five persons confessed and were immersed, (one of whom was from the Baptists.) We also selected three brethren for the office of deacon, to be ordained at a subsequent meeting. Up to that time we were without officers in the church. We come to the conclusion that we are not yet ready to make Elders. Our only preacher was brother J. L. Sewell, our District Evangelist. The Christian Church and the Methodist are the only ones in this village. We have appointed the 12th of September next, the time to commence another protracted meeting.

Fraternally yours,

O. D. WILLIAMS.

ENQUIRY.—We would be really thankful to Bro. Williams, if he would inform us in regard to the manner in which churches make Elders?

T. F.

---

EVANGELIZING SOUTH.

DEAR BRETHREN.—After I wrote you last, I returned home in February to see my family, with the expectation of returning to my field of labor the first of March. But much sickness in my family and other matters, requiring my presence and attention, prolonged my return till May. While at home, being invited, I held a meeting with the church on Flat Creek, in Bedford county, at which three persons turned to the Lord and the brethren were much refreshed and encouraged. There are many good brethren in Bedford, but some of the churches have neither *monthly*, nor *scriptural* pastors.

Last Lord's day I worshipped with the church at Augusta, Ga. Bro. Campbell and brother Shannon had recently held an interesting and successful meeting there of some days. Being advertized in one of the city papers as the speaker of the day, I preached morning and evening. Two made the good confession and four were baptized in the church after preaching at night. The congregation was large and the scene very interesting. Brother Lamar said there had been thirteen confessions in all. The church is much revived and hope for many more. Brother Lamar, though comparatively young, has fortu-

nately the sense, gravity, and dignity of age, and seemes destined to do much good in this lovely city of his own State.

Brother Bush, in the true Christian spirit, met me at Augusta and brought me on to his own house, where I now write and enjoy his Christian hospitality. Brethren Havener and Alfred are to be here next Lord's day, and I shall be happy to unite with them in holding a meeting with the church at Union. The Lord bless our humble efforts!

Vegetation is much farther advanced here than in Tennessee, and the weather much warmer. The sudden change from lingering winter to advancing summer somewhat relaxes this mortal body, but by frequent applications to Dr. Hydropathy I keep it braced up and hope I will continue to enjoy my usual good health.

Yours in the Lord,

J. J. TROTT.

Union, S. C., May 14, 1857.

---

### A WORD TO MOTHERS.

EACH mother is an historian. She writes not the history of empires or of nations on paper, but she writes her own history on the imperishable mind of her child. That tablet and that history will remain indelible when time shall be no more. That history each mother will meet again, and read with eternal joy or unutterable grief in the far coming ages of eternity. This thought should weigh on the mind of every mother, and render her deeply circumspect, and prayerful, and faithful in her solemn work of training up her children for heaven and immortality. The minds of children are very susceptible, and easily impressed. A word, a look, a frown, may engrave an impression on the mind of a child which no lapse of time can efface or wash out. You walk along the sea-shore when the tide is out, and you form characters, or write words or names in the smooth white sand, which it has spread out so clear and beautiful at your feet, according as your fancy may dictate, but the returning tide shall in a few hours wash out and efface for ever all that you have written. Not so the lines and characters of truth, or error, which your conduct imprints on the mind of your child. There you write impressions for the everlasting good or ill of your child, which neither the floods nor the storms of earth can wash out, nor death's cold fingers erase, nor the slow-moving ages of eternity obliterate. How careful then, should each mother be of her treatment of her child. How prayerful, and how serious, and how

earnest to write the eternal truths of God on his mind—those truths which shall be his guide and teacher when her voice shall be silent in death, and her lips no longer move in prayer in his behalf, in commending her dear child to her covenant God.

---

### TRUTH—A GEM.

Our principles, however imperfectly carried out, are now, I sincerely think, shown to be insuperable, invulnerable. They have long and often been assailed; but, like the pure gold, they have always come out of the furnace with brighter lustre.

Truth, my friends, holy truth, stands upon the Rock of Ages. It lifts its head above the stars. It communes with God. It holds sweet converse with the hierarchs around the throne of the Eternal King—with those elders, sons of light, and with the spirits of the mighty dead. It is the bright effluence of the essence of the uncreated minds. God spoke and truth was born. Embodied in the words of God, it came down from heaven and became incarnate. It is, therefore, *immortal*, and cannot be killed. It will survive all its foes, and stand erect when every idol falls. No one knows its gigantic strength. It has been often cast down, but never destroyed. For ages past it has been gathering strength and preparing for a mightier conflict yet, than time records. It needs no fleshly wisdom, nor worldly policy, to give it power, or gain it victory. It is itself redeeming, soul-redeeming, and disenthraling. It has passed through fire, and flood, and tempest, and is as fresh, as fair, as beautiful, and as puissant as ever. He that defends it, feels the strength of mountains, as though girded with the everlasting hills. It gives him more than mortal strength, and enlarges his benevolence as wide as humanity itself.

I am sorry that I have been so much disappointed in the promise of an honorable, high-minded, dignified investigation of its great principles. But, though assailed with unbecoming rudeness, it cannot be destroyed. It is self-preserving and recuperative. Conceived in the bosom of everlasting love, its aspirations are to its native heaven. Light and fire, earth's purest elements, are but the shadows of its glory. The tongues of lambent flame that sat upon the heads of the Apostles, were but indicative of its irradiating and consuming potency.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

VOL. III.      NASHVILLE, OCTOBER, 1857.      NO. 10.

PROFESSOR ROBERT RICHARDSON'S THEOLOGY AS  
SET FORTH IN THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER FOR  
SEPTEMBER, 1857.

With increased interest we again invite our readers to a careful examination of the New Theology of Prof. Robert Richardson and others.

## FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY.

"Beware lest any man spoil you, through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—Paul to the Colossians.

"It was intimated in my last article, that from the delicacy of some of the questions handled, and their detached and isolated presentations in short and disconnected essays, I felt myself exceedingly liable to misconstruction. I have been conscious that not only particular positions taken, but the general scope and design of the whole series of articles might be misconceived and misinterpreted, but I ventured to proceed under the assurance of my own good intentions and the hope that the gradual evolution of the subject would at last place all these matters in a proper light. It may be that, in this confidence, I have too long neglected to introduce some explanations and qualifications of my remarks, which I now desire to offer.

"Let me not be understood, then, as questioning in the least, the correctness of the principles and teachings of any of the leading brethren in the Reformation, when I have ventured to express the fear that many may have adopted their conclusive arguments showing that facts are the *true* basis of faith, as a theory or philosophy of faith itself. I would, on the contrary, re-affirm my entire conviction that this point has been so clearly elaborated, especially by Bro. Campbell, as to leave no just ground of dispute, and that if any have converted the ar-

gument into a *theory*, this error is not to be attributed to those who have *employed* the argument. It is due rather to that tendency, so common in religious society everywhere, to substitute theories and philosophies of things for things themselves. As to the actual extent to which the particular error in question may have prevailed, I do not undertake positively to say; for though, in view of the strong natural tendency in men to mix philosophy with religion, and the various indications of the existence of this error which have fallen under my observation, my fears might lead me to think that many, as taken by themselves, had fallen short of the true idea of faith, it may be no less true that, compared with the mass of the disciples, the number is but few. Of this, at least, I will endeavor to entertain the hope, for certainly nothing would be more subversive of the great principles and purposes of this reformation, or more unfavorable to spiritual progress, than the mixing up of human philosophy with so elementary a matter as faith. We, as a religious community, are distinguished from all others, in that we have adopted facts instead of doctrinal theories as the basis of the Christian faith, and, on this account also, it has seemed to me important that imperfect views in relation to this matter should not be allowed to exist in the minds of any one.

"I have no idea, indeed, that there exists amongst us as a religious body, any great diversity of sentiment. It has been said, indeed, by one whose judgment is entitled to the highest respect, that we have among us 'all sorts of preachers preaching all sorts of doctrines,' and this may be correct in the same sense as what I have above alleged as to the existence of imperfect views of faith. But it is certainly far more applicable to the other religious denominations than to us. The practice of text preaching and of spiritualizing the Scriptures which prevails among them, gives rise to the greatest discrepancies in their expositions of the Word of God, so that one will scarcely hear the same doctrine deduced from the same text by any two preachers in any one party. We, however, having adopted the true and established rules of Scripture interpretation, almost invariably reach the same conclusions, so that brethren the most widely separated from each other, find themselves of one heart and of one mind in regard to all the great matters of the gospel. This is not only agreeable in itself, but a sure indication of the correctness of our principles, and that the Bible alone furnishes the proper basis for the union of Christians. How important it is then that we should carefully adhere to this standard and allow no human philosophy to mingle itself insidiously with the pure teachings of the Sacred Word.

"The liberty we enjoy as disciples of Christ of sitting at the feet of our Master to hear his word, and to grow in knowledge of divine things, is one which we cannot too highly appreciate. Sectarians who are shut up within the narrow precincts of human creeds, can neither realize nor comprehend it. But knowing, as I do, the earnest desire of the brethren to make progress in the divine life, and the sincere delight with which they gain new insight into the sacred mysteries of the



gospel, and that they will bring every thing to the test of Holy Scriptures, I trust that my present effort to break the cold fetters of that sensuistic philosophy which has cramped the energies and arrested the advance of this religious movement to some extent, will be accepted in the same kind spirit and cordial love of truth in which I am sure it is made upon my part.

R. R.

"While upon the subject of misconstruction and consequent misrepresentations of my views, I wish to say a few words in relation to the sense in which I have used the word philosophy, and the point of view in which I contrast it with faith in the title to these essays. This, indeed, is to most readers, sufficiently indicated by the *text* which I have selected as a motto, but in order to prevent misapprehension on the part of any one, I would remind the reader that I have throughout, carefully *specified* the sort of philosophy to which I object in religion, as being *human* philosophy. He will also remember that I have by no means objected to human philosophy or wisdom, considered *in itself*; but that, on the contrary, I have defended it from the rude assaults of an ignorance so adventurous as to denounce it wholly and unreservedly as calculated only to 'make infidels.' I have taught that, *in its own place*, it is worthy of attention and respect, and that it is very far from being a mark of intelligence or wisdom to charge literary institutions or individuals with having infidel proclivities because they 'use the philosophies mental and moral of the times.' The reader will perceive how forcibly this view of human philosophy is sustained in an article in the present number of the Harbinger from the pen of Bro. Campbell, and how absurd, in view of what is there said, are all such assertions as that 'The revelations of God and the philosophies of the world agree in no particular,' and that 'no one who respects the Bible can believe in any system of philosophy in existence'—thus making faith and all philosophy necessarily antagonistic to one another. Truth is always harmonious. No truth in the universe can possibly be incompatible with any other truth, and whatever men may have discovered that is true in reference to mind or morals, or material nature, will be found to be in perfect harmony with what may hereafter be discovered, and certainly can never conflict in the slightest degree with any truths in Divine revelation.

The reader will remember that I have distinctly asserted that religion itself has its own philosophy, and that my objection has been to the substitution of human philosophy for that *divine* philosophy, which pervades the gospel. I remarked in the May number that, 'since the philosophy of anything is its *reason*, there is a philosophy in religion, else there would be no reason in it. But it is a *divine* and not a *human* philosophy. *It is Christ crucified that is God's philosophy.* It is the *gospel* that is God's *power* and wisdom. Hence it would be correct to say that Christianity contains the most glorious and sublime philosophy in the universe, since it is the *divine plan* or *system* of salvation, perfectly adapted to man through an *infallible knowledge of his nature, character and condition.* It is because it is thus absolutely perfect in its own philosophy that any addition of *human* philosophy spoils it.

Christ must be our '*wisdom*,' as he is our righteousness, our sanctification, and our redemption.' I take pleasure in again referring the reader to Brother Campbell's essay on 'Christianity the true philosophy,' in the present number, as a cogent and forcible presentation of the same view, and as exhibiting the contumely offered to the 'Great Teacher,' in forsaking his lessons of wisdom for mere human theories and speculations.

"It will be then, I presume, apparent to the most ordinary apprehension in what sense I use the word philosophy, and in what respect I contrast faith with philosophy. That there is a contrast and an antagonism between the faith of the gospel and human philosophy as its substitute, cannot be truthfully denied. The former is God's wisdom; the latter is man's wisdom; and being thus things of the same class, they are *with entire propriety* contrasted with each other. 'My ways,' saith God to man, 'are not as your ways, neither are my thoughts as your thoughts.' But the opposition or antagonism between faith and human philosophy is clearly implied in the text which I have prefixed to these essays. The apostle in addressing those who were to be guided by FAITH, warns them to take heed lest any one should 'spoil them through PHILOSOPHY,' which he further defines as 'after the *tradition of men*, after the *radiments of the world* and not after CHRIST.' This human philosophy, then, was, in his view, *antagonistic* to the Christian faith, since he warns the disciples AGAINST it, and exhorts them to 'walk in Christ Jesus the Lord as they had received him, rooted and built up in him and established in the *faith* as they had been taught.' While I have thus, the language of an inspired apostle clearly affirming the mutual antagonism of faith and human philosophy in religion, I care not to seek for any other justification or defence of the appropriateness of the title, "Faith *versus* Philosophy." The faith of Christ is adverse to human philosophy in religious affairs. The Holy Spirit has declared its entire incompatibility with a pure faith, and has given us the most earnest and emphatic warnings against it, and it will be our wisdom to give proper heed to these admonitions.

Of course there never can be any just antagonism between the Christian faith and that *divine* philosophy of which it is itself the exponent, and I trust that no reader will so far misconceive me as to imagine that I have anywhere asserted the existence of such an antagonism. As our beloved Bro. Campbell has well remarked, one might as well assert an antagonism between faith and reason. For faith is the very perfection of reason or true philosophy, and we cannot then too reverently receive the things of faith which are revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, since they are the infallible dictates of infinite wisdom, and the appropriate and necessary means devised by divine love for our salvation.

"Upon this subject I have many things to say which seem to me important in the present position of affairs. But as this particular point has already occupied so much space in the present number, I defer any further discussion to a future opportunity."

R. R.

## FIFTH REPLY TO PROF. ROBERT RICHARDSON.

PHILOSOPHY *versus* THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION,—FINAL STATEMENT OF  
THE QUESTION.

*Courteous Reader*,—Although we have not been hasty in our examination of the New Theology, we have endeavored to discuss the matters under consideration in great moderation, and we have not doubted for a moment, the truth of our position, or that we would not be fully sustained by our most discriminating and pious brethren. We have cause to rejoice—the best men of the world are with us, and the boldest advocates of the “higher-law theology” are now attempting to escape from the rotten castle in which they have been sheltering. An *honorable* retreat gives the highest evidence of competent generalship, but a confused disappearance under a suspicious flag, or no flag at all, is most inglorious.

In the present number, it is our purpose to advance several steps in our examination in the New Theology. We think it possible to show with the clearness of a sun-beam that there is nothing profound in it, no “*delicate*” question, suited only to a “rare class,” but that it is shallow throughout, and its advocates are incompetent to defend it.

1. *The first fatal error of the school consists in the adoption of the old heathen dogma, resuscitated in modern times, which makes the soul of man an emanation from the Deity, and teaches that unaided by the Bible it is fully able to originate all spiritual light.*

The doctrine is first found plainly set forth in the Vedas of idolatrous India. Bram is represented as the *all*, the soul of the universe, and all human souls are but modes of his existence, and their transmigration shall continue, till they finally return to unity, “Atma.”

The next instance is Plato’s doctrine of IDEAS being real existences, one with the Supreme which is identical. The soul, with Plato, is a self-acting energy at one with the Divine—it is God within. Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, taught that *consciousness* is the only ground of absolute certainty. Hence his principle of knowing was within and depended not for its action upon any external influence. Leibnitz, his disciple, taught that the soul was capable of immediate, spontaneous thought, and competent to make all spiritual discoveries without aid. This is the basis of all modern philosophy. Some call it “The divinity within,” others “reason,” others the “inner consciousness,” others “intuition”—some speak of the divine governing principle within, under the head of “*conscience*” or a “suggestive power.” “The higher-law of our nature;” and some “as a directing and con-

troling *element* in the soul. Others call it our "*moral sense*." Cousin, a favorite with Prof. Richardson, speaks of "the universal and perpetual revelation of reason." He maintains, that "The ideas of the useful, the just, the beautiful, the divine, the true, are facts attested by the human consciousness, and are the controlling *elements* of human nature. He further contends, that "There are no other elements, and that these exhaust the capacity of human nature." This is the key to modern philosophy, and the reader need not be told, that if we possess *natural* elements to afford us all the knowledge we need with regard to God, and things divine, we should seek no such aids as are afforded in the Bible.

The infidel Newman calls this "*the noetic principle*;" "an inward monitor;" speaks of following the "*instincts of the soul*," and "the soul is the specific sense by which we come into contact with God;" exhorts to follow "our glorious tendencies," and declares "*A book revelation on the subject of spiritual matters is impossible*." Theodore Parker maintains that there is "*a religious element in us*," amounting to a "*higher-law*," that is our only safe guide.

The philosophical idea is, that there is a power within—call it by whatever name we please—capable of originating spiritual ideas, and of perceiving spiritual truth without aid. *This spontaneous operation of the soul* is called *philosophising*, and the various theories drawn from it, are denominated "*systems of philosophy*." As we stated in our first essay, light from within is called the *a priori* knowledge. Spirit, mind, reason, or the soul, it is said, is a cause quite adequate for all absolute truth.

Each system professes to give the *principle*,—original cause of all things. Thales regarded *water* as the grand cause in creation.

Anaxemines chose *air* as the agent in creation. Hereclitus said *fire* was the maker and preserver, but it remained for Anaxagoras to set forth the theory, (though the idea no doubt was borrowed,) that there "Is a world-forming intelligence." These systems assume, that the "*divine spark within*"—the *pure reason*, is quite sufficient for teaching also all duty, and hence the highest authority in the universe is *feeling or natural inspiration*.

It will be proper in this place to give the Christian position. Those who believe in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, maintain that God made man liable to err; "The first man was *not spiritual*, but earthy. He was distinguished by mind—capacity to improve—and draw correct conclusions from data submitted to him. Yet man is not

regarded as God, or in any part divine, or capable, in the words of the prophet, to "direct his steps," and, therefore, it has pleased our Kind Father, to become our adviser and teacher. All of his instructions to us regarding his existence, our creation, our present relations to Heaven and earth, and eternal destiny, have been revealed by the Spirit, and are embodied in the Bible, and beyond the lessons of wisdom therein contained, the world has no spiritual light.

We think proper in the next place to call particular attention to the teaching of Prof. Richardson and some of his coadjutors on these momentous questions.

They plainly and unequivocally maintain the natural ability of man to discover truth without the intervention of God's revelations, by the spontaneous powers within.

1. Dr. Richardson speaks of "*the spiritual in man*"—although Paul said, "That was not first which is spiritual"—affirms that "It is the spirit itself (spirit of man) that can perceive or contemplate the truth presented," and caps the climax by asserting, that "*All attempts to reduce spiritual truths to the forms of the understanding must be futile, and derogatory to that Divine word which addresses itself to our higher spiritual nature—to our self-consciousness.*" He employs the phrase "*Inner consciousness,*" as indicative of an infallible spiritual power common to all men. We need not say to our readers that this is the doctrine of metaphysicians and infidel philosophers.

2. Our friend, Mr. I. N. Carman, editor of the Christian Sentinel—which Pres. Campbell suggests "is conducted with good ability"—says, "That man has an *intuitional* nature as well as an intellectual one, and within this intuitional nature must be saught the spiritual" He calls it "*the Divine spark,*" "*spiritual nature,*" pronounces Mr. W. S. Russell, "*The talented, spiritual and beloved,*" and publishes what he calls "*The excellent article of Prof. Richardson—'Faith versus Philosophy,'*" against us, but has neglected to give our reply. Mr. Carman and co-editors we believe were pupils of Prof. Richardson.

3. But by far the most talented, consistent, and so far as we are able to judge, best man of the new school, is W. S. Russell, whose teaching we long since felt constrained to pronounce unblushing infidelity. It is true, our venerable Bro. Campbell congratulates the brethren of Illinois for their good fortune in securing Mr. Russell's services to the presidency of a college. No doubt Bro. Campbell is as sincere as we are, but we are sorry that we differ so widely in reference to men and their teaching.



We will let Mr. Russell define his own position touching the philosophical dogma of man's natural ability to discover spiritual truth.

In the June number of the *Christian Sentinel* he openly avows his philosophical creed. He sets out by saying he must "select the class of minds" he will address, and he can "*expect sympathy from only a rare class of men.*" "*Those who are accustomed to obey the highest behests of reason and are not averse to the labor of thinking.*"

With Prof. Richardson he considers the questions not suited to the "*common mind*" or the masses of thinkers amongst Christians. He says, "*There is a vulgar prejudice against the word metaphysics, yet it is but a circumlocution for spiritual.*"

"Let us," he says, "gather up our conclusions." "We have seen that in the soul there is a HIGHER REASON, not reflective but SPONTANEOUS in its character, giving *all men primary inspirations* which compose the elements of thought, and this is determined by the fact that these principles are universal and necessary—exhibiting themselves wherever there is a sane mind, and which it is impossible to conceive as ceasing to exist—which cannot, therefore, have their cause in the finite spirit of man, and must be referred to a Higher Intelligence, to the infinite mind of God." "Once admitting," he adds, "and fully realizing this important conclusion, which a rigid analysis of the phenomena of consciousness cannot fail to establish, the *possibility* of God's making *more revelations* through man than those constituting the elements of his spiritual activity, or of his imparting greater energy to those elements already existing in their germs, is fully established. Also the avenue through which all divine revelations given in the form of inspiration must come, is made known, that is, in the *instinctive reason* or *conscience*, taken in its wider significance." He calls "the higher laws of our being, the laws of God." The energizing of the pure reason, therefore, is the *method of inspiration.*" "All nations possess the primitive intuitions"—"Conscience is the representative of the will of God." In opposing light through the senses, he asserts "It denies intuition or *immediate suggestion* as a means of obtaining knowledge. The theory of spiritual influences founded upon it, (knowledge from without,) maintains that all the influence of the Spirit is exerted by the truths conveyed through the words of scripture; that these words were spoken by the Spirit, (all philosophy denies that these words were spoken by the Spirit,) and these only, and therefore its influence is restricted to the ideas which thus reach the mind."

This he calls "*spiritual philosophy.*"

But we need no more. Mr. Russell possesses the rare merit of speaking plainly, and he seems to believe what he says. There is no mincing of matters; no saying a thing and then saying its opposite.

Now we ask the candid, if we can be mistaken as to the assumptions of philosophy? Prof. R., Mr. Carman, and Mr. Russell, fully agree with the German, French and American infidels in asserting that "there is a divinity within," who is our only teacher, "and that shapes our ends."

With such data we feel fully authorized to draw conclusions.

2. The doctrine that man is born with an inspiring divinity which is an infallible guide, call it "conscience," "intuition," "reason," "Divine spark," that makes us one with God naturally, precludes the possibility of sin, or future condemnation, and in fact all its advocates, if they would speak candidly, maintain that death but frees the human family from habiliments of clay, to enjoy unconditionally, eternal bliss.

3. The system precludes the necessity of a Savior—none is needed—man being divine naturally, never sinned, cannot be lost, and salvation has no meaning. No one of its advocates regards Jesus Christ as a Savior.

4. The doctrine destroys the whole idea of the church as a saving institution. Hence the teachers speak of a something natural *within the heart*, which they call "the kingdom of heaven."

No marvel that with such views even Prof. Milligan should say, "*In our present independent, weak, and distracted condition, we can, as a church, do but little for the salvation of the world.*"

Prof. M. says, "Brother Fanning has very unfairly and erroneously represented my views concerning the church."

We cannot see wherein we represented unfairly Prof. M. His words need no interpreter. If Prof. M. will publish our last reply to him, we will be in a condition to examine our differences as Christian brothers. We appreciate his use of the phrase "*gross perversion*," applied to some of our statements; and we certainly should feel under obligations to him and Prof. Richardson for their well intended interest in our "*secular business*." Men who have done no more for the world in a temporal or spiritual point of view, it occurs to us, should be modest in assuming the guardianship of others. Prof. M., like some of his timid associates, in stepping forth into the realms of speculative religion, has defended two systems as opposite as the poles. When under the influence of, perhaps, his grand-mother, he was for the church alone, but in his *liberal*, learned and philosophical teaching "the church

could do but little," and the world must look to "the institutions of necessity" for the benevolent labor "for which the church," he says, "as it is now organized furnishes no corresponding medium. We forbear.

Prof. Richardson, in his second essay on *Misinterpretations of Scripture*, as found in the Harbinger for November, 1856, devotes over six pages to Greek and other criticisms to prove Christ did not intend to communicate the idea, that the passage, "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," indicates the perpetual existence of a visible church, but merely the *resurrection* of its individual members. True, Prof. R. did not say there has been no church in the different ages, but his style is well calculated to discountenance the faith of a permanent church. We doubt not our Lord intended to make the impression, that on the confession that he was the Christ, he would build a church—a spiritual temple—that should not be broken down, and even "the gates of the unseen world should not prevent its triumph," and he would finally deliver up the kingdom, as a kingdom, to his Father. We will notice some of his singular declarations. He says, "The promise has been commonly understood to be the *perpetuity of the church on earth as a distinct, visible, organized community*, and that the Savior referred to something *more than a mere external and formal existence of a body of professed believers at all times upon the earth.*" Again he says, "Suppose that this promise referred to the mere *temporal existence of the church.*" "It refers to a far more glorious deliverance than from the mere external, formal and temporal overthrow of an outward organization."

This is the style of the entire school of speculatists from Cousin, Sleightmacher and Strauss, to Parker, Newman and Andrew Jackson Davis. The renunciation of the church as a city on an hill to give light to the lost, is a legitimate result of Dr. R.'s natural spiritualism. Hence his style.

*The advocates of intuitive spiritualism, are forced from their premises to oppose the inspiration of the scriptures, and to deny the authority of the Bible in religion.*

Theodore Parker says, "Naturalism is the philosophy that lies at the foundation of theology, though little understood by men in or out of the pulpit, while they deny the *immanence* of God in matter and man, and, therefore, take away the possibility of NATURAL INSPIRATION." Thus, Mr. Parker, most consistently with the idea, that the divinity within guides us, maintains natural and universal inspiration. Conse-

quently he affirms, that a "*Man is not sent outside of himself to ancient documents (the Bible) for a rule of faith and practice—inspiration is co-extensive with the race.* There can be but one mode of inspiration," he adds, "it is the action of the highest within the soul. Is Newton less inspired than Simon Peter?" The system admits of degrees of inspiration. Hence Mr. Parker says, "*There must be degrees of inspiration, from the lowest sinner to the highest saint.*"

It is not necessary to add authority. All the school agree. But, we are asked if it is possible this is the teaching of Prof. Richardson, Mr. Russell, and many others amongst us? We will see.

Prof. Richardson informs the world that "The scriptures do not reveal spiritual truth to him who relies upon his understanding alone." He says, "We must take account of man's higher forms of being to realize the truths of Divine revelation."

"To reduce spiritual truths to the forms of the understanding must be futile—it is the spirit itself—(the spirit of man. T. F.) alone that can perceive the truth." (See M. Harbinger for 1856, pp. 304 and 5.) Dr. Richardson is almost as clear on the subject as Parker, Newman or Strauss. He says, "*The veil of the outward appearance (the written word) must be lifted from the face of divine revelation.*" Open transcendentalists say, "in proportion as we rise above words, forms, written documents," to something they call "*the real, absolute truth, independent of subject or forms, do we perceive what is spiritual.*" This is precisely what Prof. Richardson has been trying to say for years. It is what he imagined he saw, and what others were too ignorant to see, but he has lacked two essential qualities of mind to say what he wanted. In the first place, the very peculiar construction of his *sensorium*, as Kant would call it, does not permit him to make a very lucid statement of any question; and, secondly, he has not been sure that the brethren would go with him. Mr. Russell, however, hesitates not to say that the teaching of "A. Campbell and others is shallow," and we must keep pace with the progress of the age. We will hear him upon inspiration.

As already quoted, he says, in the June number of "The Christian Sentinel" for 1857, "In the soul there is a higher reason, not reflective but spontaneous, giving all men primary inspiration." His language is even stronger than Theodore Parker's. He adds, these "Inspirations compose the elements of thought—these principles are universal and necessary, and cannot have their cause in the finite spirit of man, and must be referred to a higher intelligence—to the infinite mind

of God." This is as nearly Plato's doctrine of Ideas—ideas constituting and being the essence of Divinity—as it is possible to conceive. This inspiration which is universal, as Parker says, "from the lowest sinner to the highest saint," is "intuitive," says Mr. R., through the "reason or conscience." He modestly admits, with all the school, the *exceeding imperfection* of revelation, owing to the *imperfect* agents. Hence he says, "The revelations cannot come to us except they be marked by the *characteristics* of the prophet's own mind, and be given to us in the *imperfect forms* of the understanding." Again, "While all nations give evidence of possessing the ideas of God as primitive intuitions, in what various degrees of purity and strength do they express them through the materials of the understanding." Mr. Russell maintains boldly, that the various books in the Bible partake of the personal imperfections of the writers, and, therefore, they can constitute no *infallible* standard of faith and practice. We repeat, that he is consistent so far as we have noticed. He has not denied his position. He has not adopted the philosophical system, and pretended all the while that it is precisely what Brother Campbell and the brethren universally have taught, as J. B. Ferguson, Dr. Richardson and others have done. But why pursue this point further? All understand and must admit that inspiration which is *universal* in saint and sinner, is not Christian, and worse still, a volume not *verbally* inspired, possesses nothing divine in it. The idea of following the mere inspirations of our nature, is a yielding to animal impulses—to fleshly desires, brute instincts, and a plain denial of the authority of the Scriptures. As we stated in our first essay upon "*Metaphysical Discussions*," our spiritual knowledge must be *a posteriori*,—from the external world—nature; *a priori*,—from *within*, *intuitive*—or in direct revelations—communications in words from God. Prof. Richardson, says, "*Man can learn the being and perfections of God from the works of nature*;" secondly, he maintains that we perceive spiritual truth direct—not through the understanding and the written word—but *a priori*, by "*the Spirit*," or the "*spiritual in man*." But what signifies all this, if Prof. R. and friends, after asserting these things, should now talk of our light by the word of God in the Scriptures? They certainly understand the meaning of the positions they have so zealously advocated. They have not renounced them, and should they now all retire from the contest under *false colors*, we can but fear their stealthy return. If Pres. Campbell were not on the stage, we know not what they would, or would not attempt.



6. *The system completely neutralizes and blots from existence the meaning of positive institutions or ordinances of religion.*

Prof. Richardson's style, in regard to what he is pleased to denominate "a mere visible, external church," shows the direction of his mind. Hence the course of Mr. Russell in engaging with the denominations "in praying for the mourners in revivals." Wonder if it is true that the party preachers gave him \$25—Judas received 30 pieces—for his spiritual efforts to bring the disciples to the truth. If they did not, we will apologise for the insinuation. The fact is, ordinances have no meaning with the school. The highest authority is *within*—the voice of conscience is the voice of God. We regard it not necessary to notice the system or its tendencies further than to call attention to some things in the September Harbinger.

1st. Prof. R. thinks "from the *delicacy* of some of the questions handled, and their detached and isolated presentation, he is exceedingly liable to misrepresentation." We hope to relieve our quondam friend, by assuring him that it is not difficult to understand him. No one can be mistaken in regard to many cardinal points.

2. He "*desires to offer explanations and qualifications.*" None are necessary. The whole system is unblushingly infidel. It is moral death to touch any part of it. He is better understood without explanations than with them. The only hope for Prof. R. is to renounce his *intuitive faith*, and do works worthy of a great reformation.

3. He says his object has been "*to break the cold fetters of sensualistic philosophy.*" His object has been to satisfy the brethren that faith is not through the facts of the gospel, but from our "*inner consciousness*," and from influences above the written oracles. His new doctrine he cannot force upon the brethren—it has led him to the precipice, and he is inclined to hold on a little longer to Bro. Campbell's skirts. Will he let him? That is the question.

4. In the August number he left us under a deceptive banner, but he returned masked in the September number feebly crying, "I have by no means objected to *human philosophy*, (no one supposes he has,) or wisdom considered in itself, but that on the contrary, I have defended it from the RUDE ASSAULTS of an ignorance so adventurous as to denounce it wholly and unreservedly as calculated to make infidels. I have taught that in its own place it is worthy of attention and respect, and it is very far from being a mark of intelligence or wisdom to charge literary institutions or individuals with having infidel proclivities because they "use the philosophies, mental and moral, of the times."

Prof. R. has said so much of "*rude assaults*," "*ignorance*," etc., etc., that we have no heart to reply. His is the deep wail of a martyr; but it is not a martyrdom for the truth of the Bible, but, from his own showing, it is death for defending human philosophy, against the ignorance and rudeness of believing on the Savior through the words of the Apostles. Dr. R. has saved us from the delicate office of becoming his executioner, by a most suicidal course. His vascillating, contradictory, and bitter manner, consigned him to a different position from what he has long occupied amongst the disciples. To think of his future usefulness is extremely preposterous, "*So they hanged Haman on the gallows he had prepared for Mordecai.*"

5. He consoles himself by asserting that Bro. Campbell sustains his "*view of Philosophy.*" This statement to our mind lacks a very essential ingredient, viz., proof. To be sure, Bro. Campbell has spoken of Prof. R.'s essays being "*Timous, learned and highly interesting.*" We regret to differ across the whole heavens with our venerable brother, and confess that we do not understand these remarkable suggestions. Perhaps it is not our province to ask for more light. It is Pres. Campbell's right to defend whom he pleases, but in the day that he shall adopt any part of Dr. Richardson's philosophical system, he will renounce the whole teaching of his well-spent life. As we intimated doubt when Prof. R. stated that Bro. Campbell was teaching "Natural Theology in Bethany College," we cannot and will not believe that he will defend his views till he does it.

6. Prof. R. attempts to shift the whole ground of controversy, by asserting that his "objection has been to the substitution of *human* philosophy for that divine philosophy which pervades the Bible," and this he says Pres. C. is defending.

We remark, with much respect, that no one has the right to use the word *philosophy* in a sense not discovered in the Bible, or any reputable author of ancient or modern times. This new application of the word to something in the Bible, portends nothing good.

In the only passage it is found in the Bible (Col. ii, 8) the apostle exhorts the brethren to "Beware lest any man spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." There is no acceptable sense in which philosophy can be connected with religion. It is of the world, of men, and religion rests upon no intuition or even "natural inquisitiveness," to look into the cause of things, in our humble judgment, but upon direct revelation from God. Philosophers in all ages

have professed to *learn the being and perfections of God*, what is law, what is right, and all religious obligations from nature" without the aid of revelation. The apostle, however, says, "The world by wisdom knew not God." Prof. R. and associates think differently.

Still Prof. R. asserts, by way of explaining himself, that his "*objection has been to human philosophy for that divine philosophy which pervades the gospel.*" Does Prof. R. speak at random? Does he really believe the brethren are destitute of ordinary perception? The idea of connecting philosophy with the gospel is gratuitous. This was not in his mind when he wrote his "essays." He was advocating the philosophy of Cousin—"the *higher-law*" doctrine of Parker and infidels generally, and now to take shelter under a *pretended* philosophy of the Bible, must make a singular impression upon the candid. We feel no ambition to reply further to Dr. Richardson and comrades on infidel speculations.

Thus have we given some of our reasons for believing that the whole system drawn from the heathen dogma, of "a divinity within," "spark divine," "*spiritual nature*," "higher reason," "intuition," "inner-consciousness," nature without or within, being a teacher superior to Christ, is infidel in its inception, infidel in its details, infidel in the lives of its advocates; subversive of the faith of the Gospel, subversive of the church of Christ, of the ordinances of religion; subversive of every influence calculated to purify the heart and elevate the character, and disgraceful to any people professing to be governed by the mind of Christ. Towards the several writers and editors who have published their various infidel effusions without giving our replies, we feel that it would exhibit the deepest hypocrisy to profess Christian regard. We cannot be induced to respect the doctrine as Christian, or the men teaching it, or in any way aiding and abetting in its propagation, friends to Jesus Christ and his religion. It is a pleasure to treat them with respect, as men, and we will not degrade ourself by abusing, misrepresenting or disparaging them, but we shall be forced to regard them as apostates and infidels, till they renounce, without reserve or equivocation, their deistical and atheistical teaching, and at least *endeavor* to repair the serious injury they have done to the cause of Christ. We will wait for developments. There is but one platform upon which we dare associate with men religiously—the oracles of Heaven, as recorded in the Bible.

As the papers generally have been so free to publish and favor the infidel teaching of Prof. R. and pupils we ask, with great respect,

if the brethren have not a right to expect that replies will be admitted? So far as we have been able to learn, it is the first instance in the history of "the reformation of the nineteenth century" in which there has been the least hesitation to give answers to controversial and personal productions. We refer particularly to the course of the *Millennial Harbinger*, *Christian Sentinel*, and *Christian Age*,—while under Mr. Bosworth's administration. We respectfully ask the editors of these journals to give our replies, and especially our fifth, in their columns.

T. FANNING.

---

#### EDITORIAL.

Bro. M. M., of Moulton, Ala., urges us to visit his section. Gladly would we do so, were it in our power. There are no people to whom we feel more endeared. In the congregation of that place two of our best men have fallen to rise not till the resurrection of the just, but the Lord will raise up others to occupy their places. We pray constantly for the beloved disciples and friends at Moulton. We hope to see them again—perhaps in December. We trust also that we may be able to comply with the wish of our friends further South.

The brother in Missouri who writes so favorable a notice of Franklin College has our thanks; but we think it best not to publish it.

---

#### FRANKLIN COLLEGE.

The Fourteenth Annual Session of Franklin College opened September 14th with a small but we think very promising class. Many things have conspired for years past to diminish the patronage. The institution is in the country, too far from the exciting influences of which so many youths are ruinously fond to suit the taste of the light minded and unsteady; the officers have done little or nothing to attract patronage, the various religious influences are brought effectually to bear, and worst of all, in our judgment, young men are becoming less and less inclined to study, and parents seem to us to be growing more and more indifferent as to the education of their sons.

With our new organization, however, and plan of interesting the members of our Faculty in the business of the establishment, the college never opened a session with more healthful prospects. The Faculty, Trustees and friends who know the condition of affairs, never felt greater confidence. The institution is, in our judgment, in the midst of the best country on earth, the buildings and preparations are every

way suited to the objects contemplated, and a more competent Faculty, we think, cannot be found. We feel it our right and duty thus to speak, and we are conscious that our language is not too strong. Indeed, we have felt cramped for years from the fact, that the business was mainly *ours*, but we have relieved ourself from much of the pecuniary interest, and, therefore, we speak with confidence. Prof. Carmack, who is at the head of the Preparatory School, offers greater inducements to parents to educate their younger sons with him than any one in our acquaintance. Prof. Lipscomb, our Vice-President, Prof. A. J. Fanning, and Mr. T. T. Baudouin, are fully alive to the improvement of the students and advancement of the school in usefulness. Such persons as desire their sons in school, in circumstances most favorable for pursuing and cultivating moral habits, and making the best intellectual advancement, will not be disappointed in sending to Franklin College.

T. F.

#### REVISION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

THE best argument, in favor of a "Revision" of the Holy Scriptures, is the fact, that a "Living language is always changing." It is the best, because it commends itself to the understanding of every thinking man: it is the best, because it needs only to be stated, to be understood; and only needs to be understood, to be believed.

Had we a perfect and an immutable language, and a perfect translation of the living Oracles into that language; then, the necessity of, and excuse for revision would forever cease. But while it is so obvious that we have neither a perfect language, nor a perfect translation, it does seem to me, that the necessity for a new revision must be transparently obvious to every man, that is not committed to the support of a party. It has been said by some one, in support of the importance of a revision of the Bible, that "Words are constantly changing their meanings." The original meaning lost, and a new meaning substituted for it. As an illustration of this, and in order to call up a new field of thought before the public, I beg leave to investigate one single word; which will show the changes of meaning a word is liable to. I refer to the word "*Religion*." This term is a Latin compound. It originally meant no more than to *re-bind*, and was used as an "Oath to the gods," by which the offender was supposed to have regained the favor of the god, or gods, by whom, or to whom, he swore. This was the *ancient* meaning of *religion*. Now I ask does



any man, in all christendom, so understand this word or so use it? Not one! What, then, is its modern meaning? Every thing, any thing, nothing. It would take a volume to define this single word. Without an adjective to restrict its meaning, it stands for Judaism, Paganism, Mohamedanism, Romanism, Protestantism, and all the parties under the broad banners of all these primary bodies, or parties. Has not this word changed its meaning? We answer most wonderfully. There is a question, however, which I desire to ask, of much more grave import, viz.: Is there a word in the Greek of the New Testament, that answers to the word *Religion*, in either its ancient or modern use? This I must be at some pains to answer; for it is the object of the present scroll; and is intended to be thought on by the present Board of Revisers of the New Testament. Every man, writing or speaking for public edification, is bound to use the words of his discourse in their common acceptation. Otherwise, he will stultify himself, and misrepresent, and becloud his subject, beyond all hope of understanding. Now if we are so bound to use the word *religion*, and that it is as broad, and as ambiguous as we have seen, in its meaning, then I must say, there is not a word in the *Greek* of the "Living Oracles," that would be fairly translated by the word "*religion*." This word is found only five times in the King's Bible: (as a noun, I mean.) This word is found in the following passages, viz., Acts xxvi, 5; Gal. i, 13, 14; James i, 26, 27. All told.

Now, although this word occurs so seldom, in the common version, yet it is found oftener in this than in any other translation I have seen. In Gal. i, 13, 14, the word is *Joudaismos*; simply Judaism; and is so translated by Macknight, by Campbell, and in two versions of the French, one from the Vulgate, and the other from the Greek. In fact, no one but the King's Revisers, so far as is known to me, has ever rendered this word by any other than *Judaism*. I, therefore, conclude that it is a misrepresentation of the meaning of the original, to translate this word, by the phrase "Jews' Religion!" *Ismos* is not a just equivalent of religion, but is the root from which all the "*isms*" in the world are derived. In Acts, and James, the word is "*Threskeia*." This word has, by common consent, been translated religion, by all translators, to whom I have had access since I have been thinking on this subject. But why has it been so translated? Because it answers to the modern meaning of the word religion? No, verily. Is it, then, because it answers to the ancient meaning of religion? We shall see. To come to a correct understanding of the meaning of any word, it

is best perhaps to examine the whole family. I shall begin, then, with "*Threskeuien*." This is the infinitive form of the verb, and means "to worship—to serve." This word was formed in the following manner. Orpheus, a Thracian, "Instituted," the "Mysteries," or ancient Greek worship. Thus, to worship like the Thracians, was to perform something they call *Threskeia*. In plain English they performed something called *worship*. I, therefore, conclude that the word *worship* comes nearer the meaning of the word under consideration, than any word in all the English Language!

*Threskeia* is found four times in the New Testament; three times translated *religion*, and once worshipping. Acts xxvi, 5, is the first time the word is found in the new Institution; Paul says, the Jews know, if they would testify, "that according to the strictest sect of our religion, (*worship*), I lived a Pharisee. Sects of worshippers might be, but sects of *religion*, never!!! Every body knows that the Jewish worshippers were divided into many parties; but who ever heard of the Jewish religion, (*worship*) being divided into sects. No sir; it was always the same, and indivisible. But this word sect is found in Col. ii, 18. Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angles, etc. In this case the King's revisers themselves, committed as they were to the verbiage of Papalism, could not quite stand "The Religion of Angels;" but to show this, they converted the noun into a participle, and rendered it *worshipping* of *Angels*, rather than give the true idea of "*Angel-worship*," one of the distinctive marks of the mother of Harlots and abominations of the Earth, by whom the word Religion has been fastened, like an incubus, on the public mind.

The next and last place in which this word is found, is James i, 26, 27. In this connection we have the adjective derived from the same root. "*Threskos*;" which is here translated *Religious*; its meanings are *religious*, devout, pious, a worshipper. (Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament.) The text reads thus: If any man among you seem to be religious, (pious, or a worshipper,) and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion (*worship*) is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and the widow in their afflictions, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. Now, to change religious, for pious; and *religion* for *worship*, and this text is perfectly plain to every one that reads; but otherwise the preacher feels himself bound to give an exegesis of the passage. The common explanation of it is this: "Not-

withstanding the Bible says, Pure and undefiled religion *is this*, To visit the fatherless, etc., we are to understand it to be the *fruits of religion*." That is to say, the Bible says *this is religion*; but *I* say this is *not* religion, but only its *fruits*!! I would rather say, All such tampering with the word of God, is the *fruit* of such translations, and of such uses of words as have been made of the word religion. I am aware that this word is esteemed *sacred*; and that any one who shall dare to call its divinity in question, must be regarded as profane, and guilty of sacrilege. I must, however, think that no word is worthy of being canonized as a sacred word that does not answer to the meaning of *some* Greek word found in the *Bible*.

Whenever a word becomes so mystified as the one under consideration has, it is sure to become the "*shibboleth*" of every party:—it is true, too, to every party because of its Delphian antiquity. Hence we hear of religion of all sorts: head-religion, heart-religion, and heart-felt-religion, cold-religion, warm-religion, true, false, and all other sorts, until some years ago in Tennessee they really sung, "I love the *straw* religion, Hallelujah," etc. Now, my dear reader, in view of these things is it not, after all, better to call a "spade a spade." To call piety, piety; to call worship, worship; and so on of every fact and emotion in the Bible and the human heart.

This much have I said to call attention to this word, its uses and abuses. Much more might be said and ought to be said to correct the false impressions made on the minds of the young, through the pulpit and the press; and as far as possible to free the Bible from such ambiguities as may make its pages of doubtful interpretation.

I am glad to see, since writing the above, a notice of the same words, by Brother Campbell, in connection with the greatest inconsistency in the world, "Natural Religion." For every true exposition of the Word of Life we ought to be thankful to the Heavenly Father and take courage.

W. H. H.

June 24, 1857.

### SPIRIT AND WORD.

*What is Spirit?*

God is spirit. So spoke the great Teacher. The Bible speaks of the Spirit of God. Angels are spirits. Men have spirits. The inspired apostles speak of the spirit of *truth* and the spirit of *error*. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual *body*. Spirit is *something*, not *nothing*. Spirit is not flesh and bones. But words are used

*figuratively* as well as *literally*. Hence the *disposition* of God, and Christ, and man, is spirit. Hence the *gospel* is spirit in contrast with the law which is letter. And hence the *doctrine* of Christ is "spirit and life" in contrast with his literal flesh and blood. Confounding the figurative with the literal produces great confusion in the Christian world.

Hence many imagine there is a *literal baptism, pouring out, shedding forth, falling on and filling, of literal divinity!* Is divinity literally found like water? Are Christians literally immersed in Divinity? There are figurative illustrations of miraculous and moral *influences* of Divinity. The application of a little common sense in understanding the scriptures would prevent many serious errors and guide us into all truth. Surely the Divine Spirit of God can influence man without being dissolved into a fluid like oil or water. The same absurd rule of interpretation applied to Christ would convert him into literal sunlight, bread, etc.!

#### *What is Word?*

We read of the word of *God*, the word of *angels* and the word of *man*. The spiritual Doctors have degraded the Spirit into *fluid* and the word into solid *matter*!! Hence they speak of the word as *ink and paper*! But the word existed in *oral* history before it was written. It was spoken in certain articulated *sounds*. Is the word of God therefore mere sound? It existed in the minds of apostles, Christ and the Father previous to the utterance of those sounds. How? *As the wise, benevolent and powerful Christian idea*. But what is an *idea*? Is it *matter* or *spirit*? Here we are lost. We can trace the word through letters, sounds, facts, ordinances and types, to Apostles and Prophets, to the Spirit, to Christ and the Divine Father. Here we have a Divine *terminus* that fills the mind and heart of finite man with that faith, hope and love that gives sweet rest to his traveling spirit! It brings the *human* into fellowship with the divine, the *finite* with the *infinite*, and the *temporal* with the *eternal*.

The *Christ Idea* then, as embodied in God, the Son of God, the Angels of God, the Prophets of God, the Apostles of God, the Church of God and the Bible of God, by the Spirit of God, is the living, spiritual and saving word of God. Any thing short of this pertains to the vulgar, sensualistic spiritualism of this age.

With these premises before us, who can fail to understand the divine teaching in reference to spirit and word? *Abstract* spirit, and *abstract* word, or spirit *alone* and word *alone*, are the absurd inventions of men.

They were invented to sustain the *Calvinistic* theory of partial grace or some modification of it.

Spirit and word were united in the wise and benevolent *provision* of salvation, and word and Spirit are united in the blissful *enjoyment* of salvation. To separate the word from the Spirit in the provision and enjoyment of salvation, is salvation without the *Christian idea*! To separate the Spirit from the word, is salvation without a *Savior*!

Was not the Christian idea connected with the Spirit of God when he so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to be the Savior of the world? Was not the Christian idea connected with the divine Spirit of Christ when he lived and died for the salvation of the world? Was not the Christian idea connected with the Spirit when he came to convince the world of sin? And was not the Christian idea connected with the spirit in the apostles when they preached the gospel to all nations for the obedience of faith? Thus we see the word was the *means* by which the Father, Son and Holy Spirit provided salvation for man, and the *means* by which the apostles presented it to all nations. Now, in view of these facts, to write and preach of and to pray for salvation by abstract Spirit, is to impeach the wisdom, power and love of God!

Did not John and Christ, the apostles and evangelists, connect the word with the Spirit in them in the conversion of Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles? Has not the church in all ages connected the word with the Spirit in the conversion of the world? And have not the disciples in all ages continued steadfast in the apostles doctrine as the means of spiritual enjoyment? Is not the word the means of faith, hope and love? Can we believe without an idea? Hope without a promise? Love without an object and the Christian idea of that object? We love God *because* he first loved us. The love of God is the *reason* of our love. Are we influenced by this reason without an idea? Reason without an idea?

*Regeneration* without the word would fill the church and heaven with spiritual and immortal *idiots*! But Paul, James, Peter and John connect the gospel, the word of truth, the living word or the celestial seed with the new birth, and to teach otherwise is to ignore the inspired apostles and trust in our own foolish imaginations.

The order of Heaven then is, 1. *Spirit and Word*. 2. *Word and Spirit*. The Spirit by means of the word provided and presented salvation. We by means of the word receive and enjoy the Spirit in salvation.

Thus agents, means and conditions are all united in the salvation and glorification of man.

J. J. T.



## CHANGE OF HEART, LIFE AND STATE.

BY A DEAF MUTE.

1. The change of heart is effected by preaching faith—the gospel, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

Is the above called a preparatory change made in reference to Rom. i, 15–17, x, 8–17; Acts xv, 7; 2 Tim. i, 9, 10, and other passages.

2. *Saving faith, or trust, or heart belief to righteousness before mouth confession made to salvation.*

Is the above called a heart change made in reference to Rom. x, 9, 10; Eph. i, 12, 13; John iv, 16, and other passages? A persuasive change, or a change of the love of sin. Another particular change.

3. *Repentance or godly sorrow, working repentance to salvation not to be repented of.*

Is the above called a legal or contrite change made in reference to 2 Cor. vii, 10; Acts ii, 37; Isaiah lvii, 15, lxvi. 2; Luke xviii, 13, and other passages? A change of feeling. Another particular change.

4. *Repentance or reformation to life and salvation.*

Is the above called an evangelical change made in reference to 2 Cor. vii, 20; Acts ii, 38; xi, 18; Matt. iii, 8; Luke xiii, 3; Matt. xxi, 29; Isaiah i, 16, 17; lv. 7; Prov. viii, 13; xxviii, 13 and other passages? A change of the practice of sin or a change made by ceasing to do evil and learning to do well. Another particular change.

5. *Confession, or profession of heart belief.*

Is the above called a new life-begetting and procuring change made in reference to John xx, 31; Acts viii, 37; Rom x, 9, 10 and other passages? An invisible change of the state and relation of sin. Another particular change.

No heart believer is evidently or known to be begotten of the Word and Spirit, or begotten of the Spirit through the word, unless he confesses with the mouth his belief that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. This faith confessed is necessary for baptism, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.

6. *Birth of Water and of the Spirit.*

Is the above called a new life—new-born and enjoying change made in reference to John iii, 3–5; Rom. vi, 4; Titus iii, 5 and other passages? A visible change of the state or relation of sin. Another particular and last change.

---

\*Though I do not understand the Greek language, I agree with the Greek scholars who render *Metameleomai* for Repentance, and *Metanoia* for Reformation in reference to 2 Cor. vii, 10.

To you, children of your parents, you cannot see your father unless you are born. So, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." You cannot enter into the kingdom of Nature, where you might enjoy your life, unless you be born of your mother and of your father. So, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

If I am right, the above is all the changes made from the beginning to the end in consequence of the obedience to faith. In conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates on persons through the word of Truth believed and obeyed. I claim no infallibility, and if I am mistaken in any thing, I am willing to be, scripturally, corrected.

The great matter is "rightly dividing the word of Truth," giving each one his portion in due season.

Particular selections of scripture for sinners. 1 Cor. x, 15.

If for enlightened sinners who ask, "What shall we do?" Let them hear or read the answer in Matt. iii, 38-41 after 37. If for unenlightened sinners who ask, "What must I do to be saved?" Let them hear the answer in Acts xvi, 31-34 after 30.

Particular selections of scripture for pious and innocent persons who will be saved eternally, though not saved in this world, in the New Testament sense, such as Abraham, Isaac, Israel, David and all others like them from the beginning to the end of the world, infants and pagans.

Let us read such passages as are found in the scriptures, viz., the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, and especially 40; Luke xxiii, 39-43; Mark x, 18-16; Rom. 15, 16; v, 14; Isaiah xxxv, 8, etc.

Particular selections for Christians.

Let them hear or read the exhortatory epistles in 1 Peter i; and 1 John v. To love each other with a pure heart fervently, since their obedience and purification is necessary; because to love God and keep his commandments is necessary to love his children. James i, and 2 Peter show not only that their Christian or good works are necessary to show the truth of their faith; but also that it is necessary for them to attend, diligently, to the seven additions to their faith, for if they do these things they shall never fall. Rom. ii, remind them that a patient continuance in well-doing to the end is necessary to realize the hope of eternal life to be enjoyed. Their works of never-dying love to God and man are necessary, both for an example and for the conversion and happiness of the world now and for ever to the glory of God, who will judge the dead and the quick according to their works.

"God is Love;" because his good word is enough to tell them what to do and not to do during their Christian pilgrimage. The Christian religion is a religion of practice, not of profession. If the world know that scripture-keeping Christians walk by faith, seek by hope, and work by love, produced or fructified by the Holy Spirit given to them, they cannot fail to admire their character because they do not persecute, abuse, think evil, do evil, nor love in mere word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. Christian love is not like any other love in the human heart, not purified by the Holy Spirit.

Gifts without Christian love are nothing, nor acceptable to God. The world suffer, spiritually, so much for their want of conversion to God as to demand the works of love and even sacrifices, if necessary, of Christians. Temporal sufferings would be more successfully and more permanently relieved by Christians than any other people that can if the whole world were now converted. The doctrine and practice of Christian love are beautifully explained and understood in 1 Cor. xiii.

To you, teachers of Modern Revelation. You imagine that the Spirit revives (quickens?) persons dead in sins without the word spoken to them; as you have been taught by your fallible traditional fathers that the Spirit does any work without the word as you work without a plow. You seem to be too much like Spirit-Rappers, Witches, Quakers and other false prophets; for they do not preach the words of Truth sent down with the Holy Spirit from Heaven. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life." (John vi.) "For the word of God is quick and powerful," etc. (Heb. iv.) The word is not dead; for it is the quickening power of the Spirit of God. Christians preach the word through which the Spirit quickens sinners. "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." (Acts v.) We have another objection to your modern revivalistic doctrine and practice; for I was informed in Mississippi that when the sickly season came on, the members, professors or victims of revivalism were so much alarmed about their sins as to come to camp-ground meetings to beg to be prayed for; but when the sickly season was gone they returned to the same habits of sins as before. This is the reason of our objection to your doctrine and practice, not consistent with the doctrine of Christ, which requires of Christians a patient continuance in doing well, without which they cannot obtain eternal life. Christians are not idle; for they are patient in doing God's will, prayerful always, benevolent, peaceful and ready to die blessed in the Lord.

P. H. N.

## THE INDIAN MISSION.

DEAR BRETHREN:—The Lord willing, I hope to leave for the great missionary field of the far West the first week in October next. I expect to go with letters of authority and instruction from the church at Franklin College, of which I am a member, provided the benevolent enterprise accords with the views and wishes of the brethren. I have long desired to enter on this mission, but have been hindered hitherto by many unforeseen causes. But so far as I can now see, there will be no serious obstacle in the way, and I trust I shall be ready by the time mentioned.

Some of the benevolent churches of Missouri have already defrayed the expenses of my exploring and preparatory mission to the Indian Territory. I now wish to ask the churches in *Tennessee* to contribute a portion of their abundant surplus to help sustain the mission. The churches of other States are co-operating to send the gospel to Jerusalem, Jamaica, Liberia, England and some portions of America. In view of this great missionary movement, cannot the churches of Tennessee be inspired with the missionary spirit and induced to take some part in the conversion of the world? If they are not disposed to co-operate through the agency of the American Christian Missionary Society of Cincinnati, why not co-operate as *churches* through the agency of some of the congregations according to primitive usage? How long shall we object to the manner of others and do nothing ourselves? It would be an easy matter to amend our missionary society so as to obviate all objections, if we were disposed to occupy common ground. How? I answer in one sentence—Let the *church* at Cincinnati act as the agent of all the churches in the United States in the great missionary work. But we have such a wonderful predilection in this new world for Constitutions, Presidents, Vice-Presidents, etc., that it is doubtful whether we will ever conform to apostolic simplicity in our missionary operations!

But I do not ask the churches of Tennessee to contribute to sustain me in the great missionary field of the West. I perhaps could not do so without exciting in them a suspicion that I am actuated by *selfish* motives in pleading the claims of the Indian mission. It would be better for me to live and die in want than to be the occasion of such a calamity. I therefore ask for no \$500 or \$1000 outfit, which might be perfectly lawful and proper under other circumstances, but I do ask for you authority, your instructions, and your prayers for myself, and

your contributions to help sustain one or two other missionaries in the same field, with whom I may co-operate in the good work.

If the love of God, the mission of Christ, the mission of the Spirit, and the mission of the church, commenced by the apostles, embraced the white, red and black children of our world, then it is our duty and our glorious privilege to send missionaries to the great central Territory of the United States. Kansas Territory has its thousands of white inhabitants already, besides many Indian tribes scattered over its vast surface, and the Indian Territory proper, adjoining it on the South, is filled with thousands of whites, Indians and Africans. But why argue this matter? We have as many reasons and motives for sending missionaries to this extensive and promising field as to any other on the four quarters of the globe.

Now, my dear brethren, may I hope to have your prayers and efforts in this truly benevolent enterprise? Will not your benevolent hearts move your tongues and pens to plead the cause in which God, angels, and the wisest and best men have co-operated? Having devoted twenty years of the prime of my life in laboring with and for the churches of Tennessee, I would be happy to spend the evening of life in the midst of long tried and faithful friends; but humanity and Christianity, as I believe, call me far away, and, by the blessing of Heaven, I hope to spend the remnant of my days in the missionary field of the West, pleading the cause of Christ to the glory of God the Father.

The Lord bless and prosper us all in every good work!

Your brother in Christ,

J. J. TROTT.

Locust Hill, Tenn., August 21, 1857.

---

#### A TENT MEETING.

Twelve miles distant, in quite an out-of-the-way place, (for the sake of good water and grass, an object this unusually dry season,) we commenced a Tent meeting on the 7th inst., being 13 or 14 miles south east of Belton, and one to two miles from any house or road. Six tents were on the ground, however, and many people found the place from distant parts—some only after bewildering rides through the prairies. The meeting closed on the 12th inst. in the greatest harmony and joy. There were 32 additions, six of whom were Baptists, a few were Methodists. Bro. S. Strickland, Father T. Armstrong, young Bro. Brown, bro. E. Morgan, and Bro. Rainey, Evangelists,



were with us. I never witnessed more brotherly love or Christian joy; never attended a more happy, or successful meeting, all things being considered. There were six additions at the last discourse; and the meeting would have been continued, had it been practicable.

We are to have another in three miles of this place, at Col. Robinson's well known spring, on the Salado, commencing Friday before the 2d Lord's day in October next, and if I were able, I would go with a large tent to many places in our beautiful prairies, the happiest place in the world for such operations, and invite the people to a series of discourses setting forth and sustaining the gospel. What a vast field of labor we have, and how inviting! I have done so little recently, owing to circumstances I could not control, and the opportunities are so great, it is really a sore trial to be restrained! Our days are passing away! They are swifter than the weaver's shuttle! What exclamation is sufficient to express the feelings and desires of the Christian heart! It really does seem to me, that, with such a system as the Lord has been pleased to commit to us, he *ought* to hold us strictly accountable for the conversion of the world.

C. KENDRICK.

Salado, Texas, 1857.

#### CIRCULAR:

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, THROUGHOUT THE  
GREEN RIVER COUNTRY.

BELoved BRETHREN,—The following resolution was unanimously passed, during the last session of the Green River Co-operation, viz:

"*Resolved*, That a Committee of five be appointed to address a circular-letter to all the Churches within Southern Kentucky, urging them to meet, by their messengers, in Hopkinsville, on WEDNESDAY BEFORE THE FIRST LORD'S DAY IN NOVEMBER NEXT, to interchange views, thoughts, etc., in regard to a more thorough system of evangelizing and building up the cause within said region of country."

And, in accordance with its intention, we now extend to you a cordial invitation to *come*, at the time and place specified. Time is hurrying us all to the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of our Stewardship—shall it be said of us, before assembled worlds, that we have been unfaithful to the great interests committed to our charge?

Many questions, of eternal importance, demand, at the present time, the earnest attention of the wise and good amongst us. These interests must suffer if we neglect to take council together, and fail to concen-

trate our energies for the work before us. Is it necessary, dear brethren, to put you in remembrance that the salvation of the world has been committed—a solemn charge!—into the care of the Church? Are we doing all we can to rescue the world from sin, sorrow and death? Can we do anything effectually, unless we combine together to accomplish that which the Redeemer of men has committed to our care? The experience of years proves that we cannot.

Will you, then, dear brethren, come to this meeting, and will you, in the meantime, gravely and earnestly consider the following vital questions?

1ST. What are the best means for procuring a pious and able Christian Ministry?

2ND. What can we do to arouse the Spiritual energies of our membership throughout the country?

3RD. What should we do to put upon a firm basis, our foreign and domestic missions?

4TH. Does the cause of education demand any combined efforts from us.

5TH. Should the brethren throughout this country become a thoroughly organized body, in order to advance the cause of the Redeemer?—or, can they accomplish *as much* without any co-operation?

These and kindred questions we deem to be all-important. Shall we then, brethren, in the fear and love of God, come and reason together for the good of Zion? If we can do no more, we can unite our prayers to God for help—we can strengthen each other in zeal and love—we can sing praises to the great King, and converse together about the better land and the endless life before us.

The members of the Congregation in Hopkinsville extend hearty invitation to all our brethren and sisters to come—they have room in their hearts and houses for you all. They want such a gathering together of the tribes of Zion as shall long be remembered in this great country.

E. CAMPBELL,  
G. P. STREET,  
W. E. MOBLY,  
C. M. DAY,  
G. POINDEXTER,

Hopkinsville, Aug. 5, 1857.

*Committee.*

## REPORTS OF EVANGELISTS.

Bro. W. D. Jourdan, of Easton, Mo. writes under date of Aug. 14th, that there had been 34 additions during a meeting held recently at Antioch, in that vicinity.

Sister Amelia McLester of Athens, Tenn. writes, "At Bro. Love's last meeting we had four additions—my sister and daughter being of the number."

Bro. J. B. Morton, of Lexington, Ky., reports several additions by the labors of Bro. B. Franklin, of Cincinnati.

BROS. FANNING AND LIPSCOMB—Since my last to you, we have had some interesting meetings. At one embracing the 3d Lord's day in June on the West Fork of White River, we had 4 additions; at three meetings embracing the 4th Lord's days in June, July and August, at Middle Fork Union, we had 11 accessions. At Forest Hill, near the Cherokee Line in this Co., an intelligent young Lady, a native of the nation, obeyed the Lord the second Lord's day in August; the day following on my way home at a private house, two others, one lady and a gentleman, became obedient to the faith. The Friday following, our annual meeting commenced in this county, which was well attended. We enjoyed the labors of our beloved and gifted bro. Carlton, of Springfield, Mo., who was the chief speaker; the result was 12 accessions, some of whom were among the oldest and most substantial citizens of the community; much more doubtless would have been done, but for the rain which cut our meeting short. At this meeting, the brotherhood formed a Co-operation, for the more successful proclamation of the word of life, a report of which is to be sent to the Gospel Advocate and Millennial Harbinger for publication. I hope much good may be the result at this meeting. My years service closed, but by the choice of the brethren composing the Co-operation, I am again in the field, and may the Lord bless our feeble efforts to do good.

I returned last Thursday from Carrollton, in Carroll Co., 50 miles east of this place, where in company with our esteemed bro. Robert Graham, President of Arkansas College, we held a very interesting and profitable meeting, embracing the 5th Lord's day in August, at which there were 4 accessions, leaving a general good impression with a flattering prospect for much good to be done.

Yours in the one hope,

J. S. ROBERTSON.

## EVANGELIZING IN TEXAS.

HOPKINS COUNTY, TEXAS, July 1, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—The "Advocate" still continues to visit us, and it has exerted quite a salutary influence among the good brethren; still it seems that many have failed to discover and appreciate the great superiority of *God's* plan of co-operation and evangelizing, to that of the modern and improved plans invented by *men*.

Notwithstanding the efforts, Christianity has made slow progress in North-Eastern Texas. There must be some cause for the partial failure. Some tell us it is because we have no regular system of evangelizing. Our brethren some three years ago, in all confidence of success, began to try to set on foot a "regular system of evangelizing," by adopting the advalorem system among the congregations, in order to raise funds for the support of preachers. The plan was simply this: Each congregation in the bounds of the co-operation formed a society. These societies were to choose or appoint delegates to attend at the yearly meeting of the co-operation, which was to be formed of the delegates from each congregation, or from the "auxiliary society," as they were called. The society formed by the delegates was to be called "*The North-Eastern Texas Christian Missionary Society*." The funds collected from each congregation or "auxiliary society" were to be sent up to the "Parent Society" once a year for the purpose of hiring preachers to go around and keep the churches alive another year. Many of these churches not having a treasury at home to defray the expenses incident to the congregations, were pressed to raise the means due the society by taxation. Any brother or sister found in arrears at the end of the year was excommunicated from the society, according to the constitution. To tell of the interruption, the confusion and strife that this system has created would be needless. I do not want the brethren to think that I wish to speak disparagingly of their Christian zeal, but I do think I can tell some of the reasons why we have been so disappointed in not getting a decent support. I know I can speak advisedly in relation to Texas, and I suppose the same will hold good in other places.

The general plan is, to go over as much territory as possible, and organize as many congregations as they can, leaving them undisciplined, and complain because they have never learned to work. An evangelist training congregations in this way may expect to suffer. But if they will only train them until there can be competent overseers to

take care of the disciples and encourage them in their duties, they need not fear to trust their support to such brethren. Our churches need reformation. That is the only way our preachers may look for a support. We need all the information and encouragement we can get out here. May the Lord bless and prosper you in your noble undertaking.

J. S. S.

#### LETTERS OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

WE feel thankful to know that our course in the discussion regarding the infidelity that has crept into the church is quite satisfactory to the brethren generally, and we deem it not inappropriate to give occasional extracts from encouraging letters.

Bro. A. W. Owen, of Atlanta, Ga., in regard to our teaching, writes, "Your views are correct, and were *our* plans abandoned and the Scriptural plan adopted, our cause could but prosper, and we would soon become a very different people.

"I regret very much Prof. R.'s course concerning Philosophy and Natural Theology." I fear many will be ingulphed in the infidelity. After pleading for the Bible so long, shall we now go to nature to learn who God is, and our duty to him? How degrading the thought to the people of God."

Bro. R. Houston, of Texas, under date of August 25th, writes, "Prof. R. opposes the faith founded on the facts of the Bible." "Paul, however, exhorts the Corinthians to keep in memory the truth in order to be saved;" but why did Paul write thus, if they had attained to the righteousness of the faith, as Prof. R. thinks from something *within*, that is above testimony? He takes one side awhile, and then the other. If your views are wrong, like the Corinthians, I am yet in my sins."

Bro. D. Oliphant, of Canada, who is the only Editor amongst the brethren that has intimated in any public manner, the least opposition to the "higher law" position of the school that we have for years pronounced "infidel," writes under date of July 30th, 1857: "I trust you will have on the armor of God while meeting the unexpected attacks." Bro. Dr. W. D. Jourdan, of Easton, Mo., says, "Bro. F. your views in the controversy with Dr. R. are approbated, and his are regarded as French infidelity."



# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.      NASHVILLE, NOVEMBER, 1857.      NO. 11.

---

## SIXTH REPLY TO PROF. ROBERT RICHARDSON.

The October number of the Millennial Harbinger contains two essays from the pen of Prof. Richardson, under the caption of "*Faith versus Philosophy*," to which it is proper to offer a brief reply. All his essays under this head to the present date we have been careful to publish in the Gospel Advocate, but as there is nothing new in the last issue, and as we cannot hope to see our replies in the Harbinger, we feel under no obligation to continue the publication of his articles. We are happy, however, under the conviction that we have done all that could be asked, to give our patrons an opportunity to learn the peculiarities of the new theology. The present results we anticipated and hence our care to let Prof. Richardson speak in our columns, with the view that he would let his readers see the grounds of our difference. His course has been so singular that it is, indeed, difficult to infer any thing with certainty regarding his religious belief, and from the fact that he has been found at every point of the compass, we know not where he is now, or where he will be next month. It becomes us, however, to notice a few of his strong affirmations in the October Harbinger.

1. Prof. Richardson informs us, that his object "*has been to call attention to the authority and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures*," in opposition to such "*empty and dangerous philosophical speculations as Pres. Fanning, who is full of the philosophy of Locke, entertains*." When Prof. R. penned these words he certainly knew as well as he knows

his own name, that we have advocated no speculations or system of philosophy. He was well aware, that *he* had openly advocated the philosophy of Cousin and others, which we demonstrated to be identical with the profane infidelity of Andrew Jackson Davis and other animal spiritualists. The brethren generally saw his dilemma, and he must have seen the pit into which he had fallen, and hence his determination to involve us in some system of human wisdom to protect himself. It is said, "misery loves company," but Prof. R.'s motive all must see.

It is well known by all familiar with our teaching, that we have for many years openly and zealously opposed the idea of philosophy in religion, or even divine agency beyond the teaching and influence of the Holy Spirit. Human wisdom has never afforded the least spiritual light. This is the main point of controversy between Dr. Richardson and ourself. He took the bold ground that we must rise above the *written word*, and the *forms of scripture*, to something which he called knowledge "*by the Spirit*" or the "*inner consciousness*." As we expected, to save a position in the church, he is now disposed to renounce this system of modern spiritualists and German Neologists, and return to the Sacred Oracles. Had he not been *driven* to the wall, and *forced* to assume his present position, we should certainly have much more confidence in his professed love for the Bible.

2. He says, both in the Harbinger and in the Intelligencer, by Bro. Coleman, that the charge of infidelity was in consequence of "*using books on philosophy*" in school.

We wish not to speak unkindly, but Prof. Richardson must have known, when he made the statement, that we did not object to the use of metaphysical works in college. We have used more than Bethany. It will be remembered, that in the May number of the Harbinger Prof. R. said, "Notwithstanding the fact, that Brother Campbell himself is a *teacher* of Natural Theology in Bethany College, (Not that he merely uses the books. T. F.) Pres. Fanning has *ventured*, without hesitation, to pronounce the doctrine of Natural Theology, in all its shapes and bearings, false, deceitful and subversive of the Christian religion." Prof. Richardson then admitted that we repudiated Natural Theology or philosophical religion, and boldly asserted that Pres. Campbell taught Natural Theology in Bethany College, and that we "can learn the being and perfections of God both from the works of nature" and our "*inner-consciousness*," but now he wishes to make the impression that he has all the while been the defender of the Bible alone, and

we have been ignorantly defending philosophical speculations. It seems to us, that one who can assert such things with all the facts before him, is by no means scrupulous as to his asseverations.

3. Prof. R. says we have "MISREPRESENTED" him in supposing that he is on the borders of modern spiritualism. We wish not to misrepresent; but he has advocated the mystic and infidel dogma of spiritual light, by the "inner-consciousness," and Andrew Jackson Davis has done no worse.

4. He speaks of us as "being totally incapable of comprehending any thing beyond a mere *verbal* and *formal religion*." It will be remembered that in previous numbers he spoke of "*a merely external church*," etc.

We admit very candidly that our faith has come by hearing and our hearing has been by the word of God. We profess no religious belief beyond what is written or "*verbal*." Words limit our confidence in religious truth. We also freely admit that we acknowledge none but a "*formal religion*," and we can with a good conscience pronounce all men infidels and profane scoffers at spiritual truth who profess anything beyond "verbal truth or truth taught in words," or beyond the "*formal religion*" of the Bible. We are not ashamed to admit our position. No, indeed, we rejoice in the belief that all spiritual light God has kindly given in language adapted to the humblest of his children, and that he has established a church—spiritual temple—which stands as a city on a hill to enlighten the world, and which is "the pillar and support of the truth." We are bold to deny that there is any spiritual influence exerted in the conversion of the world independent of the church, or beyond the *forms* which the church employs. All men who deny the truth of this teaching, we pronounce enemies in letter and spirit to our Lord Jesus Christ, and the only spiritual religion on earth.

5. Does Prof. R. intend to charge us with maintaining "*the form of godliness*" without its "*power*." This is the old charge of all the mystic sects for the last half century against the simple-minded disciples of Christ, whose greatest sin has consisted in believing that all spiritual light is through the Bible. The parties have said, "They (we) do not believe there is any spirit in religion."

Regarding the insinuation, however, we beg leave to say, that we know of but one way in which men can hold a form of godliness and deny its *power*. Those who profess to believe in the church of God and the ordinances of the Lord's house, and at the same time deny their *authority*, or speak of them as merely *verbal* and *formal* without

some foreign aid to give them efficacy, renounce in effect, the form and power of religion. We wish to say, that we regard the church of Christ as "*the ministration of the Spirit*," that the word of God "is Spirit and life," that where the word of the great Jehovah is, there is his moral power; that the Spirit was sent to the church—has not left it; that the body is hence spiritual; that all who enter it partake of the divine nature as a result of their spiritual union, and that it is blasphemous to speak or think of Christ's church being a lifeless and spiritless body. We profess not to understand the *how* the Spirit exerts his influence through the word and appointments in the church, no more than we can comprehend how the life is in our blood, but we know it is written that "*the Spirit is ministered by the hearing of faith*." God is in his word and church, and should we conclude that he is not in his appointments—that he has gone on a journey or is asleep, and that the word and church are *merely* "*verbal and formal*" in any acceptance of the terms, we would renounce all religious belief. Hence we *preach the word*, in perfect confidence that it is God's power to salvation and instrument for convincing and converting the lost; and we have no patience with teachers who presume to preach that the word and ordinances are inadequate without some foreign aid to give them power.

6. Prof. Richardson more than intimates that our objections to his teaching arises from opposition to Bethany College. We unqualifiedly repel the insinuation. No man save A. Campbell is more anxious for the success of that institution than ourself. We are not sure but the present discussion will be the very salvation of Bethany College. No institution can live long amongst the disciples with such influences as have been hanging around Bethany College for the past year. We profess not to be a prophet or the son of a prophet, but we most confidently believe that the brethren cannot be reconciled to the speculations of Prof. Richardson and others.

7. Prof. Richardson informs us, that "*of late*" he has "*perceived certain indications of a disposition on the part of some young brethren to introduce the mystical philosophy amongst us, and it is this very circumstance*," he asserts, "*which induced him to commence this series of articles*."

We are heartily sorry that Prof. R. has said these things. It is humiliating indeed for a man who has occupied a high position for thirty years to say things which we do not see how the brethren can believe. Six months ago Prof. Richardson manifested no opposition to the philosophy of Mr. Russell and others. We were denounced as too



ignorant and sensualistic to understand it. Prof. Richardson was the teacher of these men, and if they possess the spirit of men, they may speak for themselves. Should these "*young brethren*," however, like their teacher, deny all they have said, and profess to be laboring to correct the philosophy of believing in Christ through the words of the apostles, it would not be more strange than what we have already witnessed. We have but one request to make of friends Russell, Carman and coadjutors, viz., Should they return to the advocacy of faith through the gospel alone, we hope they will admit that they have been on an excursion among German transcendentalists and French infidels. This is a singular course of retreat in Doctor R. It is too late for him to cry "*stop thief*" to others. He is the guilty man himself, and these pupils of his should not be made scape goats to bear away his sins.

8. Prof. Richardson says, "*The opposition and misrepresentation to which my (his) recent exposure of the sensualistic system has given rise, leads me (him) to think that it has gained a much more extended influence amongst us than is commonly supposed.*"

This is a terrible admission. Prof. R. knows that the brethren will not bear his speculations. But even in his admission he is disposed to insult them by speaking of their "*misrepresentations*," and attributing their opposition to the influence of "*this world of sensation and outward show.*" Poor compliment to friends who have supported him so long. But this is the best evidence in the world that the brethren entertain a positive belief—that they do not follow men. There are thousands in this good land, whose faith would not be shaken in the least, though all the Professors of colleges and all the preachers of the land were to turn aside to fables with Robert Richardson. As we have been so often denounced by Prof. R. as "*sensuistic*"—a "*sensualist*," etc., we think it due to the brethren generally, as well as ourself, to offer a thought or two in reference to the charge.

Months ago we defined a sensualist, to be one who is influenced by his *fleshy desires*, an *animal man*, or one controlled by his *impulses*. We claim no connection with this class of men, but we regard all men led by their *animal impulses* or "*inner-consciousness*" as sensualists. We assert, that the system of philosophy which Prof. R. attempted to impose upon the brethren brutalizes man.

If Prof. R. means by a sensualist one whose information of the world is conditioned and limited by the exercise of the five senses; and whose spiritual light is limited by the oracles of God, as perceived and be-



lieved through the agency of these Heaven ordained senses, he should say so. If he is advocating "*transcendentalism*," or knowledge which transcends the natural powers of man, and the word of the living God, why deny it in the Harbinger. If he claims not spiritual light beyond the senses and the written word, why does he attempt to stigmatize us as a sensualist?

He speaks in the bitterest terms of a *merely verbal and formal religion*. Why not admit at once that he is contending for something beyond a *merely verbal and formal religion*? Transcendentalism says we must rise above the outward, above words and forms, to absolute spirit, or a religion above all forms. Prof. R. is either contending for this, or he is contending for nothing; yet he denies that he teaches transcendentalism. Then he ought to permit us to preach the gospel as God's power to salvation, without charging us with gross sensualism.

9. At an early period in this discussion we thought it might become necessary to retaliate upon Prof. R., but we have changed our mind. We have no desire to disparage him. All he has said of our "gross ignorance," and want of learning and power to think is no doubt rhetorical, and we suppose Prof. R. does not believe a word of it himself. We would respectfully remind him, however, that the old proverb, "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones," might be studied to advantage by both of us. The only suggestion we offer is a doubt as to Prof. R.'s *regular* scholarship in any department of a Literary institution. Though we are free to believe he is a man of considerable reading, and much valuable information.

Before dismissing Prof. R. we think it due to say, that his attempt to answer our arguments by stepping out of the way to attack our moral character, and especially making the Millennial Harbinger the vehicle for publishing as wicked a report as man ever uttered, we regard as wholly unwarrantable. He has had the time and means to correct his insinuations, and has failed to do so; therefore, he can lay no claim to the high moral position he formerly occupied. Months ago Prof. R. informed his readers that he was done with us, but in each number since the burden of his song has been opposition to our teaching. We have now *settled* with him all past accounts, and we hope he will not lay us under obligations to advert to his speculations in the future. True, as he sneeringly says, in the *Intelligencer*, we publish "*A small paper in the South-West*," but should he, after closing his engagement with the Harbinger, attempt a paper upon his own responsibility, we earnestly wish him better success than has attended his efforts in the

Harbinger, and a long and pleasant old age, to correct some of the speculations he has so unnecessarily put forth.

We have seen accomplished more than we designed. The brethren are generally alive to the danger of religious speculation, Prof. R. is wounded to the death by his own hand, and is attempting to leave the field as best he can with his friends around him.

We are heartily sorry that his personal assaults forbid us parting with him in as cordial terms as we could desire; but we have written in the fear of Heaven; indulged in no words of personal unkindness, and we bid Prof. Robert Richardson a present farewell, in the pleasant feelings of soul that we wish to live and to die, and to meet him in the judgment.

We are but men—we may err; but God's word is the Spirit's only truth. Beyond it all is darkness—all is death.

TOLBERT FANNING.

---

#### DR. RICHARDSON'S "FAITH *versus* PHILOSOPHY."

DEAR BRO. FANNING:—The August number of the Gospel Advocate has recently reached me; and I have read with interest and close attention the sixth number of Dr. Robert Richardson's "Faith *versus* Philosophy," and your reply to it. I think that he has given his essay the wrong title—that he should have reversed it, and entitled them, "Philosophy *versus* Faith;" for that is what they really are. I exceedingly regret the appearance of these essays, for I conceive that they are calculated to much injure the great cause for which we are pleading, the best and noblest on earth, to retard its progress, and put it back perhaps years from where it would be! But I commend you, and so do the brethren as far as I have heard an expression of their sentiments, for the bold, fearless and decided stand you have taken against his insidious teaching and subtle philosophy. We are commanded to "earnestly *contend* for the faith once delivered to the saints;" and were you to remain silent and let these things pass, occupying the position you do, you would be recreant to your duty as a "watchman upon the walls of Zion," and unfaithful to the cause of Christ. I am glad that we have at least *one* editor, who is not afraid to lift up his voice against them. I regard your rejoinder to Dr. Richardson as a triumphant reply to him, and a complete vindication of the Gospel against his speculations. And you have the whole brotherhood with

you, without a dissenting voice, as far as I know, in your course thus far in this matter.

As I read his essay I anticipated your reply; and one intelligent brother to whom I read some portions, remarked that he "was contending *against straws*." Does Dr. Richardson think that we are a parcel of *simpletons*? Does he suppose that we are so *ignorant* of the Bible—of the Christian system—as to stop short of the *person* of Christ as the great object of the Christian faith and hope?—to stop at the *facts* of which he speaks, or the *testimony* of these facts? He has made a "man of straw"—has conjured up a mere ghost of error—which he has engaged in battering down with his pen, and in endeavoring to exorcise from the minds of the disciples—a mere "figment of the imagination," not existing in the minds of the brethren, but in his own imagination, and haunting him with fear and dread! He ought to invoke the shades of Faust and Mephistopholes to aid him in expelling the fearful hobgoblin! But he stopped short too soon himself—he ought to have gone further, and insisted for "*God in Christ*" as the object of the Christian's faith! Let him ask the humblest and most ignorant disciple in this Reformation—one that knows nothing about his charge against us—what is the *object* of his faith, and I'll warrant he will be replied to, that it is the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The very *confession* taken of those to be "baptized (eis) into Christ," implies it: "Do you believe with all your heart, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and are you willing to obey Him in all his commandments?" Does not this present CHRIST to him as the great *object* of his faith? Most assuredly it does. Do not our preachers exhibit Him as such, in their discourses; and urge obedience to him as such? Every discourse from them will attest to it as the case.

However, I do not anticipate much injury to the *brethren* from his subtleties. A *few* may be carried away with them, as in the case of Jesse B. Ferguson, and "make shipwreck of their faith," but the great body of the brethren are men of too much good, common sense to be moved away from the plain teachings of the word of God, and turned to fables. But my principal hope for the disciples, in reference to Dr. Richardson's speculations, is in what you quote from him, in the third head of your last reply. He says, that "the *particular point* under consideration [object of faith] is one of *great delicacy*, and that there are comparatively *few* [very few indeed!] whose minds are accustomed to make those *distinctions* which are *essential* in such cases;" and again, that "these distinctions are *extremely nice*, and it is hence

*difficult* to render them *evident* to the *common mind*." Yes, as they are so *extremely difficult* and *nice*, and so *few* minds capable of grasping them; and as our brethren are generally men of "*common minds*," I am confident they can do but little harm to them; that the influence they will exert upon them will be extremely limited; and that, as I have remarked, but *few* will be led astray by them!

Brother Campbell very justly remarks, in his Preface to the New Version published by him, that one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Christian revelation was, that "to the *poor* the gospel was to be preached—to those not having the advantages of a liberal education;" and that "a revelation not adapted to them"—to their minds and comprehensions—"forfeits all claims of a revelation from God." If not the words, this contains the substance of what he says, for I quote from memory. We perfectly agree with him; and his remarks, as well as other passages of his writings, utterly exclude this fine-spun, abstruse theory of Dr. Richardson, which he acknowledges that none but the *few* can comprehend! God grant that it may ever be "the few," and but *few*. But the mischief which it will occasion, will be the injury to the cause in the estimation of others; the disagreeable and unchristian discussions; and his surrendering to the sectarian and infidel world what we have so long been contending for as the primitive gospel! When Sampson suffered his locks to be shorn by the Philistines, he lost his strength; and when we suffer our views of the original gospel to be shorn away by these speculations we are done—our great strength is gone from us, and we are at the mercy of our Philistian enemies! How Dr. Richardson can reconcile his view of faith and his "inner consciousness," with the plain, simple declarations of the word of God, which he is constantly endeavoring to do, is more than I can see. The result must be contradictions of the Bible and *self-contradictions*; and accordingly we find that he is constantly guilty of this—constantly involving himself in them. We find them on almost every page, and that with the writings and teachings of Bro. Campbell, and the advantages they have enjoyed, and that too with the plain word of God before them, stripped of all human additions, mysticisms, errors and appendages, they should not have found it out before this!—and that it has been reserved for the astute mind of Dr. Richardson to discover it! Let them continue to cling to the pure, unadulterated word, and they have nothing to fear.

SENEX.

Farmington, Mo., September, 1857.

## NOTES ON A TOUR TO MISSOURI.—No. 2.

IN our last we stopped with that part of our tour at Spring Creek Meeting House, in Graves county, Ky. After the immersion of the four young men, we returned with brother Shelton to the Meeting House. There was a very large audience in attendance, several more than could get into the house, or seated in it, although a large and commodious building. Bro. Shelton called upon us to preach; but as he had previously announced a discourse on the subject of Baptism, and as it was expected that he would preach it, we refused; and concluded to address the people in the evening, at 4 o'clock, which was accordingly announced after his discourse.

Bro. Shelton discussed the subject under the three divisions usual in treating upon it; but he presented them in an order different from any arrangement we had ever before noticed. He took up the subjects first, then the action or mode, and lastly the design; while we would have taken first the action, then the design, and in the last place the subjects. This would appear to us the most natural division; as the first question in reference to baptism is, what is it? then, what is it for? and lastly, who are the proper subjects?

As brother Shelton's discussion of it may not be uninteresting to our readers, and edifying to some of them, we will give them a sketch of it.

1. The *subjects*. Here he showed from various references that faith was always required as an indispensable pre-requisite; and therefore as none but adults are capable of believing, they were the only proper subjects; and infants were excluded. The commission in Mark was adduced as evidence: "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved;" where faith is made by our Savior to precede baptism. The case of the Ethiopian Eunuch was also brought forward in proof. Philip preached Christ to him; and in so doing must have preached baptism, or he would not have known any thing about it; which also shows that Christ cannot be preached without preaching baptism; and that the preacher who does not preach it, in its true action and design, does not preach Christ. Let this be well noted. On coming to water the Eunuch enquired of Philip what prevented him from being baptized? and was told that "if he believed with all his heart he might." He replied: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Here we learn that faith is an indispensable pre-requisite of baptism; and also have an example of the confession required before baptism; as



this was all that was required, before Philip baptized him. This example excludes infants.

The baptism of the Samaritans was the next case. Here was the same preacher again, Philip, and he is said again to have "preached Christ unto them." The Samaritans, "when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized both men and women." Here faith is made to precede baptism again; and while the baptism of adults, men and women, is mentioned, there is no reference to that of infants, which we would find if they were scriptural subjects.

The case of the Corinthians was also in point. "Many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized."

The household baptisms, so much relied on by Pedobaptists, were then taken up and disposed of in a manner equally as conclusive and satisfactory. It was shown that there were circumstances connected with every one which clearly proved that no infants were baptized. In the case of the Jailor at Philippi, it is said of him: "he was baptized, he and all his;" "and (then) rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

The case of Lydia, in the same chapter, was adduced. "She was baptized and her household." This was a clear case of infants to the Pedobaptist; but is dissipated, when it is added, that Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren they comforted them and departed." They would hardly have comforted infants!

Also the household of Stephanus. Paul says: "I baptized also the household of Stephanus." Here was thought to be another clear case; but he says afterwards: "they have addicted themselves to the ministry;" which could not be predicated of infants. The invariable requirement of faith as a pre-requisite of baptism was also shown from other places and circumstances, as also the equal necessity of repentance, etc. while not a single clear case of infant baptism could any where be made out! All was presumption and groundless inference!

2. The *action* or *mode*. Here brother Shelton was equally powerful and conclusive. In the case of the Eunuch, "they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him, and they came up out of the water;" which would not have been the case, had pouring or sprinkling sufficed or been the "mode." And then the manner in which Paul speaks of Christian baptism, in the 6th chapter

of Romans and the 2nd of Colossians, where he represents it as a burial and resurrection, emblematical of those of Christ, shows most conclusively that the action is immersion, and not affusion of any kind; as it is impossible for this to represent a burial and resurrection. The substitution of the three words there, in the place of baptize and baptism, shows that while immerse and immersion only will make sense, that of either of the other two will make unmeaning and ridiculous nonsense! The figure of a birth, in John iii. 5; a planting, in Rom. vi. 5; a bath, in Titus iii. 5; and a washing, in Heb. x. 22; all go to prove immersion, as that is required in all these figures, which will not do without them. John's baptizing in Jordan, and our Savior's "coming up out of the water," (properly rendered, "as he was raised from the water;") and at Enon, near Salim, "because there was much water there;" all go to demonstrate the same. He replied to the position of of Pedobaptists, in Rom. and Col. taken to evade the force of immersion, by making the burial in baptism, a spiritual baptism; that, admitting it to be such, it did not change the matter, as the metaphor continued the same, and still made the action immersion. So they gained nothing by this attempted evasion. As brother Shelton was not acquainted with Greek he made no attempt at criticism on the meaning of the original word, *baptidzoo*, and its cognates; nor on the expression, "baptize with water." These he left for me to attend to in the evening, which I did, by showing that the original word always meant to "immerse, submerge, dip, plunge," etc., always including the idea of immersion in some way; and never that of sprinkling or pouring. As to the expression: "He shall baptize you with water," the Greek particle, *en*, there used, should be rendered *in*, "in water," which would make sense with immerse, as "he shall immerse you in water," but not with sprinkle or pour.

3. The *design* of baptism. Bro. Shelton was equally as strong and conclusive here. He showed from various passages that baptism was in order to remission of sins; that there was no such thing as remission before baptism taught in the New Testament; and that there was no assurance of pardon, acceptance with God, etc., until the individual had been baptized. In proof he quoted the baptism of John. He was to "give the knowledge of salvation to the Jews by the remission of their sins." And we are told that he "preached the baptism of repentance for [in order to] the remission of sins." The fulfilment of the commission by Peter was then cited. The commission as in Luke read, that, repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his

[Christ's] name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." On the day of Pentecost, at Jerusalem, when Peter told the penitent Jews to "repent," he preached repentance, and when he said, "and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for [in order to] the remission of sins," he preached remission of sins in the name of Christ. And when Ananias told the believing and penitent soul to "arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins," he taught the same thing. The same thing was taught in the 6th chapter of Rom. which could be found by comparing the first part of it with the 17th and 18th verses; and also in the 2nd chapter of Colossians, where those baptized are said to "have forgiven them all trespasses."

In the evening, as announced, we addressed a respectably sized congregation on Jno. xx. 30, 31: "Many other signs truly did Jesus," etc. We first spoke of the confirmation of the word of God; and the importance of miracles in this; and showed that we could conceive of no other evidence which a messenger from God could give in proof of his mission, than the suspension or interruption of the laws of nature in some way; as God, the author of nature and her laws, could alone suspend or interrupt these; and when it was done, it was a proof of His presence, approbation and authority. The case of Moses when he was sent to the Jews in Egyptian bondage, and to Pharaoh, was adduced, and the working of miracles by the prophets, as Elijah, and the various miraculous demonstrations in their favor. The words following the commission in Mark, and the 2nd chapter of Hebrews, were also adduced, and the fulfilment of the language there recorded; and then the "signs" or miracles recorded by John, in his testimony. We then took up the record of these, and showed the purpose of this, "that ye might believe." We showed from this the importance of testimony to faith; that where there was no testimony there could be no faith; and that testimony was as essential to faith as sound was to hearing or light was to seeing; and as light is the medium by which we discern objects, so faith is the medium by which we discern God.

The proposition to be believed came up next: "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." This was showed to be of the most grand and comprehensive character, containing the greatest and most sublime truth ever offered to the faith of man; and embracing every thing in reference to the birth, life, character, death, resurrection and offices of the Messiah. Hence the confession of this great truth, was all the public confession, or profession, ever required by the apostles as qualification, and we have no right to demand any other. The object

of faith in this proposition: "that believing ye might have life through his name." We spoke of three kinds of life: natural life, in the kingdom of nature; spiritual life, in the kingdom of grace or favor; and eternal life, in "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

We spoke of the birth into each; that life must exist before birth; and that birth takes place, not to procure, but for the enjoyment of the life already procured. In the kingdom of nature we are born of our mother and father: there is a striking analogy in the kingdom of favor. Here, when we believe we are begotten by the spirit through the word of God, called the "good seed" and the "incorruptible seed;" and when we are baptized, we are then "born of water and of the Spirit." Hence the expressions: "Born [begotten] again; not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God:" "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth," etc. "Life through the name" of Christ. The Lord told Moses that in all places where He recorded his name, there would he meet with, and bless his people. He recorded it in the Temple at Jerusalem; and there the Jews had to come to worship him, to bring their sacrifices, etc. So now, under the Christian dispensation the Lord has recorded his name—not on the "mourner's bench," nor in a place covered with straw, called "the altar"—but in the institution of Christian baptism; and it is here that He will meet with the believing penitent, and bless him, in the pardon of his sins, and acceptance into a state of favor, where he becomes one of the children of God, an "heir of God and joint heir of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Such is a sketch of our discourse, which we here give, as it may be of interest to the reader.

The congregation at Spring Creek numbered some 60 or 70, and under the labors of brother Shelton have gotten along in peace and harmony, increased, and grown in the favor and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

They have, with commendable zeal and praiseworthy liberality for their means—for they are what is termed "poor" in worldly possessions—built themselves a new and commodious frame house for worship. But though poor they are "rich in faith," the best of all possessions, "and heirs of the kingdom which the Lord has prepared for them that love him."

J. R. H.

Cooke's Settlement, St. Francis Co., Mo., Aug. 15, 1857.



## HAPPINESS AND USEFULNESS.

That these are intimately connected, few persons have yet to learn. Exactly how dependent the former is upon the latter, perhaps none of us certainly understand. From the very organization of man, to be happy, to any considerable extent, we must be useful. Usefulness is to happiness somewhat as food is to life. True, some people *imagine* themselves happy in the most selfish and wicked cause, and many, no doubt, think they *would* be happy if they could attain certain ends, though being useful enters not into their contemplations, but a little experience in the inimitable bliss of doing good will convince the most sceptical, that there is nothing really deserving the name of happiness disconnected with usefulness.

We should not forget, however, that we can do good to and for *ourselves*. No one is required to love others better, or to do more for them than for themselves. The "new commandment" was not simply loving one another, but loving "*as Christ has loved us.*" This often gives an actual preference to others—as, "In honor preferring another." But even here self is neither forgotten nor neglected. The same Teacher would have us understand that humility is the way to honor; to serve others the way to be served.

But which should be first in our thoughts and efforts, happiness or usefulness? This is the question for the times and for us.

Many of us proceed as if our individual happiness was the first and grand object of our lives. And if in this we were right, should we not earnestly consider the plan to be adopted and followed—whether our own, or that laid down in the Bible? Selfishness might cause us to forget others in our efforts to be happy, but we must add great weakness and folly to take our own course instead of the Lord's. To attempt a good thing on a bad plan—a human system—may be the best we can do when we have no heavenly instructors. But we are not left to devise ways and means for our happiness. It is too great an object, and our Heavenly Father is too much concerned in it. Knowing our weakness he has provided for it. Hence we shall have no apology if we mistake the road to happiness.

Temperance and benevolence are great themes, and, strange to behold, to attain and promote them even professed friends of the Bible sometimes adopt human plans instead of God's plan! Some even complain that a few of us prefer working by the Master's rule! So it is touching Christian union, missionary operations, etc. 'Tis no wonder those who do not believe the Bible, and those who do not understand



its teachings should form and adopt human systems for their own and the happiness of others; but it is strange that any of *us* should do so. Reader, do pause and think who is guilty here!

Some seek a certain degree of earthly treasures before they can do good. With them it is a fixed purpose, that if ever they reach a certain point in their aspirations, they will then begin to live for others. They are much like the miser, who stints and starves himself, labors and makes himself miserable, to get money—under the impression that getting money is the road to happiness, and forgetting that his course of life will utterly unfit him for extracting happiness from dollars, if, indeed, it was there! Now, will not this selfish course of Christian professors unfit them for doing good or enjoying good, if they should reach their proposed position? Let us think of this. What will be the condition of our minds and hearts—perhaps of our bodies also, by the time we succeed in amassing a considerable amount of earthly treasures? And let us consider whether this is God's plan or our own. Have we really and heartily adopted God's plan in all things? How far are we influenced by *human* philosophy?

Some undertake to "live as they go along," and, under the silly notion that happiness consists in the gratification of our vulgar, our lower and more beastly propensities, they actually consume the products of their labor in advance, and so become entangled in interminable debts and troubles! A few have, on the opposite extreme, seemingly forgot that any attention should be given to time-things.

Now, allowing that our individual happiness is a laudable object of pursuit, whether primary or secondary, what is the best plan? Where is the medium between all extremes? *What is God's plan?* In answer to this, may I suggest that, to do good is to be happy, and that what the world and the Bible mean by wealth does not largely, if at all, contribute to usefulness or happiness. The most wealthy have not generally been the most useful or happy. More good has been done by the poor, and vastly more happiness has been enjoyed by them. God has worked by the rich, but he has much more frequently worked by the poor. Hence, "having food and raiment, let us be *content* therewith," and if more be put in our way, with this contentment, we shall be better prepared to use it for good. "Do good to all men, as we have an opportunity, especially to those who are of the household of faith." This is the philosophy—the wisdom of heaven. There is, perhaps, as much, both of danger and misery in wealth and worldly honor, as in the reverse. Neither happiness nor usefulness is closely

bound up with, or absolutely dependent upon either. With Christ we may be both happy and useful while "despised and rejected of men," while "hated of all men" for Christ's sake.

What sad mistakes we make! How we compromise the truth, and injure ourselves and others, by mixing up our ways with God's ways! adopting our plans, and rejecting the wisdom of heaven! How long will we be carried away by the tinselled drapery of earth? We *profess to take the Bible*; let us then *follow it*. C. K.

### REVELATIONS AND MIRACLES NEW AND OLD.

THE great conflict of this age is between *new* and *old* revelations and miracles.

1. *Natural religionists* contend for new revelations from internal and external nature as evidences of the *progressive* tendency of human nature in this fast age. Newman, Parker and others belong to this school. These new revelations, they imagine, frequently come in conflict with Bible revelations, and, hence, the old are set aside to make room for the new!

2. "*Spiritualists*" have added a new chapter to the bible of natural religion. The appropriate teaching of this chapter is *ghostology*. They not only contend for the internal and external revelations of nature, but also for new revelations from the ghosts of the dead. These new ghost revelations often, as they suppose, contradict the Bible, and, therefore, they are driven to the necessity of attributing its supposed errors to the mistakes of the old-time spirits, in or out of the flesh!

3. *Mohammedans, Mormons, Shakers, etc.*, profess to have real *bona fide* new revelations from the Spirit of God. They of course have but little, if any, regard for the Bible, supposing the new to be better than the old!

4. *Catholics* believe in the *infallibility* of the Pope and Romish Church. As there can be no infallibility without inspiration, they, consequently, are new revelationists, and hence the many ridiculous signs and wonders of Romanism!

5. Many *Protestants*, though they still say "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," yet, in effect, believe in new revelations and, in some degree at least, repudiate the Bible!

1. All *Calvinists* who contend for the *special* influence of the Spirit in order to save the elect by partial grace, are virtually new revela-

tionists. They also teach regeneration *before* faith. Now, if the Spirit does something for the Calvinistic elect which he refuses to do for others, by which they are regenerated and convinced of their election, that something is effected through the Bible as the means, or without the Bible. If through the Bible, then some new *idea* to make it special must be added, or it would be divine influence without an idea! If without the Bible, then there must be a new revelation, or it would still be divine influence without an idea! If through the *Bible idea*, then the reprobates may be saved as well as the elect, as that idea is *common* to all. But the notion of regeneration before faith amounts to regeneration without an idea new or old!

2. *Arminianism*, in reference to divine influence, is only a modification of Calvinism. Arminians as well as Calvinists contend for an influence of the Spirit preceding the word. The former extend it to *all*, the latter confine it to their *elect*. Hence Methodists and others, by perverting a few scriptures, can prove that all men, whether in Christian or pagan lands, Bible or no Bible, are the subjects of the "irresistible *converting* influence of the Spirit." Now if this influence is without the Bible idea, it involves a new revelation, otherwise it is a conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment without an idea!

3. But we have some *Baptists*, and perhaps some *Disciples*, who are great advocates for the *word*, as they suppose, who, nevertheless, seem to supercede it by their strange views of spiritual influence. They speak of a "miracle or influence over and above and independent of the word," and not connected with it! Now if it is independent of the word, it must be without the Bible idea, and if so, it implies a new revelation, or else it must be spiritual influence without an idea! This view is only a modification of Calvinism!

What then is the conclusion of the matter? Is it not the following:

1. *Spiritual influence in and through the Bible idea of Christ.*
2. *Spiritual influence in and through the Christ idea of a new revelation!*
3. *Or spiritual influence without the Christ or any other idea!*

Is it not philosophically and absolutely *impossible* for the Father, Son or Spirit, angels, saints or sinners, to think, will, feel, say or do any thing, in reference to Christianity, by divine influence, without the Christian idea?

Now if neither divine, angelic nor human nature can have any Christian feeling by spiritual influence without the Christian idea, of what use is such an influence in heaven or earth? It never has, never

will and never can do any good to preach it, write it or pray for it. Suppose we send a thousand missionaries into the Pagan world to preach and pray for spiritual influences, with instructions to carefully conceal the Christian idea from the heathen mind. How many disciples to Christ would they make?

In all nature "*God makes to grow*" through certain *means*, on certain *conditions*. So, in all grace, the *Spirit* converts through the *word* on condition of *faith* and *obedience*.

If God is not as good in grace as in nature, Christianity is unworthy of God and not adapted to man. But Christianity is the climax of infinite love and wisdom, and, consequently, so intelligible, so credible and practicable that thousands, in the apostolic age, became Christians the first time they heard the gospel. And doubtless it would be so now, were it not for the skeptical influence of *sectarianism* and the everlasting controversy about the *wordless*, *idealless* and *senseless* influence of Spirit.

The cold-hearted speculation of Calvinism involves thousands in doubt whether God ever had any love for them. The Hopkinsian modification involves thousands more in doubt whether the Spirit will ever make them willing by regeneration without faith. The almost innumerable hair-splittings of the self-styled orthodox and evangelicals about word and spirit, faith in facts, the power of Christ, historic faith, etc., so bewilder the great mass of the people, that they are afraid to use the means and comply with the conditions of salvation, lest they should make some awful mistake.

Last, and worst of all, is the raging, conflicting and antipodal sectarianism of the so called Christian world, which, perhaps, is driving more along the broad, dark road of infidelity to destruction than it guides into the straight and narrow way of life. No wonder conversions are now like angels visits, "few and far between."

We need a new declaration of independence in religion as well as politics. A declaration that will ignore all the speculations and traditions of *Protestants* as well as *Romanists*, and bring us back to the simplicity of Christ and the apostles. This declaration, thank the Lord, has been made. If we adhere to it we are safe, but if we depart from it we are at sea again, tossed and driven with every wind of doctrine, and who can divine where our bark will land?

The Lord grant we may preach "*the word*" and faithfully contend for "*the faith*" formerly delivered to the saints!

J. J. TROTT.

Salem, September 4, 1857.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Brother J. G. Carrigan, of Marshall county, Tenn., wishes to enquire if it is possible for persons under the influence of different faiths to serve God equally acceptable? As an example, if one man preach baptism *for* remission of sins, and another preach baptism *in consequence* of the remission, do both preach the truth? and do persons acting under the influence of these contradictory systems, serve God with equal acceptance?

*Reply.*—If persons do not perform obedience in the *true* faith, it is *no* obedience. The twelve baptized in Ephesus by Apollus, although sincere, in consequence of being so far mistaken as to have been immersed under the conviction that John's baptism was the true obedience, did not obey the Lord, and consequently, after hearing the Apostle preach, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Nothing short of an *intelligent* and *sincere* obedience can constitute the service of God.

Bro. James Tucker, of Mooresville, Alabama, wishes to be satisfied as to the true method of "*making elders*."

The word *elder* indicates a person of greater age, or greater experience in the cause of Christ than another. A lad, novice, or man without experience is not suitable for an overseer, but not every aged man in the congregation is competent for a pastor. There is no *elders office*, and it would be as ridiculous to speak of the *office of age* as the office of elder.

While the brethren entertain the idea, that elders—overlookers, we should say—or bishops, are made by the *votes* of the members, we can hope for no scriptural officers. The office springs from the work, and not the work from the office. When the first churches were planted, all the members labored in the congregations according to the ability which God gave, and so soon as any number of the members gave practical demonstration of fitness to superintend the flock, they were set apart by the evangelists to the work of bishops or pastors. There is a simple and safe rule which the brethren of any congregation may adopt on this subject. Are there men in the church who are feeding the lambs? Who meet with the children on every Lord's day; sing, pray and rejoice with them? Who teach publicly and privately the members how to live godly—we do not mean ministers of the gospel, but the faithful seniors in the church—who watch for the souls of the disciples? All such the Holy Spirit particularly en-



joins to take the oversight of the church, as the only shepherds or pastors. We have two dangerous classes of *elders* in the churches. The first class is composed of old men, who do nothing, but they have been elected to what they call "the elder's office." The other class is composed of bigotted old worn-out preachers, who regard long, high-sounding and empty sermons, the chief requisite of worship and labor of a bishop. These overseers, instead of having the members to do their own work, undertake to perform it themselves. Such overseers on a plantation would soon starve both operatives and masters.

Physical indolence is physical death, intellectual indolence is suicidal, and moral inaction is spiritual destruction. The only faithful shepherds are the men who employ all the energies of the congregations. Men who hire themselves to congregations to conduct the worship, in the first place, bind the disciples hand and foot, and, secondly, they paralyse their own influence. Through the church alone can we labor successfully. T. F.

#### SPECULATIONS *versus* FAITH.

DEAR BRO. FANNING,—Not being in the habit of writing, I must ask the indulgence of the brethren. In the July number of the *Advocate* you request the "brethren to say plainly whether they are for the authority of Christ and the apostles, or the vain and deceitful philosophy of the age." In reply we are bold to say, that none but the authority of the Bible is worth any thing with us in matters of Christianity. "Let us contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," not the speculations of men—not heathen or modern philosophy—not modern spiritualism, but that "faith" that comes by hearing of the words of apostles and prophets; this we conceive is clearly taught in the Bible, and faithfully set forth in the Gospel Advocate, and therefore we heartily endorse the sentiments.

We contend for Christian union on the principles of the Bible; but if we cannot have it, we say contend for the truth and let the chaff go. The sooner we get rid of error the sooner we will get rid of our troubles. Under these considerations we humbly hope the Gospel Advocate may still continue to circulate, and that its worthy editors may as ever remain firm and able to triumph over "modern philosophy and spiritualism," and every species of error, and that they may long continue to see the happy results of the triumphs of truth.

J. B. WILMETH.

Pleasant Grove, Collin Co., Texas, Aug. 15, 1857.

### WHAT DOES THE BIBLE READER THINK?

1st. By what is the evidence of unseen things admitted as true?

By faith. Though we do not see Christ, as Thomas did, yet we believe, through their word, on Christ who is our trust, confidence and hope. Heb. xi. 1, John xvii. 20, xx. 29, 1 Peter i. 8, etc.

2nd. By what does faith come?

By hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. Rom. x. 17, Gal. iii. 5, etc.

3rd. By what are we dead to sin?

By repentance from the dead works to life. Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, xi. 18, Rom. vi. 2, Heb. vi. 1, 2 Cor. vii. 10, etc.

4th. By what is the design of Christ's death for our sins, burial and resurrection for our justification acknowledged?

By heart faith confessed with the mouth, followed by baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, etc. Rom. x. 9, 10, 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, Rom. iv. 24, 25, and Acts ii. 38, etc. "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Acts viii. 36, 37.

5th. By what are we buried with him into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE?

By baptism into Christ, i. e. into his death. Rom. vi. 3, 4.

6th. By what do we receive, realize and enjoy the blessings of the remission of past sins, of the Holy Spirit, and of the hope of eternal life?

By the obedience to faith, pleasing to God and his servants according to the testimony as recorded and proved in the Scripture given by inspiration of God in 1 Peter i. 22, Acts v. 32, 1 Peter i. 2, 3, etc. which show us that we are the children of God. Paul says, beautifully, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. viii. 16, Gal. iv. 6, including 1 John v. 1, John iii. 5, etc.

7th. By what shall the just live and walk?

By faith. Rom. i. 17, 2 Cor. v. 7, Heb. x. 38. The just means the children of God, Christ's Disciples, called Christians, Saints. A Christian is a practical or working person of holiness, godliness, benevolence, spiritual songs of praise to God, and rejoicing in the hope to see God as he is. 1 John iii. 2, 3, etc. Such an excellent character for an important example pleases Christians and encourages

sinner to become Christians. Paul, though being dead, lives, still to speak "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality; eternal life." Instead of feeling good that we may do good, we do good that we may feel good. The just enjoys the fruit of the spirit which is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, etc. Gal. v. 22, 23, Eph. v. 9, etc. Kind words and deeds in truth and in love influence those who know, feel and practice them as well as return the same good more or less according to their ability and willingness. To love is good. To love and give, pay or do good in any way is better; for Heaven will repay and even pay more than what Earth pays. Such good works of love are the works of Christian candidates for Heaven. To give without Christian love is nothing. 1 Corinthians xiii.

That we believe what God says, we obey what he commands and we shall enjoy what he promises, is happily peculiar to the Gospel of Christ. By whom are the things reported to the willing hearers and readers? By them who preach the Gospel unto them, with the Holy Ghost, sent down from Heaven; which things the Angels desire to look into. 1 Peter i. 12, Rev. i. 3.

In conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates on persons through the Word of Truth only believed and obeyed. These things have nothing to do with the spirits of certain men and women of nonsense, such as Spirit-rappers, wizzards, witches, false prophets, "higher-law" persons, hypocrites, etc., who operate on ignorant or weak minded persons through their words of falsehood. From such (nonsensists,) turn away.

If Christians do not wish to be mistaken, let them preach the Gospel of Christ without addition to and subtraction from it. The true question is not, what do we say? but what does the Bible say? "And he that hath my word, let him speak my word, faithfully, saith the Lord. Blessed are they that DO his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

I claim no exemption. If I am mistaken in any thing, I feel willing to be corrected scripturally. 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

P. H. N.

(Deaf Mute.)

## MISSION TO THE CHEROKEE NATION.

ON Tuesday, September 15, 1857, Brother J. J. TROTT, our faithful and highly esteemed evangelist, was, by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of the hands of the seniors and teachers in the church at Franklin College, solemnly consecrated to the work of evangelizing amongst the Cherokees, beyond the Mississippi. This is a mission which Brother Trott has long had at heart, and no man, we presume, is more competent for the labor. He gave the prime of his life to teaching the Cherokees, before they were removed from Georgia and Alabama, and suffered much from various sources, but from no cause so severely as from injudicious legislation. Then he fought under the banner of our Methodist friends; but now he goes West under the simple banner of Christ and the apostles. No doubt he has the prayers of the beloved brethren everywhere, and we think proper to ask, how many of the congregations of Christ will co-operate in this noble enterprise? Brother Trott has gone forth as the missionary of the church at this place, and in our view of the Christian economy, we can recognize no other missionary society. Paul and Barnabas were "recommended" by the church at Antioch, set apart by the elders, prophets and teachers, and when occasion suggested they returned to report success. Others co-operated in their support, in their own way, as God gave them ability. What the brethren may do in this mission time alone can reveal.

T. F.

---

TEXAS REPORT.

PLEASANT GROVE, TEXAS, September, 1857.

BROS. FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—We have just returned from a meeting some ten miles North of this, in the neighborhood of Weston, where the strongest sectarian prejudice and opposition to the truth prevails that I ever have met with any where. We labored, in connection with Brother Baker, for ten days, and in despite of all opposition thirteen noble souls made the good confession and were buried with the Lord by baptism. For all of which we praise the Lord.

We cannot close without expressing our satisfaction and gratitude for the good impression that the Gospel Advocate is making on all that read it, on all the important subjects therein discussed. May its editors long live to battle in the cause of truth; by exposing every species of error and speculation connected with our Master's cause, until the wheat may be sifted from the chaff. Yours fraternally,

J. B. WILMETH.

## LETTER OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

Brother Dr. B. W. Lauderdale, of Dyersburg, Tennessee, writes under date of September 24, 1857.

BROS. FANNING AND LIPSCOMB:—I have been a careful reader of the Gospel Advocate from its commencement, and while I am most free to say, that while I have found in it nothing of the "*word alone*" system, and nothing which detracts from the office of the Holy Spirit, as charged by Prof. Richardson of Bethany College, I find much to commend. Indeed I feel thankful to know there are brethren who plead in a clear and forcible manner for the simple truth of the Gospel. I thank you for the promptitude and firmness with which you expose and utterly condemn every vain and deceitful philosophy. The brethren in this county most heartily approve of your course. Those who revile you but beat the air. You will ever have the approval of good men.

Yours in Christ,

B. W. LAUDERDALE.

SALADO, BELL Co., TEXAS, Sept. 12, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—Near four weeks ago I wrote you of our *tent* meeting—32 additions. The next Lord's day and Monday following there were, near 20 miles from this, seven additions.

I am just from Austin, where, for 19 days, the people listened, day and night, to the plain gospel with an interest truly encouraging, and fifty-six, I believe, were added—two not being yet immersed. Many others are almost persuaded. To-morrow week we commence there again.

Meantime, Bros. Strickland and Giles held a meeting at Young's Prairie, which resulted in nine additions; and Bro. Strickland held one in Bastrop, which resulted in seven additions. And a letter from Bro. B. F. Hall just informs me that he is conducting a meeting in M'Kinney, Collins county, Texas, during which thirty-five were added. So the work goes bravely on. How happy the thought, that the dearth has not reached so much to spiritual matters! Oh! if we would all *live* aright, the truth would soon triumph. But when *preachers* adorn themselves in "gold, pearls and costly array," love money, and *show* pride and worldly-mindedness, whether they *feel* it or not, the dead weight is severely felt. The Lord be merciful to our weakness, and deliver us from the chaff, the dross and the drones!

Most affectionately,

C. KENDRICK.



SALADO, BELL CO., TEXAS, Sept. 29, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—To-day I reached home from Austin. Fourteen more were added, mostly from the world. These added to the others make 70 recently at that place. And the prospect is yet improving. The enclosed letter from Brother B. F. Hall will explain itself. We have some other meetings of promise on hand.

The Lord prosper the right.

Affectionately,

C. KENDRICK.

McKINNEY, Sept. 14, 1857.

C. KENDRICK,—*Dear Brother*:—Saturday evening before the fourth Lord's day in last month, (August,) I commenced a meeting in this place, which continued till the Wednesday week following. Our congregations were large from the beginning, and continued to increase until they became overflowing; and towards the close very few except the ladies could get in the house. As good behavior, if not the best I ever witnessed for so long a time and in the circumstances, was observed by the whole audience, both at the preaching and baptism. During the meeting forty-three were added to the church—twenty-four by baptism. The interest continued to the close of the meeting. I would have continued longer but was compelled to go to Dallas county to a meeting which I had appointed there.

The meeting in Dallas county commenced Friday before the first Lord's day in this month and closed the Lord's day week following; with twelve additions—ten by baptism. I am now resting a few days—till next Friday—when I am to commence a protracted meeting at Mantua. Early in October I am to attack the town of Dallas, and with God's help hope to take it. A great harvest might be gathered in this country if we only had reapers. But I am the principal laborer here. I am giving all my time to the work, and have the promise of support.

Great and general interest is taken in our preaching here everywhere. Large audiences, and marked attention and respect unsurpassed, if not unequalled in any country where I ever labored. O! if I only had you here as a colaborer, we could take this country. I want you to come up and live here. It is the best part of Texas, and is settling up with the best population.

I leave you to write to the Gospel Advocate. My regards to sister Kendrick and the children. Write soon. I can't go to Palestine this fall.

Yours fraternally,

B. F. HALL.

FOREST GROVE, TEXAS, September 19, 1857.

The North-Eastern Texas Co-operation assembled pursuant to adjournment.

On motion Bro. E. D. Moore was called to the Chair, and H. L. Williams was chosen Secretary.

The following named persons presented themselves as delegates from the various congregations, to-wit: W. W. Baird and James M. Baird, from Antioch; L. V. Moore and H. L. Williams, from Mulberry; Thos. Barrot and David Halbrook, from Mt. Vernon; N. A. V. Henderson, Forest Grove; J. L. Couch, Woodlawn; Robert Neathry, Mill Creek; R. L. Daniels, Black Cypress; W. C. Gaines and C. B. Thompson, Clarksville; James M. Baird, by proxy from Union.

On motion the following brethren were appointed a committee to arrange and regulate the business of the Co-operation so far as selecting evangelists and designating their respective fields of labor, to-wit: Bros. Thomas Barrott, L. V. Moore, W. W. Baird, J. L. Couch, N. A. V. Henderson, W. C. Gaines, R. L. Daniels and J. M. Baird. Who, after a short retirement, submitted the following report, which was unanimously adopted and ordered to be spread upon the minutes, to-wit:—

We, the committee appointed to select Evangelists, etc., beg leave to submit the following Report:

We have succeeded in procuring the labors of Brothers Asher Gough one half of his time, and James M. Baird all his time as evangelists for the ensuing year, and assign to them the following field for their evangelical labors, to-wit: The counties of Titus, Cass, Red River, Lamar, and that portion of Hopkins included within the congregation known as the Woodlawn congregation.

THOMAS BARROTT, Ch'n.

On motion it was ordered that the Secretary forward a copy of the proceedings to the Gospel Advocate, with a request that the same may be published in that periodical.

On motion the Co-operation adjourned to meet at Sulphur Spring in Lamar County, on Saturday before the fourth Lord's day in August, 1858.

E. D. MOORE, Chairman.

H. L. WILLIAMS, Secretary.

---

CO-OPERATION.

The Co-operation of the Mountain District assembled pursuant to adjournment with the church of Christ at Ivy Bluff, and organized by appointing Bro. W. B. Huddleston President, and J. P. Rascoe, Secretary.

Eight churches were represented by letter and delegates, setting forth the number, increase, order of worship, etc., of their respective congregations.

The evangelists reported, for the current year, 186 additions to the good cause by confession and baptism.

The Co-operation resolved to send the evangelists to the world to preach the gospel, and that the congregations contributing for the support of the evangelists will not expect them to preach to the churches, but that the bishops will teach and instruct their own congregations.

After discussing many important propositions the co-operation adjourned to meet with the church of Christ at Fountain Springs, Friday before the first Lord's day in October, 1858, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

W. B. HUDDLESTON, President.

J. P. RASCOE, Secretary.

---

TRENTON, TENN., August 27, 1857.

BRO. FANNING:—With pleasure I address you a few lines this morning. Feeling great interest in the discussion between you and Mr. Richardson, I thought that I would say for one that I am greatly pleased with your course and conclusions; for if you are not right the Bible is wrong, in my judgment. But the Bible is right and every thing else is wrong. Men may seek to become wise above what is written, and attempt to make nice distinctions; but they always entangle themselves in their own meshes.

Dr. R. has certainly departed from the faith. I have conversed with all the brethren in this section, and have not found one that said R. was right. They have said that they would like to send a list of names to say to you, to press on, contend for the faith—all are right here.

I held a meeting the 4th Sunday in September last, with nine additions—all by immersion. The first Sunday at Mason's Grove, with twenty-five; sixteen immersions, the others were brethren united; one at Eno, near Trenton, last Sunday. I have protracted meetings until the first of October. I think we can do great good in this field. Wherever I go I labor for the Advocate; for it and one or two others are all that we can look to for the faith. Go on Brother F., you have

nothing to fear, the crown is before us, and when we labor according to the word we have all the promises.

Yours in Christ,

JAS. HOLMES.

Thankful are we to have the encouragement of our faithful evangelists. T. F.

### CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

A friend (S. G. O.) wishes to see an *expose* of the call to the ministry in the Advocate. He says, he heard a preacher not long since attempt to prove that he was specially called to preach as were the apostles. No sensible man acquainted with the New Testament can arrive at any such a groundless conclusion. The witnesses and ambassadors of Christ, were particularly called by name, and qualified by the Spirit, to *make known* the will of the Savior to the world—they “*brought glad tidings of good things to light*,” and revealed the mind of God “*not in words which man’s wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches*.” These revelations were written in a book, and since the sealing up of the testimony of the apostles and prophets new developments have not been made; they have not been needed, and consequently all who have professed themselves the especially called and sent, have been, and are, impious imposters. Faithful men should be called by the church, qualified and commissioned to preach the Gospel, and this is Heaven’s arrangement to convert the world. “If an angel from heaven preach a new gospel, let him be accursed.”—*Paul*.

### REPORTS OF EVANGELISTS.

Elder James Holmes, our most experienced and efficient evangelist in West Tennessee, reports thirteen additions during a recent meeting at Liberty Grove, in Gibson County, and eight the next week at Lumsamam.

### JOHN LOCKE.

THE celebrated John Locke, for fourteen or fifteen years, applied himself closely to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and employed the last period of his life scarcely in any thing else. He was never weary of admiring the grand views of that sacred book, and the just relations of all its parts. He every day made some discoveries in it, which gave him fresh cause of admiration. And so earnest was he for the comfort of his friends, and the diffusion of sacred knowledge amongst

them, that even the day before he died he particularly exhorted all about him to read the Holy Scriptures. His well-known recommendation to a person who asked him which was the shortest and surest way for a young gentleman to attain to the knowledge of the Christian religion, in the full and just extent of it was, "Let him study the Holy Scriptures, especially the New Testament. Therein are contained the words of eternal life. It hath God for its author; salvation for its end; and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter."

### OBITUARIES.

Sister Rebecca Curlee, wife of the late Calvin Curlee, of Cannon County, Tenn., died October 3, 1856, in the 65th year of her age. Few women are more devoted than was sister Curlee, and seldom do we find one more clear in her Christian confidence and experience.

Her daughter, Sister J. Yourie, died in the spring of 1857.

Bro. W. H. D. Carrington, of Austin, Texas, writes, August 22d: "My youngest son, Dannie, died on the 17th instant; aged about two years. It is a sad bereavement, but God has permitted it, and it is for the best. May we be enabled to submit."

Bro. C. has our sincerest sympathy.

T. F.

James C. Anderson is no more. He died at his home in Davidson county, Tenn., after lingering for some four years, on Saturday, September 12, 1857; aged about 58 years. He was baptized into Christ by M. W. Matthews in the year 1825, if we mistake not; began to preach the Gospel in 1826, and was a bold, fearless, and humble teacher of the Christian religion a little over thirty years. From the year 1827 till his death, we had not a more intimate acquaintance, and from our long and uninterrupted attachment, our deceased brother, before he breathed his last, requested that we should attend his funeral. Never did we attend to service with a deeper sense of our nothingness before God, and we do not recollect to have witnessed more heart-felt sorrow by the many brethren and friends who were in attendance. We can say of Brother Anderson what we can say of few. When truth and right were the question, *policy* had not the least weight with him. In all the trials we have experienced in Tennessee, James C. Anderson, has been an uncompromising advocate of the truth as it is written. He died a believer in the power and willingness of Christ, to save him everlastingly. Sister Anderson and her orphan children have our sympathy; but we mourn not as those who have no hope. Elders E. D. Moore,



J. E. Matthews, M. W. Matthews, teachers of our deceased brother in youth, are about all who remain, and it is a sad thought, that very few of us who have been his companions in the journey of life are spared. Blessed be the Lord for the consolations of the Gospel of Christ.

T. F.

Charles W. Metcalfe, the subject of this brief memorial, was born at Mt. Verd, McMinn county, Tenn., on the 21st day of February, 1825; united with the "Christian Church" July 1, 1843, and died at the place of his birth on the 9th of August, 1857.

As an humble, faithful follower of his Lord, our brother both lived and died. We knew him well, and loved him fondly. In every relationship of life he practiced those virtues which adorned his character, and contributed to the welfare of such as were embraced within the sphere of his influence. In his social pleasures or business engagements he remembered his religious duties, and proved by their strict observance that the attractions of earth could not seduce him from the path or virtue.

But he is with us no longer. Death has removed him.

As the approach of the destroyer became nearer, his faith brightened until his spirit was filled with unutterable joy. The latest hours of his life were spent in assuring the living of the realities of religion, and warning them of the dangers that lie hidden in the paths of vice. No terrors affrighted him in the moment of dissolution. He smiled at death; it was but his Father's messenger bidding him to a "feast of eternal love." Quietly and gently his life passed away, and he was borne by angels home.

A. McL.

We had the pleasure of knowing our deceased brother well, and from his youth he was a most sincere and devoted believer in Jesus Christ. We are pleased at the privilege of mingling our sorrows with the afflicted relatives.

T. F.

PLEASANT GROVE, TEXAS, July 21, 1857.

BRO. FANNING,—It is with more than ordinary interest I now write. "From the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks." Must my Brother Fanning know, that she whose voice he has often heard, whose feet were swift, whose tender hands were ever ready to minister to his wants, and the wants of my laboring brethren, lies low and cold in death! Mary Moore, my wife, has passed to better mansions. Why am I so loth to express the solemn fact, but because my heart is full—my hand trembles. Near forty-two years we have lived and loved to—

gether. From advanced age (74) I cannot be far in the rear. Her disease was of the most malignant character, baffling all medical aid; seizing immediately on the stomach and bowels, rejecting every administration. Taken on the last day of June, she continued to bear, with Christian hope and Christian philanthropy, unparalleled sufferings until the 17th inst., when she resigned her spirit to God who gave it—her body to death. Mortification had ensued to such an extent as to appear on many places of the surface; these she viewed with calm composure, saying, all was calm—all peace. She retained her mind apparently in full vigor to the last. As above, on the 17th of this instant she left her family and a crowd of weeping friends to mourn her loss; but are not left to weep as those who have no hope. My children did all their duty to a dying mother; my neighbors vied with each other in acts of kindness and attention. On the 18th we laid her mortal remains decently away, amidst the tears of children and a large concourse of friends. I must thank my God, I too was able to stand round her dying pillow, ministering to the last.

My epistle may be tedious to you, but it, to some extent, unburdens my heart. My dear Tolbert will forgive me; while I write my tears obscure my lines. I know I have friends, I know she has friends in the wide range of the Advocate. I know that Brother Fanning can write much better than I can. If my dear brother thinks us worthy of any notice, will he be so good as to give the name of Mary Moore a place in the Advocate. I now live alone. My children twine round my heart. Nothing but God's word can console me. Thank God it is nigh, in the heart and in the mouth. I have some strength left. I try to teach sinners the way of salvation, and Christians how to live and love. Much opposition, yet truth is on the advance. Some young men are rising and devoting themselves to the ministry. I rejoice that when I die the cause of God will not die with me. I preach every Lord's day. I think I will devote the balance of my life to the word. In my decline I experience the fact, that the way of the righteous grows brighter. Speak kindly of us to your dear wife. Ask her to accept the best regard of an old unknown brother. Please to accept the very high consideration of, yours in hope,

E. D. MOORE.

Brother and Sister Moore were amongst our earliest and kindest Christian friends. May the Lord bless our venerable and most faithful brother and family.

T. F.

# THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

---

T. FANNING AND W. LIPSCOMB, EDITORS.

---

VOL. III.      NASHVILLE, DECEMBER, 1857.      NO. 12.

---

## "WHAT'S IN A NAME."

SOME writer has said, that "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

This is no doubt true as regards flowers; and it is equally true, that "A rose with any other name is still a rose."

But that which will hold true with "the flowers of the field" or garden, will not hold true in society and with men and systems. A name here will make a vast difference, as we can every day witness. What a charm is there in some names, while others equally good, even better, will be heard with disgust and even horror! What is the cause? It is not in the name itself, abstractly considered and as "nothing but a name," but it is in the object or thing for which a name stands, and the associations connected with it. In illustration, suppose that a companion and myself are out in the woods of some frontier country, engaged in hunting, and my friend should say to me, "Here comes a man." It would excite no particular sensation in me; but suppose he should say, "Here comes a panther!" Surprise and terror would immediately seize my mind; and I should prepare instantly for defence! So much for the different sensations occasioned by names. Let us carry the illustration into religion, and apply it there. What a charm do we see connected with the name Methodist, Baptist, etc. with many minds; while what disgust and aversion does the name "Campbellite" excite in these same minds!—while the humble Chris-

tian, to whom it is applied, rejects it as a nickname, given to him by way of opprobrium, by his "religious" opponents and enemies, and discards all these human, sectarian names for that of his Divine Master. Strange, that because he has obeyed from the heart his Lord and Savior, according to that system of religion taught by His inspired Apostles, and become His disciple, and refuses to wear any of these sectarian names, he should be dubbed a "Campbellite," because a man named Alexander Campbell has occupied the most conspicuous position before the religious world, in advocating the cause of primitive Christianity, and exerted the greatest influence in restoring it to the world! And not so "passing strange" either, when we consider human nature, and its proneness to evil and obliquity of mind.

And these very individuals, wearing these divinely unauthorized sectarian names, and glorying in them and the cause they represent, when told that they are not recognized in the Bible, and that the sacred volume not only does not sanction such appellations, but condemns them, knowing it to be so and that they can give no scriptural authority for them, endeavor to get off by saying, "Oh, there is nothing in names—when we get to heaven it will not be asked us what name we bore in this world." If there is nothing in names, why then be so tenacious about them?—why cling to them with such pertinacity? But their assertion is not so—it is a mere empty one to get off with, and nothing else. Ask this same individual, if a Baptist, if he would be willing to renounce his Baptist name, and take that of Methodist? Or, if a Methodist vice versa,—and will he consent? He will be the furthest from it—he loves his name too dearly for that. If "names are nothing," then they are superfluous and naughty; and we are commanded to reject "all superfluity of naughtiness." But while none would be willing to part with his own sectarian name, and take another, there is one name which all are willing to wear—nay, claim to possess; and would not for the world be thought not entitled to it, as well as the character it represents; and that is the sacred name of CHRISTIAN. All are willing to wear that—all can unite upon that; but the misfortune is, that they want to wear their sectarian name along with it; and be called a Methodist Christian, or a Baptist Christian, or a Presbyterian Christian! They merely want it for a surname, to be used as occasion may require, or not to be used at all. But the Master don't permit the like of that; and his Apostles condemn it as carnal. If you wear His name, you must do it to the exclusion of all others. And who would not, when it is the only one divinely authorized—the

only one permitted—the only one which carries in it the name of our Divine Master, our Blessed Redeemer, our Almighty Savior? The poet Young says:

“A CHRISTIAN is the the highest style of man.” If so, and it is, who ought to want any other name?—who ought to be willing to wear any other? No, let us cling to that sacred name in preference to all others.

“Nothing in names.” I will relate some anecdotes here to show that there is something in them, and the great influence they have. Some young ladies in a Baptist family, greatly prejudiced against us, happened to pick up one of our Hymn Books that happened to be there by some means. They opened it, and began the hymns and songs, without noticing the title-page. They read one after another, and perhaps sang them too, admiring them as they went, until the great excellence of the selection caused them to turn to the title-page, to see what selection it was. As soon as they saw the name of Alexander Campbell on it they dropped it as if it had been a coal of fire! “Nothing in a name.”

One of our ablest preachers was once mistaken for a new Methodist Circuit Rider. After the discourse a Methodist came and congratulated him on what an excellent preacher they had gotten on the circuit, and how delighted he was. He was informed of his mistakes and told that it was one of those despised “Campbellites;” when he uttered an exclamation of surprise, bordering on horror, and immediately slunk away! “Nothing in a name.”

A young man who had heard our brethren preach, but was very much prejudiced against them, united with the Baptists, and concluded to buy a Testament. He went into a store and enquired for one, when one of the common versions was handed to him. He looked over it a while, and handing it back said it would not do. When asked why, he replied that “it read just like the Campbellites preached!” He took it for a “C——ite Testament.” Quite a compliment; and evidence that our brethren preach the word of God. Query—Where would he get one that did not so read?

An old Methodist gentleman, personally known to the writer of this article, bought himself a new family Bible, the common version, not very long since. He also had heard our brethren preach and knew our religious sentiments, and was very much prejudiced. In reading and examining it he found in it so much of what is nicknamed “Campbellism” that he was about to return it to the merchant from whom



he procured it; and would have done so, had he not been convinced by comparison with other Bibles that it was the common version.

These cases go to demonstrate that our brethren preach the word of God—the true gospel—and that what is called “Campbellism” by our opponents is nothing else but this!

But the strongest we ever heard of this sort, was that of an old Baptist lady in Mississippi, who, when one of our brethren told her that she ought to listen to Peter, replied that they “need not quote Peter to her, for he was as grand a Campbellite as any of them!” Enough. Were the apostles on earth, and it was not known who they were, and preach just as they did, they would be called “Campbellites,” and shut out of the sectarian meeting-houses!

August 31, 1857.

PETER.

---

## THE PHILOSOPHICAL ESSENTIALITY OF THE WORD OF GOD.

WHEN will the controversy in reference to the Spirit and Word come to a satisfactory close? Is it impossible to settle it by rational investigation? Let us make one more effort to get to the bottom of this long vexed question. To do this we must first understand the *nature* of the word. What is the word? Not *paper* and *ink*. Not articulate *sounds*. Not Hebrew, Greek or English *letters*. The word existed anterior to its embodiment in *oral* and *record* history. The true spiritual and living word of God is,

*The divine spiritual Christian Idea.*

When we, therefore, speak and write of the word, we do not mean abstract letters, sounds or facts, but we mean the Christian idea as connected with the Father, Son and Spirit, angels, prophets and apostles; the Bible, with its Christian prophecies, types and facts, and the church with its living oracles, living ordinances and living members. The true word, then, is identical with the Christian idea, and anything below or short of this is too literal, vulgar and sensualistic. With the true idea of the true word of God before us we now proceed to demonstrate its philosophical essentiality.

1. *The word is philosophically essential to any thought, feeling or action of the divine Father in reference to Christianity.* Did God foreknow, predestinate and elect all nations in Christ without the Christian idea? Did he so love the world as to give his Son to save the world without the Christian idea? Did he come from heaven and

~~~~~

speak the great Christian proposition, at the Jordan, and on the mount of transfiguration without the Christian idea? And did he deliver up Christ to die as a sacrifice for the sins of the world, raise him from the dead for our justification, exalt him far above all heavens and constitute him Lord of all, without the Christian idea? Can God forgive our sins for Christ's sake, bless us with spiritual blessings in Christ, judge the world in righteousness by Christ, and finally grant us eternal life in Christ, without the Christian idea?

2. *The word is philosophically essential to the views, feelings, and actions of the Son of God in reference to Christianity.*

Did the Son of God love us, become one of us, live with and for us, teach us, descend with us into the lower parts of the earth, rise from the dead for us, and become our Prophet, Priest and King—our all in all—all this and more, without the Christian idea?

3. *The word is philosophically essential to all the physical, intellectual, moral and miraculous agency or influence of the Spirit in reference to Christianity.*

Did the Spirit of God "know the things of God" in reference to Christ, inspire the patriarchs and prophets to utter promises and prophecies in reference to Christ, produce the incarnation of Christ, descend from heaven upon Christ at his baptism and fill him without measure, produce the preaching and miracles of Jesus to prove that he was the Christ, enable Christ to offer himself without spot to God, raise the body of Christ from the dead, inspire the commission of Christ delivered to the apostles, descend from heaven as the divine missionary of Christ to the church, inspire the apostles and evangelists to preach Christ and work miracles to prove that Jesus was the Christ, and inspire the church of Christ with all spiritual gifts, to sing, pray and prophesy for the edification of the members of the body of Christ. I say, did the Spirit do all or any of this by abstract influences, destitute of the Christian idea?

Did the Spirit bring to the revelation of the apostles all the teaching of Christ, "and guide them into all the truth" of Christ without the Christian idea? Was the baptism of the Spirit at Jerusalem and Caesarea void of the Christian idea? Was "the gift of the Spirit" at Jerusalem, Samaria and Ephesus, "in the name of Christ," destitute of the Christian idea? Did the Spirit convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, because they believed not on Christ, because he ascended to the Father, and because he judged the prince of this world, without the Christian idea? Were the Jews, Samaritans and

Gentiles "born of the Spirit" by abstract influence separate from the Christian idea? Were all the primitive Christians the chosen of God "by sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" without the Christian idea? Were they "renewed" by the Spirit and "filled" with the Spirit of Christ without the Christian idea? Was the love of God shed abroad in their hearts while they were ignorant and faithless in regard to the Christian idea? The Spirit inspire love without an idea? Does the Spirit of God bear witness with our spirits that we are Christians without the Christ idea? Finally, does the Spirit of Christ change our spirits into the moral likeness of Christ, from glory to glory, while we live, and will he change our bodies into his immortal likeness in the resurrection, and, in all this glorious Christ transformation, the Spirit and we equally destitute of the Christian idea?

4. *The word is philosophically essential to angelic agency in Christianity.*

Did the angels of God deliver the charter promise of blessing all nations in Christ, announce the incarnation and birth of Christ, strengthen Christ in his temptation and agony, preach the resurrection and second coming of Christ, become the loyal subjects of Christ, when the Father said, "Let all the angels of God worship him," superintend the apostles and evangelists of Christ in preaching Christ to the world, rejoice in heaven over every sinner that turns to Christ, and become ministering spirits to all the disciples of Christ—and will they come with Christ the second time, to witness and participate in the glorious consummation of the new creation? I say, did, and will, the angels of God perform all this glorious Christ work without the Christian idea?!

5. *The word was philosophically essential to the agency of the apostolic mission.*

Did the apostles teach all nations, preach the gospel to every creature, preach repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ among all nations, baptize the believers into the name of the Father, Son and Spirit, and teach them to observe all the commandments of Christ, by abstract spiritual influence, while they and their converts were destitute of the Christian idea? Did they convert three thousand Jews on Pentecost by preaching and praying for spiritual influence without the Christian idea? Did Phillip convert the Samaritans and the Eunuch by spiritual influence without preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ? Did Peter convert the Gentiles by the baptism of the Spirit without preaching Christ as Lord of all? Did Paul convert Lydia and the Jailor by

earthquakes and mystical influences, without preaching the word of the Lord to them?

6. *The word is philosophically essential to the conversion of sinners.*

Were the Pentecostians pricked in their hearts by the Spirit, without the Christian idea contained in Peter's discourse? Did they believe and receive the word gladly, without the Christian idea? Did they obey the command to "repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," without the Christian idea?

Did the Samaritans believe, and were they baptized, both men and women, without the Christian idea?

Did the Eunuch believe and confess that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, submit to baptism, and go on his way rejoicing, with a mind and heart destitute of the Christian idea?

Did Saul believe, repent, pray and wash away his sins in Christian baptism, by the great spiritual light that shone around him, without the Christian idea?

Did the Gentiles believe, repent and submit to baptism in the name of the Lord, by the baptism of the Spirit, without the Christian idea?

Were the Corinthians "begotten in Christ," by Paul, without the gospel?

Were the Christians to whom James wrote, "begotten of the will of God," without the word of truth?

Were the saints to whom Peter wrote "born again," without the incorruptible seed, the word of God which liveth and abideth forever?

Were the Romans saved without the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation?

7. *The word is philosophically essential to Christians in order to the enjoyment of spiritual blessings in Christ.*

The first blessing in Christ is remission of sins. Who can enjoy remission in Christ, through his blood and in his name, without the Christian idea?

The second blessing in Christ is the Spirit of Christ, the spirit of adoption, the fruit of which is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance. Is there any love, peace, joy, etc., in the family, State or church without an idea? Christian love without the Christian idea! Christian joy and peace without the Christian idea!

The third blessing in Christ is the Christian hope. Can we derive and expect immortality without the idea embodied in the Christian promise?

8. *The word will be philosophically essential to the enjoyment of eternal life.*

Will the saints be raised by Christ, judged by Christ, reign with Christ, and live forever with Christ, in his own immortal likeness, and yet be destitute of the Christian idea? Will we then no longer see through a glass darkly, but see him face to face, and know him as we are known, without the Christian idea? The fullness of the divine Christian idea will then and there overflow our immortal minds and hearts, and constitute the eternal fountain from which shall flow the grateful and triumphant song of the redeemed—glory to God and the Lamb forever and ever! Amen!

Our eight propositions may now be engrossed into one, as the conclusion of the whole matter:

*The word of God, containing the Christian idea, is philosophically essential to divine, angelic and human agency, in the provision, enjoyment and eternal consummation of the Christian salvation.*

Now, if the infinite wisdom, power and love of God, cannot enable him to think, feel and act in reference to Christianity abstract from the Christian idea, how foolish, unphilosophical and absurd for finite man to preach, write and pray about some imaginary something, (rather nothing,) which never has been, is not, and never can be! And if all the divine nature, all the angelic nature and all the human nature in the universe, united, cannot have one thought, one feeling, or perform one act in reference to Christianity, without the Christian idea, is it not time for preachers to cease talking about the word being the *ordinary* means of salvation? What are *extraordinary* means? Spiritual influence without a spiritual idea! An impossibility the means of salvation! Gentlemen, come out, and say a *new* revelation of the Christian idea. The people would then understand you.

Prove to us that a *perpetual* revelation of the Christian idea is the order of Heaven, and the controversy would be at an end. But, if you are afraid to attempt this Herculean task, and are conscious of your inability to accomplish it, you should, at least, cease to present your ridiculous counterfeit to the people as genuine apostolic coin.

With these premises before us, how strange is the effort of some of our *Baptist*, and even some of our *Christian* preachers and writers! They are very zealous for a corrected *version* of the Bible, and yet seem to contend for a spiritual influence equivalent to a new revelation! Why do they seek to convict us of error, and to correct us, because we teach the essential union of the Bible word and Spirit, in



---

conversion and sanctification, if they do not believe in divine revelation?

Now I hope these dreamers of "the things of the Spirit" will condescend to explain to "our friends in Tennessee" the nature of that divine influence which is not connected with the Christian idea, old or new. I am certain it is not *Christian*, for that necessarily implies the Christ idea. Till better instructed, I must believe there is but one word in our language that defines it—*imaginary*.

Yours in the true Christian idea,

J. J. TROTT.

Salem, Tenn., September 5, 1857.

---

### CONVERTING POWER.

BRO. FANNING:—I consider it my duty to say a few things, as I near the eternal port, upon the raging controversy under the head of "Faith vs. Philosophy."

I have long desired, and a number of us for many years have labored to introduce the change in the popular mind which must take place on the "modus operandi," or divine scriptural conversion to God.

It is not a threatening cloud now gathering to burst upon our heads, but a volcano long pent up in the bosoms of even great and good men, fed by the commentaries and religious philosophy of hoary ages, that is now crackling through our ranks in its burning streams of consuming fire.

Had I time and ability I would write long numbers on "*Clerical Philosophy vs Christianity*." But the history of the various grades and classes of philosophy which have operated against Christianity ever since its birth would fill volumes, and of course cannot be introduced in a short letter. I have then to say—

1st. In the premises before us, in the Harbinger and Advocate, I am glad to see that Bro. Campbell has had to explain away, and thereby correct Bro. Richardson in order to endorse him.

2d. That of all the writers I have read this year, Bro. Richardson has, in his well written but metaphysical numbers, the greatest amount of philosophy.

3d. That the philosophy which is called "Natural Religion," as taught in most universities, has, since the Protestant cause was espoused by Henry the Eighth, done more to deceive mankind and given rise to more superstitious practices among the various religious de-

~~~~~

nominations than any other system of philosophy known to me. It at once admits the insufficiency of revealed religion, so called; and leads the mind off from that "*Word*" which God has magnified above all his name. Under it men have sought God's converting power or path to Heaven in nature's wilds, often thinking thereby to accomplish what the word of God is charged with being incompetent to do. And generally they have found most of nature, so far as their various religions are concerned, in themselves. And hence the scheme of exciting our own frail natures and passions at camp-meetings and elsewhere, so that through them we may imagine that we get new powers, new revelations, or at least additional evidence from God to make us Christians, or prove that we are the favored of modern influences.

When the plan of "Getting Religion" was first set on foot, at *Red-ruth* in England, by the preachers—not 300 years ago—from whence it crossed the Ocean and became a disease to our sympathies and a curse to the American colonies; placing in lunatic prisons many who went darranged on the subject of getting religion; they doubtless acted under the teaching, that God must use some other means—that natural religion or some other system of philosophy should be brought to bear upon the human mind and passions to help the Bible to convert them to God.

Even Wesley, long after he founded the Methodist Societies, had to get religion to conform to that abandonment of the peerless claims of the blessed gospel, which introduced a corrupt and vainly philosophic religion suited to the fashions of men and the ignorance of the times.

Transcendentalism has grown out of the *college christened* "natural religion," and more than forty other systems of philosophy, some of which make spirits out of matter by dividing parts till that matter becomes invisible, and have even reduced the Great Eternal to a monad.

I wonder that Brother Richardson cannot see that God lives on this lower world as well as on the utmost verge of boundless space, or in the center of unnumbered rolling spheres—that the Holy Spirit has never left—that every feeling and thought produced by the holy scriptures is an impulse from God and an operation of the Holy Spirit, and that the Spirit of God is competent to honor and does honor the word of God, by making it his sword as well as his voice of consolation in the conversion and sanctification of men.

I am ashamed that I ever intimated to God that he had not used words sufficient to make me wise unto salvation, and that I (guided by the philosophy of popular but vain theories of religion) ever prayed

---

to him to lessen the value of his word by exerting his power in some other way, in my conversion. But why should I be ashamed of an error which is more popular than truth?

Answer. I have to settle the question of my conduct on earth with that Almighty Being who sees not as man sees, and I want to stand erect in the "eternal morn." I add only, that I think there is no getting the popular theories of "natural religion" up, without getting the Bible down. I am very feeble, and have had to get help to transcribe in part, the little I write.

May God bless you,

ALLEN KENDRICK.

Hamburg, Tenn., Sept. 10, 1857.

---

#### FAITH ALONE—HOW THE APOSTLES ADDRESSED ENQUIRERS.

THE question, "What shall I do to be saved?" when asked in reference to the Christian salvation, is truly the "Great Question," as it has often been termed—the most momentous question ever asked by mortal man; for, in the reply to it, is involved his present and eternal salvation, from sin and its consequences here and hereafter, in this life and that which is to come. How important, then, that it should be rightly answered; and that the honest enquirer should be directed to the proper source! But how far from this have been the answers usually given! Andrew Fuller once wrote a long treatise upon it, entitled, "The Great Question Answered," in which he did not answer it at all, or at least give no scriptural reply; but after pages of learned and labored metaphysical disquisition upon it, and attempts to make this salvation dependent upon faith alone, he left the question—not where he found it, for that would have been better—but involved in a maze of mysticism and confusion of mind, calculated to bewilder and mislead the sincere enquirer after truth; and to leave him in that unsettled and doubtful state of mind, which either terminates in skepticism, or leads him to lay hold on some animal impulse, or some change of feeling, as a relief to his unsettled state of mind! The celebrated Robert Hall, of England, also wrote a long discourse upon the same subject; but after all his eloquence, left it pretty much where Fuller did; while other sectarian writers have labored it to no better purpose! The light they have thrown upon it has been only of that *ignis fatuus* character, calculated to lead him who attempts to follow it into the bogs and marshes of sectarianism, or leave him in old John

Bunyon's "slough of despond!" The simple question is, or ought to be, How did the Apostles, the divinely commissioned and inspired ambassadors of Heaven, answer this great question when asked them? They did it in few words; and a single page, or a few pages at furthest, are sufficient to elucidate and make plain, what has occupied volumes of sectarian discussion, in attempting to explain!

All this has been caused principally by misconceptions of the apostolical teaching on the subject. As men who cant see well, when they undertake to read put on a pair of spectacles, so these men, who are blinded by sectarianism, when they undertake to search the scriptures, put on a pair of "sectarian spectacles," and read the Bible through them! In other words, when they read it or hear the Gospel preached, they have their system before their minds, and read or hear it through that! And as when a man has on a pair of blue spectacles, every thing appears blue, and when he has on a pair of green ones every thing appears green; so in looking at the Bible, to the "blue stocking," Presbyterian every thing in it is blue Presbyterianism, to the Methodist all is Methodism, etc. Instead of bringing their systems to the Christian system and measuring them by that, and lopping off and casting away every thing inconsistent with it, they reverse the order and bring that to their own systems and reject whatever is inconsistent with them! Among the Baptists the "experience" of the "convert" has to be compared with their own, instead of the Bible, and he is received or rejected according as it agrees or disagrees with that; and they, according to the apostles, "comparing themselves with themselves, and measuring themselves by themselves, are not wise."

We have said that these things—these discrepancies and inconsistencies with the true Gospel—have been caused by misconceptions of the apostolical teaching. Because when the jailor at Philippi enquired of Paul and Silas, "What must I do to be saved?" and they answered him, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house," without also specifying to him that he must be baptized, men assume and contend that faith alone, to the exclusion of baptism, is the condition of justification; and point us to such other passages as the following; "justified by faith which is in Christ Jesus;" "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," etc. in confirmation of their theory. They do not consider that the apostles always addressed enquirers according to the circumstances in which they were placed, and the measure of knowledge and preparation they were in possession of. They acted on the same prin-

ciple that a wise teacher would in classifying his students. What would we think of a teacher who should take the child that had not learned its letters, and place it in the 3rd and 4th Reader; and set the boy who could read well to learning his letters? Now just in the same manner such teachers of the religion as the above act, in reference to the Christian system, and with not a particle more of discretion or wisdom? Instead of pointing the penitent believer to Christian baptism, they point him to the mourner's bench, the anxious seat, or the altar; and tell him that he must be justified by faith alone! Such never did the apostles when asked the great question. Let us see what their answers were:

1. When an individual, like the jailor at Philippi who was a Gentile and had perhaps never heard of the Lord Jesus Christ, asked the question he did, "What must I do to be saved?"—or as correctly rendered, "to be safe?"—they would give him the first command to such: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." It would have been useless and nonsensical to have commanded him to repent, or be baptized, until he had faith, as this was the first step he had to take. And now let them mark what followed. As "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," it was impossible for the jailor and his family to believe until they first heard. Hence Paul and Silas "preached the word of the Lord to him and to all that were in his house." And what then took place? Did they call them up to be prayed for?—or tell them to pray, and mourn, and agonize, as do our revival preachers of the different sects? Not a word of any such thing—not the most distant hint or allusion to any such practices! Had they done so, they would have violated the commission of the Savior, and acted contrary to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. What then followed? we ask. We see in the very next passage. "And he [the jailor] took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." This was in precise accordance with the commission: "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And who dare say, in the face of sacred writ, that the jailor and his family were not now saved from their past or alien sins?—and who dare say, with the words of the Lord before him, that they were saved before they were baptized? To contend thus would be daring presumption against high Heaven! The jailor could now "rejoice, believing in God with all his house," and not before; as the Ethiopian Eunuch, after he was baptized by Philip, "went on his way



rejoicing" in the pardon of his sins and acceptance with God through Christ. The advocates of justification or pardon by faith alone, certainly cannot see the results of their theory, when fully carried out; how it would nullify the commands of God, and that it would equally exclude repentance with baptism! Because nothing but faith is mentioned as a condition in a passage of scripture, and the justification of the sinner referred to it, it is no evidence that nothing else is required, and that baptism is excluded, and therefore nonessential. The reason that so much stress was laid upon faith by the apostles, is, that it is the great justifying principle in the Christian system—the point at which the alien must start and the foundation upon which the Christian character must be built; and because the Jews were constantly endeavoring to justify themselves "by the works of the law," and not "by the hearing of faith." In the language of Dr. Abercrombie, in his "Man of Faith," a most admirable and edifying little work: "This [faith] is at once the source of spiritual life and the supporting element of moral health; and, until a man be firmly established in this great principle, it is vain for him to expect to make any progress in the cultivation of Christian character."

2. But suppose individuals are already in possession of this faith, as were the Jews on Pentecost, after they heard the preaching of Peter, they are not commanded to believe, but to repent (or reform) as the next step. When they heard his discourse, "they were pricked in the heart," made penitent or convicted of sin, and ask the great question, "What shall we do?" Their inquiry evinced their faith; and they are not told to believe, or sent to the anxious-seat, or mourning-bench, or altar, as our sectarian preachers would do, but: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

3. But if an individual has both believed and repented, as in the case with Saul of Tarsus, when Ananias was sent to him, he is not commanded to do either, but merely to be baptized: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Thus we can see how the apostles answered enquirers, and the inefficiency of faith alone to justify and save from sin. Wherever faith is mentioned by itself, repentance and baptism are always implied or understood. All three are embraced in preaching Christ; and no one can preach Christ in the sense of the apostles, without preaching them, and that too in the order and for the purpose we have here presented them. The case of the Eunuch, to which we have referred, is to the point here. He was reading the prophecy of Isaiah, at the 53rd

chapter, when Philip took the book and commencing there "preached Christ to him." There is not a word said about his preaching faith, repentance, or baptism, but he must have done so, or the Eunuch never would have asked the question he did: "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" And what was the reply? "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." The Eunuch then made the confession which we require of the penitent believer—the only divinely authorized one ever required of such—"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" and Philip baptized him upon it. We also have the case of Lydia. The Lord opened her heart through the preaching of Paul: "whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." Not a word of any of these, but "she was baptized and her household." Baptism must have been among these "things;" and it was by believing, repenting and being baptized that she "attended" to them.

One more case, and we are done; that of Philip at Samaria. He "went down" there, and "preached Christ unto them;" and, "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Here these requirements must have been among these "things;" and Philip no doubt commanded them to "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," as did Peter on Pentecost; and that was the way Philip preached the things concerning the name of Christ.

Under the Mosaic dispensation the Lord said: "In all places where I record my name, there will I meet with you, [the Jews,] and bless you." He recorded in the Temple at Jerusalem; and there the Jews had to carry their offerings, and the Lord met with, and blessed them. But under the Christian dispensation, he has recorded it—not in a Temple, or a mourning-bench, or an anxious-seat, or the altar—but in the institution of baptism; and it is there He has promised to meet with the penitent believer, and bless him, in the pardon of his sins, and in an introduction into a state of favor and acceptance with Him; where he will be enabled to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

"To him [Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," when baptized in that name, and "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And "unto you [Jews] first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

SENEX.

August 29, 1857.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

LAVERGNE, TENN., Oct. 27, 1857.

DEAR BROTHER FANNING:—We are so well satisfied that your discourse at Ebenezer, on Lord's day, the 25th instant, is well calculated to do much good, that we sincerely request a copy for publication. If possible we would be pleased to have it just as you delivered it.

Your Brethren in Christ,

JOSHUA K. SPEER,  
JOHN W. RICHARDSON,  
DAVID LIPSCOMB,  
JOHN HILL,  
NATHAN W. CARTER.

FRANKLIN COLLEGE, NOV. 18, 1857.

DEAR BRETHREN SPEER, LIPSCOMB, RICHARDSON, HILL AND CARTER:—Your favor of October 27th, requesting a copy of the discourse delivered at Ebenezer, on the fourth Lord's day of October, 1857, has been received, and I herewith furnish the desired copy. I can but feel gratitude to God, my brethren, for your favorable conclusions regarding my humble effort to preach the "ancient" Gospel; and sincerely hope the discourse may be of service to candid enquirers disposed to examine its contents.

Sincerely and fraternally,

T. FANNING.

## THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST:

*A Discourse delivered at Ebenezer Meeting House, October 25, 1857,*

BY T. FANNING.

RESPECTED FRIENDS AND BELOVED BRETHREN,—We appear before you this morning for the purpose of re-announcing the Gospel; and we beg leave to read the only commission given for the salvation of a sin-defiled and ruined race, as recorded by Mark xv. 15, 16: "*Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.*"

The sincerity of our purpose, must serve as an apology for the absence of novelty in our subject. Human beings are as anxious "to hear and tell new things" to-day as they were in the days of Paul; hence the necessity of endeavoring to direct public attention from speculation, visions and dreams, to the great source of spiritual light. It will be our chief purpose, to ascertain if possible, in *what* the power of God that brings salvation, consists. We wish to examine

our subject somewhat systematically, and with this view, we will endeavor to group our thoughts under such distinct heads as we trust can not fail to excite attention and interest.

1st. *Why is it, we respectfully ask, that preaching seems to have little or no effect, and that both preachers and people seem to have lost confidence in the Gospel to convert men to God?*

Whilst we cannot doubt the truth of the intimation, that most of our preaching is powerless for good, it may be well to call attention to a few very startling developments connected with the subject. When the Gospel was first announced by Peter, "About three thousand" were pierced to the soul, and became converts to the new religion, the same day. Five thousand submitted from a short, and simple sermon from Solomon's porch;—multitudes of the common people, and even great "companies of the priests," daily yielded their hearts to God, and in every city, village and hamlet the first preachers visited, scores of the people of both sexes, and all kinds of religious prejudices, became rejoicing believers in the Messiah. But such results are not now witnessed; men preach for years without seeing any great move in society. God is the same Almighty Father, who is willing always to save to the utmost such as come to him by his Son; the church is still "the pillar and support of the truth," and we imagine the Gospel in its facts, is precisely the same it was eighteen hundred years ago. Has it lost its power? or are the people more ignorant, depraved and deeply sunk into the mire of sin? Has the church fled from the earth?

We may be told, that the cause of the failure of the Gospel lies in the fact that the people generally have lost all fear of danger, and hence, they *feel* not the necessity of listening to the voice of inspiration. We are free to admit, that persons must be in a proper frame of mind, in order to hear profitably. It is agreed that our kind Father was four thousand years educating our race for the reception of the Gospel, and "Natural men" then, were not able to hear the word of God. Civilization has always been an indispensable prerequisite for receiving Christian instruction; and all classes not versed in the arts of industry, are beyond the reach of the Gospel of Christ. They are "wayside" hearers who understand not the word. From the fact that Cornelius and relatives were "*all ready before God, to hear whatsoever was commanded of God,*" it was an easy labor for the men with the keys to open the door of faith to the Gentiles.

But it is clear to all observers, that the people frequently attend meeting, not with the fear of God before the mind—business engrosses

their thoughts,—and really they *heed* nothing. They possess no religious feeling, because they have no religious faith. Their thoughts, their hearts, and their feelings are not actuated by religious influences.

Analogous to this state of mind, we find thousands in seasons of epidemics and malignant diseases, in the very jaws of death without feeling the least danger. They call not a physician because they feel that there is nothing to fear till it is too late to employ remedies.

It is indeed distressing beyond measure, to witness the exceeding indifference of our contemporaries regarding a spiritual life. Moral death hangs over the world, whilst we seem to regard it not; but we eat, drink, marry and are giving in marriage in the midst of sorrow, affliction and death temporal and eternal.

But there is a question beyond all this, of still higher moment, viz.: the causes of this general and almost universal indifference with reference to religion. There are doubtless many, but there are a few which lie on the very surface that are the chief hindrances to the Gospel of the grace of God.

Amongst the indolent, dissipated and degraded classes of society, there is not elevation of mind to appreciate the things of the spirit. Persons in ignorance and vice, must be elevated by training in practical agriculture, the mechanic arts, and commerce. They should be instructed in the primary branches of a common school education, and must have at least a partial knowledge of the laws of right, they must know ordinary proprieties of society, and must be taught to look up to God as the giver of all we enjoy, before they can hear the life-giving word.

Many, we deny not, have been educated to a very considerable extent, but their fleshly appetites prevail to such a degree over all their moral powers, that the gospel can scarcely reach them. They cannot restrain their passions, and frequently, when from unusual excitement, they profess faith, there is “no foundation in them,” and they soon fall away.

Many of the poor, we admit, are too degraded to be reached by the gospel of Christ; and most of the rich are too much under the influence of the flesh to open their hearts for the entrance of the word. In the parable of the Savior, but one class in four could hear with profit the word of God. There are two, and but two, conditions for the reception of truth, viz: “An honest,” a “good” and “an understanding heart.” Persons with such prerequisites fail not to believe and bring forth fruit, some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred



fold. The greatest obstruction to the progress of the truth possibly is the *manner* in which men write, speak and *preach* ABOUT religion. Most of the papers and books written on the subject of religion are not addressed to the people, or at all adapted to their wants. They are dead as they issue from the press, and never inspire the least spiritual emotion. What proportion of religious writers make deep and lasting impressions on any subject? The people fall into the soundest sleep in attempting to read, and the papers and books are thrown aside to be trampled under foot. But is the preaching much better? The mere time-server proceeds with measured steps, timidly, and fearfully, dreading to reprove sin in high or low places; the ambitious preacher soars aloft in swelling strains, employs great high sounding words of vanity, and while he fills an ignorant and admiring crowd with surprise, the great heart of humanity is untouched. Few preachers speak as if they had any confidence in what they utter, and indeed, they have no well matured and *positive* belief, and of course they are dead while they live. If men preach with the *humility, sincerity, independence, and confidence*, in the Word of God, felt by the first preachers, the people will be just as ready to hear now, as they were in the days of the Apostles.

With these suggestions, beloved friends, we feel encouraged to attempt a re-announcement of the Gospel of God to-day. Timothy, though not inspired, was commanded to "*preach the word,*" as he had learned it, and been taught of Paul. No opinions in regard to it, and no expositions, or eulogies upon the sacred oracles were to employ his mind. If we mistake not, the great moral labor of this age, should be to turn the thoughts of the teachers of religion from what they are pleased to call the "*meaning or explanations of the Divine truth,*"—by which craft myriads make their bread doling out moonshine,—to simple statements of the spirit, adapted to the wants of all classes, in the reach of God's moral influence.

But this leads us to gravely ask the question,

2nd. *What is the Gospel?*

Etymologically, it denotes "*Good News.*" It was prospectively preached to Abraham as *Gospel*, but not *the Gospel of Christ*. Isaiah said, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of the Everlasting age, the Prince of peace."

An angel from heaven first announced the glad tidings to the humble

shepherds of Bethlehem, while watching their flocks by night. He came from the courts above, crying in sweet accents, "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Savior, who is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you, ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest; and on the earth, peace, good will toward men."

None but the sinful sons and daughters of earth, can appreciate tidings so divine. Yet it is to be deeply regretted that so few are prepared to hear it. If the heart of the condemned criminal leaps for joy at the sound of a *reprieve*, we who are condemned to an eternal death, should cease not to shout the praises of God and the Lamb for good news, whose effects will be realized in the ages of eternity. The Lord of glory came to release prisoners in iron chairs, to pour into the soul the oil of joy and gladness, and to take the unfortunate home with him to heaven.

Thus we are led to enquire,

3d. *Is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, God's converting power?*

Paul said, Rom. i, 16, "*I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.*" The question is not, whether the Gospel is a power unto salvation; for this would imply, that there are other powers. Nor that it alone is the power of God in redemption, for if we find the doctrine set forth, that the Gospel is *the* power of God to salvation to each believer, the language precludes all other powers; and should we look to other sources, we would repudiate this. Even David in the 19th Psalm, said, "*The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;*" and the Heavenly Father asks, Jer. xxii. 29, "*Is not my word like as a fire; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?*" It is both becoming and respectful to say, that *fire, is fire*; and it would be ludicrous above comparison, to seek to employ measures to give fire efficiency, or to admit that fire can exist without all its constituents. No one would think of heat being absent from fire, or pray for heat to attend the fire; and when we are told that "The word of the Lord is as a fire, and a hammer that breaketh the rock," we feel assured that the power is in the truth, and without this power it would not be the word of the Lord. A powerless truth of God would be an anomaly, an impossibility.

The Savior speaks of the gospel as the "good seed," that sown in suitable soil, fails not to bring forth thirty, sixty and an hundred fold. In this we have reference to the *indescribable* vital principle in the seed that God has made, and without which seed would not be seed, but mere husks; and the word of God, without the quickening influence—vital power, as before intimated—is not the word of God. "Where the word of a king is, there is power," and every officer, by human authority, bears his authority and official power *in his name* alone. Jehovah inscribed his name upon the mercy seat, in the Jewish economy, and Israel ever after, to insure answers to prayers, was compelled to look to Jerusalem. The name, authority and power of God were not elsewhere; and so long as we have evidence that "there is no other name by which men can be saved than that of Jesus, we are satisfied that God is *in* Him of a truth.

It is surprising, however, that in most books and papers devoted to religion, the word of God is represented as "*the mere letter of religion*," but the vital power or spiritual principle is thought to be beyond; and, hence, we are taught that men may hear all God has said, and believe all he has written, and still be destitute of the power of godliness. In at least one periodical amongst the disciples we have noticed the doctrine we are opposing boldly advocated.

But we are asked, if the word of God is not, of itself, really and truly nothing more than "*the letter that killeth*?" Is it not a spirit that acts without forms and words to which we must look? Philosophically speaking, the word of God can have no power; its life cannot be detected, and all philosophers are, in the true sense, infidels, and only infidels. Let us consult Paul as to the spirit and letter of religion, with a determination to abide by his record.

He wrote, 2 Cor. 3, 5-11, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who has also made us [the Apostles] able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter (the letter was the law of Moses which had waxed old and was ready to vanish away,) but of the Spirit; for the letter (the law) killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." This "letter" was the ministration of death, written and engraven on stone, which was to be done away; but the ministration of the Spirit—the New Testament—the Gospel of the grace of God, was to remain. Let no one then who respects God, his word, or even regards himself, say that the word of eternal life, is the mere letter of religion.

But we are fully aware it is our duty to attempt,

4th. *To examine some of the objections to this teaching.*

We frequently hear religionists speak of the word of God as destitute of all life till the Almighty is disposed to super-add his Spirit. Hence the prayer, "Lord, send down thy Spirit to quicken the hearts of sinners, and *give thy word force and power.*" This is a plain admission, that God is not in his appointments—that the word is as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, till "*energized*" by the Spirit. Hence men preach with no confidence in the truth, and the people are unmoved, dreaming that all the power is beyond words, and ideas, and in this condition thousands and millions of our frail denizens of earth are stumbling into eternity. Any form of words which conveys the impression that the scriptures of truth, are a verbal directory merely, neutralizes the word of life, and renders it inefficient for good. This is the grand sin of the age. The gospel is no longer God's power to salvation. It is effete and destitute of all life. In our opposition to this *infidel* teaching, it is our purpose to show that the word of God is not dead, but living, and quickening and will abide for ever. We regard it as out of place to employ our time in telling what Jehovah will or must do to give his appointments force, or how he must aid us to believe, and do his will. God addresses man as he is, capable in all respects of hearing his Father's living word, and when he speaks he is *in* his word, *in* his appointments, and it is this confidence which makes his worship spiritual. We pretend not to explain this matter; no more than we can comprehend how the life is in the blood, or vitality is in the seed, and is not superadded to it. We know the facts, and are satisfied. God did it all, and it is marvelous in our eyes. In like manner we profess not to comprehend how "*The Spirit is ministered by the hearing of Faith,*" but so it is written, and we believe it; or the secret of the Almighty's appearing to Moses in the burning bush that was not consumed, yet we doubt it not. Neither can we tell the secret of the saps circulating to the utmost organ of the delicate plant, but it is the Lord's work and not man's. We are also ignorant as to the manner the Spirit really and truly reaches our hearts by our union with Christ's body, or how the spirit that is in us will "*quicken*" our mortal bodies in the resurrection. True we believe not from logical or philosophical deductions, but from report, but still our confidence is unshaken in the statements. Unbelievers scoff at the positive appointments of the Lord. They ask how is there life, or advantage in the church? what fitness or intrinsic value is there in baptism? the Lord's supper; prayer, or giving a cup of cold water in the name of a

disciple? Thus they make void the means of salvation by their ignorance and skepticism.

We have never been able to comprehend philosophical fitness in a red heifer, or a scape goat, to take away sin, no more than to understand the peculiar fitness of the New Testament religion to purify the heart and qualify men for life, death and eternity. Still we believe he has spoken *living words* to the world, that these words are "*spirit and life*"—that God is in his words, and in his appointments. Heaven has ordained a power, inexplicable by chemists, in arsenic, to produce death; power in bread to strengthen the human body, and we see no reason why he could not give specific appointments to quicken the soul, and qualify it for immortality.

In answer to the philosophical dogma of man's possessing *native energy*—spiritual power—or divinity within—to enable him to work his passage through this world of disappointment and sorrow, without extraneous means, we simply state, that there is no fact in history which authorizes such a conclusion. Man left to himself, in all ages and countries, has affiliated to the beasts of the field, and still, unassisted by the power of God, is animal in his ways. In the language of the prophet, "*It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.*" The doctrine taught by German neologists, French metaphysicians, English deists and American spiritualists, speculatists and religious atheists, completely annuls and blots from existence everything like written revelation, the gospel of Christ, or the ordinances of the New Testament. It is the death of all churches in which it is countenanced, but for a day or an hour.

We need not ask, why *may* not the Lord put forth his moral power enshrined in words and ordinances; but *has* he not done so? We would enquire, where is man's moral power, for good and for evil? We never could understand the rationale of angry words exciting in the human breast the bitterest feelings; but we have all witnessed the fact. Are we deceived when we say, that in our words and example we exert all the good or bad influence in our power. When a friend whom we know writes to us that dear ones of earth are dead, although we see no particular influence in the ink, paper, etc., to move our souls, in spite of resolution, our hearts sink within us, and the scalding tears flow freely. This is *moral force*. We think we are prepared to conclude on this point by stating, that we know of no spiritual or moral influence which acts chemically, or directly on the organs of body or soul; but God approaches man through his *mind*, his *understanding*, his



*thinking self*, and in this manner only does he control the world spiritually. Hence his employment of words, ideas and ordinances, easily understood and believed.

Thus he addresses the gospel to man in a state of death—but he is man and not a beast, therefore, he is capable of hearing; and as certainly as he hearkens to the voice of his Father, salvation will be his. True, we do not say that the word is the Spirit of God. The word of God is denominated the sword of the Spirit, it is the voice of God, the voice of the Spirit, and the medium of spiritual light, life and influence. Consequently, where the word of God has not gone, the world has not given the slightest evidence of spiritual light and life.

Through the truth the Spirit reproves men—enables them to see the light and loveliness of God's countenance; to believe unto righteousness, and enter the spiritual body in obedience. "Because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father." As to the manner in which the Spirit dwells in the truth, operates through it, takes up his abode in our hearts, or will awake the sleeping dead, we have admitted we are profoundly ignorant, and we add, that we entertain not the most distant idea, that men in the present state are competent to investigate such matters. The facts, however, we believe upon proper testimony, and in this belief, we rejoice. But we do not deem it important to notice further objections to the doctrine that the Gospel, as it is, with a fair translation, is perfectly adapted to man, as he is, and is God's power to salvation to every one that believes. When the mind is prepared to *hear* the word, the *details* of the gospel—the birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Messiah to the right hand of the Father, are matters easily preached and easily believed. We are happy moreover in the conviction, that the simple statements of the Lord's word need no learned expounder, no change of forms, no apologies and no eulogiums. They are always effectual in all believers. We rejoice, though, most of all in the confidence that all who believe on the Lord "*through the words*" of the apostles are as truly one as God and his Son are one; and it is by this union, through a belief of the facts, that the world is to be saved.

5th. *It is important to consider the influence of the Gospel in the first age of the church.*

It is written, Mark i, 14, 15: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into the coasts of Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye and believe the Gospel." Notice, it was no

theory of the gospel, no philosophical or orthodox view, but simply to believe the Gospel.

Simon and Andrew Peter at the first hearing "straightway forsook their nets and followed him." Next, "James the son of Zebedee and John, his brother, left their father and went after him." But wherever the Lord or his plain, honest and confiding disciples preached, multitudes were constrained to admit, that they had never heard the like—their hearts yielded, and they went after the Savior.

Under the commission, "Go teach the nations;" "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," three thousand we have noticed were saved at the first announcement; and it was but a few years that forty thousand persons were found rejoicing in the truth at Jerusalem. After Judea, Samaria and then Galilee heard the word of the Lord and rejoiced, and last of all, the light reached the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. The Apostles bore the glad tidings into all the world, "to the uttermost parts of the earth," before the destruction of the temple, in the year 71; and it is most extraordinary that it was effectual in every place it was preached, in turning men "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Also, in the revolutions of subsequent ages, whenever, and wherever the unadulterated word has been preached, sinners have rejoiced in its light, and in its many exceedingly great and precious promises. And now, even to-day, in the midst of conflicting systems, finely spun theories, and infidel speculations, the gospel of Jesus Christ, the old-fashioned gospel, affords the only sure ground of hope regarding the future. Where it is not, death, the king of terrors, reigns triumphant. Regarding this gospel, Paul says, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels; in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe, (because our testimony among you was believed,) in that day." 2 Thes. i, 10, 11. Thus it seems the belief of the truth will secure the everlasting rest, which the Lord is preparing for his saints. It will be borne in mind, that every religious action is but an act of faith.

6th. *We may next enquire as to the condemnation that rests upon the world.*

The Savior said, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." Again, "He that believeth on him is not condemned,

but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." In another discourse our Lord said, "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins," and no marvel that he should have said, "He that believes not shall be damned."

7th. *Last of all, we ask, why is the Gospel powerful to salvation?*

Our reply is short. It is in consequence of believing with all the heart. We have heard men speak of "*a cold, indifferent and lifeless faith.*" A cold and lifeless faith is an impossibility. No man ever believed God, and remained cold-hearted or indifferent. Even Felix trembled and said, "Go thy way for this time, Paul, and when I find a convenient season I will call for thee." His belief was but momentary—"the cares of the world, and the lusts of other things" choked the word out of his soul, but while it was operating upon his mind, his body was convulsed and his very heart of hearts was deeply moved."

Upon hearing and believing, for the moment, the word of life, King Agrippa exclaimed, in agony, "Paul, almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." And man never believed the gospel without feeling the mighty power of God piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, joints and marrow," and it is always "a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." But we ask, what is the *condition* of this influence of the gospel upon the human heart? We answer, promptly, belief of the truth—simple belief "that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Are we told, there is a dead faith which possesses no power over the soul? This is equivalent to saying, there is no faith in the heart. If devils could not believe without trembling, are we to conclude belief in a man's heart leads him to seek the favor of his Savior? While the word dwells in the heart, the soul is fully alive to responsibility, but the moment it is rooted out, faith dies, and all feeling and religious interest cease. A single example we consider quite sufficient to impress upon the mind the truth of all our teaching. Abraham was styled "the father of the faithful," because he never permitted himself to "Stagger at the word of God," although he had better reasons for doubting, hesitating and an obstinate refusal of credence than can be found in the records of the world. He was told to believe and to do things, most unreasonable, in all our philosophy—unfit in themselves, every way inappropriate, and in every point of view, save one, revolting and disgusting. Who could philosophically bear the idea of serving God by slaying an innocent child?

Yet Abraham was told, "To take his son, his only son Isaac, whom he loved, and get into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering." Who ever heard of a command so perfectly adverse to all *our* views of propriety? Men generally find excuses for disbelieving the Almighty; but surely mortal man never saw so ample room for hesitating as did Abraham. He might have said, Lord, I have long been faithful to you—now I am old—have one only, dear, and beloved child, and oh, Father, if I slay him, I destroy the stay and comfort of my declining years, and I will soon go down in sorrow to the grave. He might have urged, that Sarah, the beloved Isaac's mother, whose heart leaped with joy at his birth, would have all her brightest hopes crushed, and a sudden death would remove her from earth. He might have said, "Lord, my neighbors have sons enough and to spare, take one of them." But no, Abraham suffered not himself to pause, to advise with friends, the Lord hath spoken—his duty was clearly defined, and most humbly, confidingly, and cheerfully he lifted his heart and face to Heaven and said, "I will go, Lord." He took his son Isaac and the wood; and on the third day he saw rise in the distance the mountains of Moriah; but his believing heart failed not. He said to the young men, "Abide here while I and the lad go yonder to worship." They ascended the mountain together. They stopped, silently, though not in sadness, the altar rose, the innocent and unsuspecting child was bound upon the fatal wood; without pausing, Abraham took the knife, and as he lifted his hand before the face of God and his child, the swift winged messenger from the court above cried, hold, Abraham, "for now I know thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." As Abraham looked around, he saw a victim entangled in the vines, and he took the ram and sacrificed him before the Lord. Thus did Abraham have the first glimpse of a resurrection. "Accounting that God was able to raise his son, even from the dead, from which he also received him in a figure."

This is the meaning, dear brethren and fellow pilgrims in the flesh, of faith in the promises. This is the faith of God that purifies the heart, consecrates us to our benevolent Father, qualifies us for useful and happy lives, enables us to triumph in death, and will bring us off more than conquerors through him that loved us and gave himself for us. In the belief of the sure word of testimony—the gospel of God's Son—we have all the promises to strengthen our sinking hearts, and to this faith alone can our friends of the world look, for power to save and overcome the world.

Finally, the belief of the gospel, as it is written, will bring the alien nigh to God, and will enable Christians to triumph gloriously beyond the boundary of sin and death. Thanks to God for such a treasure. Who, present, will refuse to hear the gospel?

---

### COURSE OF THE CHRISTIAN AGE, AND ELDER B. FRANKLIN.

In the Christian Age, Nov. 10, 1857, the Editor, Bro. B. Franklin, devotes a column and a half to "*President Fanning's course*," the matter and spirit of which, we sincerely regret. Were we to publish it, we should feel under obligations to criticise it with a severity that we dislike, and therefore, we will notice but a few points.

In the first place, we suggest that an interference at this late hour, in the controversy with Prof. Richardson and ourself, is entirely out of place, unnecessary and an intermeddling that exhibits a want of sound judgment and a disposition, we fear, to do us injustice. We will hear Bro. Franklin a few words. He speaks of us as wishing to make ourself "*a martyr*." We think we have made no such effort, but thought it becoming to ask editors, who without knowing what they said were sneering at us for being so presumptuous as to oppose what was considered sound in Prof. Richardson, if they intended to adopt the infidelity? Bro. Franklin admits that Prof. R. and coadjutors, "*Have fallen into the error of higher law views*," but for calling the teaching "*infidel*," he "*regrets the course pursued by us as much as the most ultra amongst them*." We heard Bro. Franklin in Nashville pronounce this higher law teaching "*infidelity*." J. B. Ferguson was then its advocate. If we were to teach it, we suspect Bro. Franklin would pronounce us infidel. But he pronounces these transcendental teachers, "*most of whom*" he says, "*have never done much thinking or reading*," and have no "*just appreciation of the New Testament*," far from intending wrong.

Bro. Franklin says the essay in the Age from Prof. Richardson, "*made no allusion to us*." We are sorry that he has laid himself liable to such exposure. We simply state, that a more bitter personal attack we think we never saw from any man, than is contained in the essay published in the Age against us personally, and our teaching particularly. Let the facts reveal who writes at random.

Bro. Franklin says, "*He has no sympathy for us in pressing this matter to the injury of Bethany College or its Professors*," and for our "*ex-*



*travagant procedure,"* he says, "*I do not believe Brother Fanning will find a party among the brethren that will sustain him.*"

These insinuations, we regard as exceedingly degrading. The idea, that one cannot oppose a false system of religion without being charged by professed friends with an ambition to injure others, is too bad for men who respect each other; and the intimation that we could be induced to operate in any way with a party, is certainly a deliberate insult. We wish, however, to state, in much kindness, that while we earnestly desire the prosperity of all our schools, and abhor parties in either church or State, we are more than confident that every believer of the scriptures living, who understands the controversy and is above *policy*, will sustain our teaching. Why has Brother Franklin so changed his tone? In a letter written by him, to which he has already referred, Aug. 21, 1857, before us, we find these words: "*I think I am fully with you in the issue with R. Richardson & Co.*"

"*I am out in the field preaching and writing against the whole thing, showing that it is an empty, deceitful bubble, containing nothing.*" But in this same letter we find the first allusion to the evil effects of colleges we have noticed. Brother Franklin says, "I am alarmed about the effect of colleges. If our colleges are to be used as engines to pull down all that we have built, we must call them to order." This was penned with direct reference to "R. Richardson & Co.'s" teaching, yet "Brother Fanning is the man that" has made the attack on our colleges that are sound in the faith. No explanation is necessary.

Last and worst of all, Brother Franklin tells us that "*Bro. Campbell has taken his pen in hand, and this matter will be set right.*" We think this particularly unfortunate. We can understand them in no other sense but that of a threat. Why attempt to excite Bro. Campbell against us? He authorized no such an expression, and we think it cruel treatment to present him in the attitude of pronouncing sentence upon the brethren. This is serious injustice to Bro. Campbell. Romanists and the degraded of earth may be whipped into traces by threats, but they are disregarded by men who know and love the truth. We must repeat our regrets at Brother Franklin's unnecessary interference. The Age for some time we had regarded as not very efficient in the cause of truth, and hoped under the guidance of Bro. Franklin it would occupy a high position; but such mistakes cannot be oft repeated with safety. We think it also due to Brother Franklin to say, that we have considered him one of our most competent defenders of the faith, but now we confess we do not know whether he is for the

truth, as it is written, or the advocate of some *POLICY* of man. In the South-west we have met with but one preacher who was disposed to defend the teaching of our friends with whom we have balanced accounts. Said he, "As for the truth, that is not the thing; the people may be for your teaching, but many of the preachers and editors, like myself, will as a matter of *policy* support R. Richardson & Co." We can give the name. But we do not and cannot entertain so degrading views of many preachers or editors. Indeed, we have seen no teacher, possessing the independence to think for himself, that countenances in the slightest degree the new speculations. But, alas! for human nature. We should all with Paul, "Keep under our bodies and bring them into subjection, lest, after we have preached the gospel to others, we ourselves should be cast away."

T. FANNING.

#### CLOSE OF THE VOLUME.

THE present number closes the third volume of the Gospel Advocate, and with it another year of our labors. What good has been the result of our labors? How many have been turned from the ways of sin and death to the paths of peace and life? Whose confidence in the word of God and the appointments of Heaven has been made surer and stronger? These are questions that force themselves upon us in looking back upon the labors of the past. We feel that it is a fearful thing to have misdirected a single human being, to have spoken or written a word to lead one into error. What has been done is gone to record. We leave it with Him whose judgments are tempered with mercy. And with a deeper sense of the responsibilities of our position we would enter upon the coming year.

If we know our own hearts we have no selfish purpose to serve. The cause of our Master, the honor of his church and the supremacy of the Word of Life are the glorious objects for which we labor, and these we feel to be the noblest and most worthy that ever engaged human energy.

To our brethren and friends who have stood by us so faithfully we can but say, we still need your aid. We make no appeals for sympathy. If the cause we plead will inspire all who love the Truth of Heaven with zeal to work together with and for each other, we have no confidence in any thing beyond. But we are assured that with those who determined to stand firm by the old constitution, all will be right and that our labors for the new year will be most abundantly blessed.

With the strong assurance that our brethren, particularly in the South-west, still have confidence in the power of the truth, and are disposed to stand up firmly for the church of Christ and its appointments as Heaven's means for the justification, spiritual growth and final glorification of man, we enter upon the work of the new year with renewed determination to labor for these great ends.

EDITORS.

#### ADVENTURE IN THE TOMB OF DAVID.

THE following sketch, furnished by Miss Barclay, daughter of Jas. T. Barclay, author of a forthcoming work, "The City of the Great King," (now in course of publication by James Challen & Sons, Phila.,) gives an interesting account of her perilous adventure in gaining access to the *Tomb of David*.

"Early one morning, during the great Mahomedan feast of Rhama-dan, I was called to the 'parley' room, to see my friend Moosa. This little fellow having become rather a frequent visitor, I was at first inclined to excuse myself, but remembering he had lately hinted at the possibility of my gaining an entrance into the Tomb of David, and in consideration, too, of the fact of being their fasting season, the everlasting finjan of coffee and douceur of sweetmeats—those otherwise indispensable marks of Turkish civility—might now be dispensed with, I concluded to make my appearance. On entering the room, my pleasing suspicions were confirmed by seeing him close the door and mysteriously place his forefinger on his lips, in token of profound secrecy. He laid his pondrous turban on the divan beside him, doffed his slippers, crossed his legs, and then disclosed the nature of his errand. In short, I was informed that his sister was ready for an adventure: and, as I was too, we were not long in reaching 'Turfendah,' (his sister,) who immediately commenced operations. My hair was taken down, and braided in scores of little plaits. A red cloth cap, with a blue silk tassel was placed on my head, and around it a gauze turban, with gold tassels and embroidery. My robe and trowsers were of the finest Damascus silk, my girdle of cashmere, and tunic of light blue stuff, embroidered in silver flowers. My hands were already dyed with 'henna,' having undergone this process on the occasion of a former adventure in Mosque of Omar, and still retained the deep yellow hue; my skin was pretty deeply tanned, too, from a residence of several years under a burning Syrian sun, which was quite an ad-

dition to my Turkish appearance. The sheet, veil, and slippers came in due order; and having secreted my pencil and sketch-book in the folds of my girdle we sallied forth, accompanied by Turfendah's favorite slave.

"The reputed Tomb of David is just outside Zion Gate, hard by the Cœnaculum and American cemetery. It is surrounded by an irregular pile of buildings, and surmounted by a dome and minaret. In the interior are some of the most grotesque architectural embellishments imaginable, on the capitals of some remains of the Crusaders' architecture. Just think of the frightful owl occupying the place of the classic acanthus and the mythic lotus! We passed the several halls and corridors, evidently of the style of the Quixotic era of the Crusaders' domination, before reaching the consecrated apartment, whose entrance is guarded by double iron doors. We found here an old derwish, prostrate in prayer, on the cold stone floor. Not being privileged, as we, to enter the sacred precincts, he was content with gazing at the tomb through the iron bars; for it is a rare thing for even a Mussulman ecclesiastic to gain admittance—my companion and her family only enjoying this privilege because they are very near relatives of the curator of the tomb. Our slave was despatched for the key, which she had no difficulty in obtaining, on the plea that her mistress wished to pray on the holy spot. But what was my consternation on seeing another slave return with her! I confess that I trembled, and thinking I had best leave my awkward slippers behind, in case of retreat, as they would greatly impede my progress, and might thereby cause me to lose my head. She peered under my veil, asked who I was, and seemed satisfied with the careless reply of Turfendah, that I was merely a friend of hers from Stamboul. She invited us up stairs to see the old keeper's harem; and Dahudeah (Moosa's little wife) who is always glad to exchange the purgatory of a residence with her lord and master for a visit of a few days here; for I can testify from personal observation that the young effendi lords it over her in true oriental conjugal style. Turfendah regretted she could not accept her kind invitation, and, as she was so much exhausted from fasting, she would prefer deferring it to another time. The slave then left, to our mutual relief, and, having dismissed the old derwish, the doors were closed and doubly locked.

"The room is insignificant in its dimensions, but is furnished very gorgeously. The tomb is apparently an immense sarcophagus of rough stone, and is covered by green satin tapestry, richly embroider-

ed with gold. To this a piece of black velvet is attached, with a few inscriptions from the Koran, embroidered also in gold. A satin canopy of red, blue, green and yellow stripes, hangs over the tomb; and another piece of black velvet tapestry, embroidered in silver, covers a door in one end of the room, which they said, leads to a cave underneath. Two tall silver candle sticks stand before this door, and a little lamp hangs in a window near it, which is kept constantly burning, and whose wick, though saturated with oil—and I dare say, a most nauseous dose—my devotional companion eagerly swallowed, muttering to herself a prayer with many a genuflexion. She then, in addition to their usual forms of prayer, prostrated herself before the tomb, raised the covering, pressed her forehead to the stone, and then kissed it many times. The ceiling of the room is vaulted, and the walls covered with blue porcelain, in floral figures. Having remained here an hour or more, and completed my sketch, we left; and great was my rejoicing when I found myself once more at home, out of danger, and still better, out of my awkward costume.” \* \*

### SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS.—NO. III.

#### TWENTY-ONE YEAR'S EXPERIENCE.

To speak of one's self is generally self-laudatory, since few confess their faults, or speak to their own dishonor. So common, indeed, is it for persons to speak of themselves only for selfish purposes, and so offensive to the public sense of justice and propriety, (an indication of good taste,) that it is common, even amongst good and sensible people, to conclude at once, on finding one speaking of himself, that he is seeking to honor *self*, and is, therefore, unworthy—which he certainly is when guilty as supposed. May I hope, then, that the reader will not think me unmindful, nor careless, touching the danger to which I expose myself in the following remarks.

Many now living have been much longer doing the work of Christian Evangelists—several more than doubly as long. Nor do I mean to present my labors as an example for others. Far from it. I have a single purpose—to illustrate, in the best way I can, the necessity, the dangers, difficulties, etc., of supporting Evangelists, and so to impress, if I can, upon the Disciples the necessity of increased attention to the subject. The fact that actual occurrences make a deeper impression than mere reasoning, (having the *facts* the reader can *reason* for him-



self) induces me to incur the risk of blame. I might, I suppose, speak of *imaginary* cases, or of the labors of others, but certainly not so effectively; and I am not so careful about the opinion of the masses, if I can have the concurrence of the Heavenly Father and his *intelligent* friends on earth and in heaven.

For three or four years I refused as much, I think, as I received, being governed by a sense of modesty, rather than a sense of justice. Starting out without the promise of aid from any quarter—as did many others then and before—I was not disappointed as to support; I neither received nor refused much. Occasionally a good sister gave me a pair of socks, sometimes I got a pair of pants, or janes to make them. During successful meetings a brother would, now and then, put into my hand, rather sily, a small piece of money, perhaps adding, “you may need this to pay your ferriage.” These were my happiest days, so far as concerns money; for, having no promises due me, and feeling my unworthiness, I was not expecting to receive support, and was not the least disappointed by not receiving it. The brethren, too, I think, were less under the influence of money, of promises and of obligations to support Evangelists, because they had not generally investigated the subject. What they did was more the expression of their hearts, than the result of theory; for few of them, where I traveled, had much theory on the subject. The little that was done was, therefore, *heartily* done, and there was nothing to hinder its being enjoyed mutually by the giver and receiver—there was no lurking feeling of complaint because more was not received, no sting of conscience because more was not given. Alas! that it was not always so!

But the \$500 or \$600 of my boyhood's hard earnings soon gave out. When I saw the end, which I did not so clearly from the beginning, I began to cast about for a horse, and for other necessities. A little experience had also deeply impressed me with the necessity of an education, such as I little dreamed of when I started. But “*to be*” was the first question with me then, to be *educated*, much as I desired it, was almost further off than hope could reach. Finally, I got a little country school, such as I could teach. This was, to me at least, the most profitable part of my life, owing to the kindness of *brethren and sisters*. I have not requited them fully, but I thank God I delight to honor them, and would here give their names, but most of them yet live, and I would rather they should have a better reward. While I replenished my purse and furnished my wardrobe a little, I profited much more by what I learned. Upon the whole, I gathered quite a

"head." But, having learned that I *could* learn, and greatly feeling my necessity, after a round of camp meetings, basket meetings, and some others, an opportunity offering I commenced the regular routine of a school boy. Meantime I had learned that money was something to me, as well as to others. Some brethren aided me liberally. Others promised, voluntarily, and disappointed me sadly. I endeavored to enter the doors as they were severally opened, both for learning and doing good.

The Christian Baptist providentially fell into the hands of an independent thinker, then a "class leader," wealthy, and standing rather at the head of others besides his class; he was soon convinced, and though he had been immersed, he sent directly for a somewhat eminent yet living and devoted Evangelist to immerse him for the remission of his sins; alleging that he had hitherto walked in the dark, and he feared such service could not be acceptable to the Lord. This Evangelist being absent, I was induced by the owner of that copy of the Christian Baptist to go in his stead—some sixty miles. I shall long remember how the class-leader, and especially his very nice and truly excellent consort, eyed my then worn brown janes pants, etc. They spared my feelings, though, and all passed in silence. The meeting was successful, however, and I made another and another visit, and finally, making the class-leader's house my home, free of charge, (he was still a class-leader, and yet is a zealous defender of the faith,) I spent a year of most interesting study and labor there. The promises of support were voluntary, and of the most definite character. Still, save the liberality of "mine host," and a few crumbs gathered here and there, I received almost nothing. For instance, a brother of good property came to me, and earnestly requested that I should preach monthly at the church where he held his membership, and, as an inducement, he informed me that he had a subscription of \$135, and would increase it. He added, also, that he would be personally responsible for the amount—he would see it paid. This I had not so much as thought of, so far as I can now remember. And though there had been a time when I might have turned deafly away, a little experience had given me a higher appreciation of money, and seeing nothing wrong in it,—it being *their* estimate, not mine of my labors—I accepted. I had, however, as I told the brother, fully determined to labor there any how, because it was in my field, and seemed more promising than other places. During the year that church, I believe, more than doubled its number of members, and was every way doing

well—at least, so it appeared. They were also very reluctant to give me up. Still I received, in all, from them, of the \$135, and otherwise, I think not more than *ten or fifteen dollars!* This was a sad disappointment. Another church promised the same liberality, and with even greater ability, and having received still larger accessions, (the last meeting there were 58,) disappointed me nearly as much. After leaving that State to attend College, I wrote to one of the “Elders” of the first named church, stating my actual need, and modestly intimating that he should make collections and forward to me. He replied very crustily, only because I had dared to intimate that what the church promised ought to be paid. Still he vowed that it should be paid. I wrote him then a positive demand of payment to me or any benevolent purpose, (not to support an evangelist to labor with them,) adding definitely that if sent to me I would use it for some benevolent purpose, not to supply my own wants. I have heard nothing from these promises since, and I suppose it possible that, though clearly covenant breakers, and otherwise violators of the Divine law, (for, as before shown, it was their duty, without a specific promise, to support their chosen evangelist,) their consciences are quite easy on the subject. So it is with “sharper” members of the church—keen traders—the love of money hiding the beam in their own eyes, they rather boast of having cheated their neighbors and brethren—“got them down”—than mourn the sin of defrauding those whose rights and interests should be as dear to them as their own. Alas! poor Evangelists! it is no sin to mortify them, disappoint them, break promises made to them, etc., although it may not be exactly right for Papists to “keep no faith with heretics.” Such were some of my reflections; and if it was sinful to indulge them, it may be no more than honest to confess them.

C. K.

Salado, Bell Co., Texas, April 18, 1857.

---

## SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS—NO. IV.

### PERSONAL EXPERIENCE CONTINUED.

When I determined to spend some time at College, some men of means, who felt the power of the gospel, offered to defray my expenses. And having declined this, under the impression that provision was otherwise made for my expenses, (in which my expectations were not realized,) I was compelled to borrow money, for a time, or relinquish my cherished purpose. I had previously found poor encouragement

from "monthly preaching," either as respects the good effected or the compensation received; but as an alternative, opportunities offering, I concluded to engage. In this way, though I received but a moiety of what was promised generally, I managed, by close economy, to clear expenses—a good brother boarding me half the time free of charge.

Traveling and holding protracted meetings yielded a better support, and it yet appears that I might have done more good in this way. Still I could secure but few books, or other means of study, had no home, etc. And, indeed, it was only during excitements that I received any thing of importance. Churches would send most urgently, and promise most magnificently, and yet, unless their *feelings* were wrought upon by *additions*, I received little or nothing. After I thought it necessary to spend much time laboring to "set in order the things that were wanting" in the churches, before endeavoring to obtain new members. For all this labor I seldom received any thing.

After I was married I thought it proper to secure, as well as I could, a support for my family. To do this, and continue preaching as I desired, was a great object. To travel would not do, for several reasons; and to engage at a sort of a horse-mill, monthly meeting business was, I knew, to cut off largely opportunities for usefulness. I might have taken the promise of twice the amount that would have sustained one using strict economy; but these *promises* were already in bad odor with me. Besides, I could not feel well so to cripple my feeble abilities for doing good. It looked like truckling to a vain world for a paltry subsistence, to obtain which I felt as able as common young men, if it were not for preaching. Still, others engaged to preach monthly for large sums, passed by the poorer, and went many miles to the richer churches. They even went sometimes far out of their own counties, and it really appeared that the largest bid was the loudest call in many cases. These, too, were older evangelists. I never had self-esteem sufficient to differ readily from such men. I might be wrong. I hesitated. And finally, as an alternative, I engaged *two* monthly appointments, having a promise of what I thought would sustain me. The remainder of the time I determined to travel, without expecting to receive much; for I was fully fixed in the determination to aim first and mainly to get the churches in better condition if possible, and I knew this would not "*pay well*." A third church beset me, however: it was near and abundantly able. I refused. But at length I told them I expected to preach for them occasionally any how, and would be governed by the prospect of doing good there as elsewhere. They

said they would pay for each visit, many or few, the same the other churches were to pay. During the year this church added about two hundred to its number of members; and though I did nearly all the labor, they paid me, if I remember aright, less than *one twelfth* of what they promised; and this was during the greatest meeting I ever saw. Next year they desired to engage me again. I told them my purpose in engagements of the kind, that I thought such monthly meetings only a little better than nothing any how, and even worse than nothing unless the churches were preached out of monthly meetings, (i. e. induced to meet weekly, etc.,) forgave them all, and urged them plainly, and in rather a sledge-hammer style, to subscribe no more to brother ——— than they really intended to pay, etc. One of the other churches paid me near half, the other a little more than half they promised. All were in peace, and, as they thought, in the highest state of prosperity, more than doubling their numbers in a single year.

Perhaps I should state here, that these failures to pay me were not at all owing to any dissatisfaction with my labors. No one ever intimated, so far as I know, that I had not filled my engagements fully, and to the satisfaction of those concerned.

To express the state of my feelings here, I will make a brief extract from my diary:

"I have just received a letter from Mr. ——— *exceedingly* mortifying to my feelings. His own brother, as honorable and reliable a man as I know, positively promised me to pay this debt in my absence. I told him it *must be paid promptly*, and proposed to leave with him the money he had collected and had just handed to me, lest he should not be able, without inconvenience to himself, to collect enough on the subscription. He refused, adding that more was due me from the church than I owed his brother, and that he would see him paid. Now brother ——— is a good man, abundantly able, and one of my best friends. All these things seemed to conspire to make him keep his promises. He knew, too, that I was very careful to be punctual in paying my debts, and that his brother would be much disappointed by not receiving pay in due time. Still, I am brought into disrepute, my feelings unutterably mortified, and the cause injured! What shall I say or do? Alas! I know not. Disappointed and disappointing others! Have I come to this! Yet I should not murmur. The ways of the Lord are right. O! for grace! O! Lord! let me not be discouraged in thy service!"

On reading this possibly a *number* of persons may think they are re-



ferred to, and many poor, devoted Evangelists may call to mind cases too nearly similar, the remembrance of which opens afresh deep wounds in the depths of their hearts. This is far from my purpose, however. I would give no one pain—not even a dumb beast—save for its good. But I have an object, definite and important, I think, which may yet appear fully. I have practiced surgery some, and, like others, have found, in various cases, that the removal of a fungus or other unnatural growth indispensable to healthy granulations and a final cure. Perhaps it is to be regretted that we have not yet a spiritual anesthetic fully capable of destroying pain during these moral operations. But so it is, and so urgent is the case, that I feel like cutting down at once to the seat of disease, if possible, though there be none ready to hold the patient, nor even a bandage for his eyes. If syncope occur, it will not prove fatal; and if some important vessels be injured they will likely heal; at any rate, the evil resulting from the operation is not likely to be equal to that of the disease.

But it may not be necessary to mention other similar cases. I could, at any time, I presume, have had, notwithstanding the failures to pay according to promise, a pretty fat living from monthly preaching, had I gone to the places sending the "*loudest call*." It might have been necessary, however, that even these *promising* fields should have been nicely cultivated, and with direct reference to the pay promised, and to future engagements, and, if possible, to increased wages. This might have required, not the preaching of errors, nor even the entire omission of any truth or duty; but something like little Willie said of washing his face—"softly, buddy, softly; there, that will do," though the seat of disease had not been disturbed. I have no reason to complain of anything of the kind, but had I relied on such labors for support, I should have been compelled to remember, perhaps, that certain classes of my supporters do not like to be told of pride, of wearing "gold, pearls and costly array, of the dangers of wealth, etc.;" nor to have urged upon them self-denial, humility, cross-bearing, an active, devotional part in the families and in the church, etc. Such things might be preached, or read from the Bible, but laying proper stress upon them might have been certainly fatal to my living.

I determined, therefore, not to rely upon the churches for support; to speak the truth as fully and properly as I could; and if I received something I should be able to do so much the more by preaching or otherwise. I have had, accordingly, various promises—more or less every year; and while some of them have been faithfully filled, what

I have detailed may be taken as general specimens of the whole. It has not been long since some good brethren were rather offended by my telling them I would not give half for the whole amount promised. Nor is it wonderful that they were sensitive. But they had not the *experience*. They were in earnest, and *meant* to be faithful, but they would not have been quite ready to pay all the deficiencies of others, I suppose. When certain excellent spirits were grieved that I would not relinquish my purpose for the promise of an abundant support, with rather unusual guarantees, I was constrained to reply, that I had been disappointed annually for *twenty-one years*, and did not think it prudent to place myself, if I could avoid it, where I might suffer the same the remainder of my time on earth; that, if they *were* to support me while I could labor for them, my family ought to have a home, where they could, by industry and economy, live after my departure, with tolerable educational and religious facilities; and, that upon the whole, I hoped to do more good in my proposed course.

Fearing I may imprudently detain the reader upon an unpleasant subject, I am much inclined to say no more; but there are some *conclusions*, from the premises here laid, which ought to appear; and lest I be misunderstood touching *monthly preaching*, and for other reasons, something more is demanded on this subject.

Salado, Bell County, Texas, June 3, 1857.

C. K.

---

LEWISBURG, TENN., August 21, 1857.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I commenced a meeting at Smyrna, Maury county, on Saturday before the first Sunday in this month, and continued ten days, which resulted in twenty-one additions to the army of the faithful as well as the encouragement of the brethren. This is the first and only protracted meeting I have held this year, and had to quit it when the congregations were increasing in numbers and interest daily. Oh, that we had preachers who could give themselves wholly to the work. To the credit of the brethren be it said, that notwithstanding I visited them without expecting any assistance, pecuniarily, from them, and my preaching was the gospel without a word about pay in the way of money, yet when I went to take leave of them, they contributed to me *liberally*, more indeed than I had a right to hope for.

Affectionately your brother,

T. W. BRENTS.

## ON OUR WAY TO THE INDIAN MISSION.

DEAR BRETHREN:—On Tuesday, 13th of October, we left Locust Grove for the Indian Mission, and by the good providence of our Father in Heaven we are now pleasantly encamped, on Lord's day, near Black Fish Lake, Mississippi bottom, Arkansas. My wife and youngest child were sick a short time on the route, but now we are all in good health and fine spirits. We are about 265 miles from the point we left, and nearly half way to the place of our destination.

As we crossed the beautiful Tennessee and the great Mississippi, perhaps for the last time, many grateful remembrances in reference to the many churches, good brethren and kind friends with and for whom we had labored as an humble Christian minister for the last twenty years, filled our hearts with mingled emotions and caused us to feel the secret utterance of our souls—"Farewell brethren of Tennessee." The Lord bless the churches of Tennessee and make them a blessing to hundreds and thousands in the great missionary field of the great West.

As we came through Alabama we enjoyed the Christian hospitality of our beloved brother Dunn and his good sister wife. How pleasant to meet with Christian friends in our pilgrimage through this money-loving world!

What a vast and wonderful deposit is this great Mississippi bottom. It contains a rich soil, sufficient, I suppose, to manure all the poor lands of the globe. How vast the means of doing good possessed by the Christian inhabitants of the extensive valley of the Mississippi, and yet how few are converted at home! The Lord forgive the past and help us to do better in the future!

To-morrow we hope to get out of the mud and hasten on with more speed. From Black Fish Lake to St. Francis river, a distance of thirteen miles, is said to be the most difficult part of the route through the swamp.

Since writing the above we have finished our travel through the much dreaded swamp. Yesterday we crossed the St. Francis and rejoiced to tread once more on higher and firmer lands. Lightnings, thunders and heavy rains were our attendants as we waded through the deep mud from Black Fish Lake to St. Francis river. But now the weather is fine and the roads good. Thus we see that good and evil is the lot of man in this life of trial.

Farewell till you hear from me again. Yours as ever in the Lord,  
Arkansas, November 3, 1857. J. J. TROTT.

## CHURCH NEWS.

LAST Lord's day five persons were immersed near 20 miles from this on San Gabriel, at Circleville. Since my last report twelve were immersed at Bryant's Station, on Little River, near 25 miles from this. Salado, Bell County, Texas, June 3, 1857. C. K.

---

AUSTIN, TEXAS, October 5, 1857.

BROTHER LIPSCOMB,—Sir:—Brother C. Kendrick has been preaching for us for some three or four weeks, and there has been seventy additions to the Church of Christ in the city of Austin.

Yours in Christ,

E. H. DARTER.

---

SHELBY COUNTY, TEXAS, August 30, 1857.

DEAR BRETHREN:—Our congregations are large and attentive. Since I last wrote you six have obeyed the Master and are going on their way rejoicing in hope of immortality.

P. F. SOUTHERN.

---

## CO-OPERATION.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Through the love and mercy of our kind heavenly Father I am permitted to address you these few lines for publication.

Our Co-operation of North Arkansas assembled with the Church of Christ at Mill Creek, in Izard county, Ark., on the 10th of October, 1857. The house was called to order. Singing and prayer by Bro. W. B. F. Treat. Brother Samuel Brown was called to the chair, Brother William Barnett was chosen Secretary, and Brother W. B. F. Treat, Assistant.

On motion messengers with their representations was called for, wherein eleven churches were represented, according to our table on this sheet.

We obtained the promise of two Evangelists for the ensuing year. We pray the blessing of Almighty God upon them, and that the fruits of their labors may be seen for the close of many years, and they may

be comforted with joy unspeakable and full of glory; and to God be all the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The brethren that we have chosen are brother J. M. Lemmon and brother W. B. F. Treat.

The cause of our blessed Redeemer seems to be advancing in this country. O, may the gospel of the Son of God be preached in its purity and have the desired effect in the conviction and conversion of all that hear the same.

The Co-operation closed by singing and prayer by Brother Samuel Brown.

Motion made and carried that the co-operation meet with the Richwood congregation in Lawrence County, Arkansas, on Friday before the second Lord's day in October, 1858.

O may God bless us in our feeble effort to establish and defend truth and oppose error in this part of God's moral vineyard.

It was motioned, by the delegates, that I should give you a list of our proceedings, with the number of members of the different churches and the amount of their contributions, which is as follows:

Names of Churches.	No. of Members.	Am't. of Contributions.
Blue Spring,	172	\$95 25
Antioc,	49	36 50
Steep Bank,	76	33 00
Huble's Creek,	15	12 00
Glaze Creek,	00	15 00
Richwoods,	21	23 50
South Fork,	25	20 00
Mill Creek,	30	67 75
Big Creek,	12	25 00
Flippin Barron,	13	28 50
Rocky Bayou,	15	20 00
	<hr/> 476	<hr/> \$376 50

Desr Brethren, receive this statement in its awkward form, and give it a place in your valuable paper. We also request Brother Franklin to give it room in the Review, as it has a circulation in this part. Now may the mercy of God ever be with the faithful in Christ, is my prayer. Amen.

Yours in the one hope,

WM. BARNETT.

October 15th, 1857.



Elder J. H. DUNN, of Athens, Ala., writes:

BRO. FANNING:—I am still much pleased with the "Gospel Advocate," and especially with the manner in which you have managed the controversy with Prof. Richardson. Your article in the October number of the Advocate unmasks Prof R. and others so completely that the brethren can at once see them in their naked deformity. But I see the Harbinger does not publish your pieces. If it should not publish all your articles in reference to the matter, the brethren and the world will certainly come to the conclusion that it has departed from a fundamental principle, viz., "Let the world hear both sides."

---

#### OBITUARY.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I announce to you with much sorrow the death of my last sister, Mrs. Martha A. Harris. She died in the 39th year of her age, leaving a kind husband, one little son, a mother, sister and brothers to feel her loss. She had spent her life in teaching, and taught to within a week of her death. To her I was indebted for much instruction and many kind words of counsel. Truly do I feel greatly bereaved, having in the short space of three months lost two children and an only sister. Still I will not murmur. The agony of separation is soothed by the strong and glorious hope of soon meeting them beyond the grave, where parting will be no more.

CARRIE M. WHITE.

We had received previous to the above from brother White a notice of the death of two beloved children, which has been mislaid. We truly sympathise with our brother and sister in their two fold bereavement. May their afflictions sanctify their hearts and turn their thoughts more and more to the Lord, where pain and sickness never come and grief no place obtains.

W. L.